

## BY08 - eManifest

**INITIATIVE DEFINITION BY08***Initiative Definition BY08*

Template Name	IT Investment BY2008
Investment Name	BY08 - eManifest
Investment Revision Number	2
Is this investment a consolidated business case?	No
Point of Contact	Eads, Mark E
Revision Comment	
Class	IT

**I.A: OVERVIEW BY08***Descriptive Information BY08*

Date of Submission	9/11/2006
Agency	Environmental Protection Agency
Bureau	Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response
Name of this Capital Asset	BY08 - eManifest
Full UPI Code	020-00-01-13-01-3014-00
Four Digit UPI Code	3014
Two Digit UPI Code	
Exhibit 53 Part	IT Investments by Mission Area
OMB Investment Type	01 - Major Investment
OMB Exhibit 53 Major Mission Area	Goal 3 - Preserve and Restore the Land
PY Full UPI Code	020-00-01-13-01-0000-00-000-000
What kind of investment will this be in this Budget Year?	Planning
If this investment supports homeland security, Indicate by corresponding number which homeland security mission area(s) this investment supports?	Border and Transportation Security

OMB Short Description

eManifest is a planned electronic option for 140,000 users of EPA's current paper manifest (EPA Form 8700-22) to track RCRA hazardous waste shipments, to be built & operated by an EPA contractor paid from future user fees to be authorized by Congress.

Investment C&A Status

00 - Systems within this investment have not been through the C&A process because the investment is not yet operational

*Screening Questions BY08*

What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2008

Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

eManifest is a planned new EPA IT system which EPA's Office of Solid Waste (OSW) proposed in the 22 May 2001 Federal Register. If granted Congressional authority, OSW plans to fund eManifest lifecycle costs using a "share-in-revenue" IT contractor to be paid from future user fees. eManifest will provide 140,000 industrial and Federal facilities and state governments involved in shipping and tracking RCRA hazardous wastes, with a voluntary electronic option for the RCRA hazardous waste manifest form (EPA Form 8700-22):

<http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/gener/manifest/pdf/newform.pdf>. eManifest will enable users to initiate, sign, transmit, archive, and retrieve manifests electronically, as an alternative to using EPA's current paper manifest form, which originated under EPA's 1976 RCRA authority. The paper manifest involves 2.4 to 5.1 million manifest transactions annually (i.e., hazardous waste container shipments on trucks, railcars, or barges). eManifest will also provide for electronic transmission of manifests to any state government which elects to receive them (as of 2005 about 30 states distribute or collect paper manifests). In addition to at least \$100 million in annual paperwork burden savings to industries, Federal facilities, and state governments, eManifest is expected to provide at least five secondary benefits: (1) provide a new manifest database to enhance oversight of hazardous waste shipments by waste shippers, state governments, EPA, and other Federal agencies such as DOT and DHS, (2) eliminate duplicate reporting by facilities of manifest data to EPA's RCRA Biennial Report database saving an additional \$6 million/year in paperwork burden, (3) integration of eManifest with the US Customs international trade data system (ITDS) for tracking hazardous waste imports/exports, (4) provide capability to track hazardous waste shipments on a nearly real-time basis, and (5) lower future entry-costs by \$14 to \$29 million/year to 20 states which do not currently collect paper manifests. As an outgrowth of stakeholder consensus in 2004 for OSW to implement a nationally "centralized" rather than "decentralized" IT approach, OSW announced in the 18 April 2006 Federal Register its plan to use EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) computer hub as eManifest's operating platform. CDX will provide users with secure 24/7/365 access to eManifest via the internet and via EPA's Environmental Information Exchange Network.

Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes

If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 5/11/2006

Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes

Contact information of Project Manager?

Project Manager Name	
Tully, John	
Project Manager Phone Number	703-308-8199
Project Manager E-mail	tully.john@epa.gov
Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.	Yes
Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes
Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	No
If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all of the PMA initiatives that apply:	Expanded E-Government
Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.">www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.</a> )	Yes
Does this investment address a weakness found during the PART Review?	Yes
If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	2004 EPA Recycling, Waste Minimization & Waste Management Program <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/detail.10002288.2005.html">http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/detail.10002288.2005.html</a> ; OMB identified eManifest as a program follow-up action not yet completed for reducing excessive compliance costs.
If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	Adequate
Is this investment for information technology?	Yes
Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	eManifest will provide 140,000 EPA RCRA-regulated industrial facilities, Federal facilities and state governments involved in transporting and tracking RCRA hazardous wastes, with an internet-accessible electronic voluntary option to EPA's current mandatory paper manifest (EPA Form 8700-22). EPA expects eManifest to reduce the current \$193 to \$769 million annual manifest paperwork burden to facilities and states for processing 2.4 to 5.1 million annual manifests, by at least \$100 million/year.

#### IT Screening Questions BY08

If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-section.	
What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 1
What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance):	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?	No
Is this a financial management system?	No
If "yes", does this investment address a FFMIA No compliance area?	
If "yes," which FFMIA compliance area?	
If "no," what does it address?	
If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52	
Provide the Percentage Financial Management 0 for the budget year	
What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)	100
For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for hardware?	5
For budget year, what percentage of the total	78

investment is for software?  
 For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for services? 17  
 For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for other services? 0  
 If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? N/A  
 Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Privacy Officer Name  
 Hutt, Judy  
 Privacy Officer Phone Number 202-566-1668  
 Privacy Officer Title Agency Privacy Act Officer  
 Privacy Officer E-mail hutt.judy@epa.gov  
 Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? Yes

**I.B: SUMMARY OF SPENDING BY08**

*Summary of Spending BY08*

Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT STAGES

\* Costs in thousands

	PY - 1 and Earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 and Beyond	Total
<b>Planning</b>									
Budgetary Resources	975	0	0	0					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
<b>Preliminary Design</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
<b>Contract Services</b>									
Budgetary Resources	975	0	0	0					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
<b>Acquisition</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	4000					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
<b>Development</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	4000					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
<b>Government FTE</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
<b>Infrastructure Expenses</b>									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
<b>Subtotal Planning &amp; Acquisition</b>									

Budgetary Resources	975	0	0	4000					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
Operations & Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
TOTAL									
Budgetary Resources	975	0	0	4000					0
Outlays	0	0	0	0					0
Government FTE Costs									
Budgetary Resources	2310	385	385	373					0
Planning									
Budgetary Resources	2310	385	385	0					0
Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	373					0
Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0					0

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

*Full Time Equivalents BY08*

Use the following table to provide the number of Government Full Time Equivalents (FTE) represented by the Government FTE Costs in the Summary of Spending Table. Numbers should be entered in decimal format for each of the categories listed.

FTE Table

	PY - 6 2000	PY - 5 2001	PY - 4 2002	PY - 3 2003	PY - 2 2004	PY - 1 2005	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 2012	BY + 5 2013	BY + 6 2014	BY + 7 2015	BY + 8 2016	Total
Financial Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									0
Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									0
Program Management	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5									22.5
IT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									0
Total*	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5									22.5

\*This row represents the 'Number of FTE represented by cost' from Summary of Spending table and will be sent to OMB.

*Funding Questions BY08*

Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? Yes

In autumn 2006, OSW announced a new hire job opening to obtain, beginning in CY2007, a new 0.5 FTE GS-2210-13 IT Project Manager for eManifest. OSW assigned this new Project Manager to future annual oversight and management of OSW's eManifest contractor during the FY2008 procurement initiation phase, FY2009 acquisition & testing phase, FY2010 implementation phase, and FY2011 and beyond steady-state operational phase.

How many and in what year? 0.5 FTE beginning CY2007

If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

Provide the Percent Budget Formulation (BF) for the budget year

Provide the Percent Budget Execution (BE) for the budget year

*Funding Sources BY08*

Funding Sources

\* Costs in thousands

FS Name: MAX Code	Row Type	PY - 6 2000	PY - 5 2001	PY - 4 2002	PY - 3 2003	PY - 2 2004	PY - 1 2005	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 2012	BY + 5 2013	BY + 6 2014	BY + 7 2015	BY + 8 2016	Total	
Total Yearly Budgets	DME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**I.C: ACQUISITION/CONTRACT STRATEGY BY08**

*Contract/Task Order Table BY08*

Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Contract/Task Orders Table

Row Number	Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded?	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order	Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	Is it performance based?	Competitively awarded?	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	Is EVM in the contract?	Does the contract include the required security and privacy clauses?	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?

*Contract/Task Order Questions BY08*

If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
Explain why (508 Compliance)?	To conform with 508 compliance law.
Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	No
What is the date of your acquisition plan?	Unapproved draft plan 5/1/2005 based on GSA FY2005 SIS IT contract approach
If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	Yes (based on revision of the 5/1/2005 initial draft)
If "no," briefly explain why:	With assistance from EPA-OARM and GSA, OSW drafted in FY2005, an eManifest contract procurement Statement of Objectives, Acquisition Plan, and Procurement Solicitation Package, based on GSA's FY2005 Share-in-Savings IT contract vehicle ( <a href="http://www.gsa.gov/shareinsavings">http://www.gsa.gov/shareinsavings</a> ). Pending Congressional authorization, these FY2005 procurement materials provide OSW with a foundation for a similar "Share-in-Revenue" acquisition approach during OSW's FY2008 eManifest procurement initiation phase, for eManifest acquisition beginning in FY2009.

**I.D: PERFORMANCE INFORMATION BY08**

*Performance Goals & Measures BY08*

Agencies must use the Performance Goals and Measures Table below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Performance Goals and Measures

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
-------------	-----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

*FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM) BY08*

FEA PRM

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2006		Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Percentage of paper manifests voluntarily transacted electronically using eManifest; this is an indirect measure of paperwork burden cost savings to OSW's RCRA manifest customers (i.e., the RCRA-regulated community involved in haz waste transport)	2.4 to 5.1 million paper manifest transactions per year nationwide.		None: FY2006 is planning phase
2006		Mission and Business	Environmental Management	Pollution Prevention and	Realtime electronic	No realtime electronic		None: FY2006

		Results		Control	tracking of RCRA hazardous waste shipments nationwide; this is an indirect measure of enhanced opportunity of industry, EPA and state govts to investigate haz waste shipment discrepancies (e.g., missing containers).	tracking; current paper manifest system provides one-month lagged tracking of hazardous waste shipments, at best.		is planning phase.
2006		Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Average number of hours between manifest initiation by waste generator, and receipt of completed manifests by RCRA-authorized state govts; this is an indirect measure of improvement in state govt enforcement oversight of haz waste transportation	Average 30 days (720 hours) consisting of initiation of paper manifest by waste generator (day 1), waste pickup (day 2), waste transport (day 3), waste delivery (day 4), receipt of completed manifest in mail by state government in following month.		None; FY2006 is planning phase.
2006		Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	The number of RCRA-authorized state governments and Federal government agencies (e.g. EPA-OECA, EPA-OGC, EPA-OEI, DOJ, US Customs, DOT, DHS) which OSW provides access to eManifest for use (e.g., queries) as a database.	Zero manifests archived into a database, so there is no baseline access to states or Federal agencies.		None; FY2006 is planning phase.

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at [www.egov.gov](http://www.egov.gov).

**I.E: SECURITY AND PRIVACY BY08**

Costs & Risks BY08

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system/s to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system/s.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified Yes and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?

Provide the Percentage IT Security for the budget year 0

Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part Yes of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.

*Security: Planning Systems BY08*

Systems in Planning - Security

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date
eManifest	Contractor Only		

*Security: Operational Systems BY08*

Operational Systems - Security

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete (d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
eManifest	Contractor Only	Low	No	9/30/2008	NA	9/30/2008	9/30/2008

*Security: Weaknesses & Contractor Procedures BY08*

Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? No

If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?

Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? No

If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

*Privacy: Planning & Operational Systems BY08*

Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Is the PIA available to the public?	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?
eManifest	Yes	Yes.	Yes.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

***I.F: ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE (EA) BY08***

*General EA Questions BY08*

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes

If "no," please explain why this investment is not included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? No

If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

If "no," please explain why this investment is not included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

eManifest is not included in EPA's 2005 Transition Strategy & Sequencing Plan because that plan focused exclusively on investments in Development, Modernization or Enhancement phases that planned to use EPA's Central Services.

eManifest is a new investment in BY2008 (planning phase) and will be included in future iterations of the EPA Transition Strategy & Sequencing Plan. OSW's FY2004 planning phase eManifest stakeholder consensus public meeting for determining the IT design and funding approaches for the eManifest system (19-20 May 2004), identified EPA's Central Data Exchange computer hub (CDX; <http://www.epa.gov/cdx>) as a service component eManifest will utilize, as well as EPA's Environmental Information Exchange Network (EIEN; <http://www.exchangenetwork.net>).

*FEA SRM BY08*

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
eManifest	A planned new internet web-based IT application to become operational in FY2010, to be hosted on EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) computer hub, to provide 140,000 industrial and Federal facilities and state governments involved with RCRA hazardous waste transport, with a voluntary electronic option for processing EPA's RCRA manifest (EPA Form 8700-22) which is required to accompany hazardous waste shipments and be archived for three years.	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service	Data Exchange	020-00-01-16-02-6029-00-404-142	Internal	0

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

**FEA TRM BY08**

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	

Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

**Reuse & Information Sharing BY08**

Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

Yes

If "yes," please describe how the application will leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government.

OSW plans to fund eManifest's future lifecycle cost beginning with its operation in FY2010, including the cost of OSW FTE for eManifest lifecycle oversight, using (a) "user fee" and (b) "share-in-revenue" contracting authority dedicated for funding eManifest, unique authority which OSW is seeking from Congress in FY2006-FY2007. For purpose of OSW collecting these "user fees" from the industrial and Federal facilities which will become users of eManifest, OSW plans to utilize the existing Dept of Treasury's "Pay.Gov" government-wide financial transaction system (<http://www.pay.gov>). Launched in October 2000, Pay.Gov is a secure government-wide collection portal, developed to meet the US Treasury's commitment to process collections electronically using internet technologies. Pay.Gov satisfies the demands of agencies by providing their customers the ability to make payments, complete forms and submit queries 24 hours a day. Pay.Gov enables individuals and businesses to securely and easily send electronic payments to the Federal Government. Pay.Gov's service allows payments by debit/credit card or to authorize an ACH debit of savings or checking accounts.

Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?

Yes

If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?

No

If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

**FEA Primary Mapping BY08**

FEA Primary Mapping

Reference Model: SRM  
 Service Domain: Customer Services  
 Service Type: Customer Initiated Assistance  
 Service Component: Self-Service  
 Mapping Code: 703525

**II.A: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS BY08**

**Analysis Background BY08**

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A- 94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?

Yes

If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?

09/20/2002

If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

*Alternatives Table BY08*

Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

## Alternatives Analysis Results

Send to OMB	Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
True	Decentralized COTS Vendor Software eManifest IT Products			
True	EPA-hosted centralized eManifest IT system			
True	NGO-sponsored centralized eManifest IT System			

*Selected Alternative BY08*

Which alternative was selected by the Initiative Governance process and why was it chosen?

There are five primary reasons why OSW selected the EPA CDX-hosted centralized IT design approach for eManifest:

- (1) Preferred option by OSW's eManifest major stakeholders (i.e., hazardous waste management industry associations, hazardous waste generators, Federal facilities which generate hazardous wastes, state government waste regulators), as determined in OSW's 19-20 May 2004 stakeholder meeting (<http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/gener/manifest/e-man.htm>),
- (2) Lowest lifecycle cost; it is 43% less expensive than the "NGO-sponsored" option, and 90% less expensive than OSW's 2001 proposed rule "decentralized" option.
- (3) Highest annual net benefits (i.e., average annual benefits minus average annual costs) to the industrial and Federal facilities (i.e., stakeholders) which will use the system.
- (4) Takes advantage of two existing EPA major IT infrastructure investments: (a) EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX) computer hub (<http://www.epa.gov/cdx>), which enables fast, efficient and more accurate environmental data submissions from state and local governments, industry and tribes to EPA's participating program offices via a single (centralized) internet access portal, and (b) EPA's Environmental Information Exchange Network (EIEN; <http://www.exchangenetwork.net>) which is a secure and efficient internet- and standards-based network for exchanging environmental data between EPA, state environmental departments, industrial facilities, and Federal facilities.
- (5) Takes advantage of existing EPA IT policy standards, IT technical standards, and IT legal standards established by EPA's 13 October 2005 "Cross Media Electronic Reporting Rule" (CROMERR; <http://www.epa.gov/cdx/cromerrr>), which established uniform IT standards for EPA offices and programs and established EPA's CDX computer hub as the agency's required IT platform for future EPA IT applications, unless EPA offices can otherwise justify self-standing systems. CROMERR-complaint electronic reporting can include (a) user-friendly "smart" electronic forms to be completed on-line or downloaded for completion off-line at the user's personal computer, (b) data transfers via the internet or secure email in a variety of COTS application formats, and (c) a wide range of electronic signature technology including PINs and passwords, the use of private or personal information, digital signatures based on PKI certifications and other signature technologies as they become viable for EPA IT applications.

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

In addition to at least \$100 million per year in future paperwork burden reduction benefits to the 140,000 industrial facilities, Federal facilities, and state government entities of the RCRA-regulated community (i.e., eManifest stakeholders), OSW expects eManifest will provide at least five additional benefits to stakeholders (most of which OSW has not attempted to monetize):

- (1) Provision of a new centralized nationwide manifest database to enhance tracking and enforcement oversight of hazardous waste shipments by: (a) eManifest stakeholder entities (i.e., industrial facilities, Federal facilities) involved in the cradle-to-grave chain-of-custody transportation of hazardous wastes, (b) EPA RCRA-authorized state government environmental enforcement departments, (c) other Federal agencies with oversight responsibilities and authorities over transportation such as DOT and DHS (i.e., US Customs), and (d) foreign governments in countries corresponding to points-of-origins of hazardous waste imports to the US and to points-of-destinations of hazardous waste exports from the US.
- (2) Future sharing of eManifest data with OSW's existing RCRAInfo data system (<http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/data/index.htm#rcra-info>), will eliminate OSW's current duplicate paperwork burden to industrial and Federal facilities of reporting manifest data to the "waste shipment" sections (in the GM, WR and OI forms) of EPA's RCRA Hazardous Waste Biennial Report database (<http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/data/biennialreport>), thereby saving an additional \$6 million per year in stakeholder paperwork burden.
- (3) Integration of eManifest with the US Customs international trade data system (ITDS; <http://www.itds.treas.gov>) to track hazardous waste imports and exports (which have not yet been tracked by either EPA or US Customs as of FY2006); ITDS is an integrated, government-wide system for the electronic collection, use, and dissemination of international trade and transportation data.
- (4) Provision of new capability to for eManifest stakeholders to track hazardous waste shipments on a nearly realtime basis.
- (5) Reduction in future entry costs by \$14 to \$29 million per year to the 20 state governments which do not currently collect paper manifests, so they may begin receiving manifests for regulatory oversight (e.g. waste tracking) or charging waste shipment fees.

**II.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08***Risk Management Plan BY08*

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively

managing risk throughout the investment’s life-cycle.

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes

What is the date of the risk management plan? 6/16/2006

Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year’s submission to OMB? No

If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan:

If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed?

If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan?

If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

*Investment Risks BY08*

Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

**II.C: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08**

*Earned Value BY08*

Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? Yes

Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):

What is the Planned Value (PV)?

What is the Earned Value (EV)?

What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?

What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor and Government

EVMS "As of" date:

What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)?

What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?

What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?

What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)?

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

Answer the following questions about the status of this investment. Include information on all appropriate capital assets supporting this investment except for assets in which the performance information is reported in a separate exhibit 300.

*Cost/Schedule Variance BY08*

Is the CV% or SV% greater than 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No

If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?

If "yes," explain the variance:

If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?

What is the most current "Estimate at Completion"?

*Performance Baseline BY08*

Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year? No

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate 0 for any milestone no longer active.

If "yes," when was it approved by OMB?

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (Estimated)	Completion Date		Total Cost		Schedule (# days)	Cost	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			

---

											0%
<b>Project Totals</b>											