

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary**Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)****Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)**

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Date of Submission: | 9/10/2007 |
| 2. Agency: | Environmental Protection Agency |
| 3. Bureau: | Office Of Air And Radiation |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | BY09 Passback - Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | 020-00-01-11-01-1030-00 |
| 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) | Mixed Life Cycle |
| 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? | FY2003 |
| 8. 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: | |
| <p>The Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) is a business-to-business (B2B) Internet-based portal that fills the real-time, nationwide monitoring and statistical reporting performance gap for EPA Strategic Goal 1 - Clean Air and Global Climate Change. CAMDBS replaces a series of stand-alone systems which were developed quickly in the early 1990s to allow the Acid Rain Program to get underway based on the schedule laid out in the Clean Air Act. As such, CAMDBS directly supports the Agency's programmatic goals.</p> <p>Several performance gaps were identified as the CAMDBS development effort began. The old, independent systems included redundant processes and data bases managed by staff throughout the Clean Air Markets Division. Data was found to be stored on various platforms and there was no direct connection between related data. Applications were developed using different, non-compatible languages.</p> <p>CAMDBS is designed to close these performance gaps by incorporating two primary design elements: a centralized database and internet-based business processes. When complete, CAMDBS will comprise four modules: (1) an on-line application that CAMD, States, and industry use to submit and update program data (including identification of responsible officials, updating of contact information, entry of allowance transfers, submittal of compliance information, and submittal of retired and new unit exemption forms) and determine compliance, (2) an application allowing industry to quality assure and submit large volumes of hourly emissions data each quarter, (3) a real-time, centralized Oracle database, and (4) an enhanced query and navigation capability for all interested parties to access program data and results on the CAMD web page.</p> <p>CAMDBS is nearing the end of its development cycle, with the final module, the emissions collection and monitoring plan module, to be deployed in 2009. CAMDBS is housed on several servers maintained and operated by the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. The investment's hardware costs are included in the consolidated infrastructure of OEI.</p> | |
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 8/29/2007 |
| 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | Yes |
| 11. Contact information of Project Manager? | |
| Name | Branch, Paula |
| Phone Number | 202-343-9168 |
| Email | branch.paula@epa.gov |
| a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? | TBD |
| 12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable | Yes |

techniques or practices for this project?

a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No

1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes

If "yes," check all that apply: Expanded E-Government

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s) (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?) CAMBDS supports E-Government by converting from paper form to real-time, on-line submissions of regulatory information using Internet and e-Business technologies that reduce costs, save time and increase customer satisfaction; providing greater public access using an easy to use interface and centralized database; enabling collaboration and joint application development with Federal, State, local and tribal governments.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.) Yes

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? Yes

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? EPA Acid Rain Program

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Moderately Effective

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 2

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMI compliance area?

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

2. If "no," what does it address?

b. 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

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	0
Software	16
Services	84
Other	

21. If this project produces information dissemination Yes

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?

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name Hutt, Judy
 Phone Number 202-566-1668
 Title Agency Privacy Act Officer
 E-mail hutt.judy@epa.gov

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? Yes

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

1. 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.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.9	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	15.2	1.53	1.5	0.9					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	16.1	1.53	1.5	0.9					
Operations & Maintenance:	28.9	3.45	3.7	3.7					
TOTAL:	45.0	4.98	5.2	4.6					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	9.169	1.187	1.103	1.1					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	11	11	10	10					

Note: For the multi-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.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No

a. If "yes," How many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

The Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) project requests a re-baseline to combine milestones currently reported separately. The funding level would remain unchanged from the BY08 E300 Business Case CAMDBS submittal (September 11, 2006); the only change is that two milestones would be combined to more accurately reflect our current system development plans. CAMDBS requests that the auditing and emissions collection and monitoring plan milestones be combined into one.

Original planning involved the creation of an auditing system as a separate application or module of CAMDBS. The auditing system would include hourly checks to catch emissions monitoring and reporting errors and miscalculations, and to provide oversight of emissions monitoring and reporting functions. Instead, we have incorporated the functionality of the auditing system into the emissions collection and monitoring plan system (ECMPS), which provides a single client tool for all users to check and submit emissions and monitoring data. ECMPS is a component of the CAMDBS, an EPA major investment.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1. 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.

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 8)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:															* Costs in millions	
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	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 (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
68W02058	Cost plus fixed fee. The plan for new contract award in 2007 is a performance based contract .In 2001 EPA awarded this 5 year mission contract, there was no agency mandate for performance based contracting.	Yes	8/16/2002	8/16/2002	8/15/2007	22.5	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Brunzman, Andrea	202-564-9699 / brunzman.andrea@epa.gov	Level 3	
EP-W-07-064	Cost plus fixed fee	Yes	7/20/2007	7/20/2007	7/19/2013	35	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Brunzman, Andrea	202-564-9699 / brunzman.andrea@epa.gov	Level 3	

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

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why:

Both mission contracts explicitly require compliance with Section 508 in all data system development efforts. CAST's Bobby WorldWide is used to test and correct 508 deficiencies. Freedom Scientific's Jaws for Windows Screen Reading Software is used to test accessibility by the blind. 508 deficiency testing is conducted whenever major system changes are implemented.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date?

7/16/2007

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures (indicators) must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). 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 each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2006	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	% of program data available via the web	80% of program information accessible online	5% increase	80% of program data is accessible online
2006	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	# of tons of sulfur dioxide emissions	11.2 million tons of sulfur dioxide emissions		9.4 million tons of sulfur dioxide emissions in FY 2006
2006	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	% of users processing facility/unit/rep data submissions	Agency process facility/unit and representative identification information within 5 business days	40% processed by users.	26% of facility/unit and representative information updated in 1 day (real time) as of December 31, 2006. The remaining 74% were processed within 3 days of receipt
2006	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% of users with access to real-time processing capabilities	64% of users with access to real-time processing	69% of users with access to real-time processing	75% of users have access and processed program information on-line using a client-server real-time application as of December 31, 2006
2007	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	% of program data available via the web	80% of program information accessible online	2% increase	TBD end of Q1 FY08
2007	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	# of tons of sulfur dioxide emissions	11.2 million tons of sulfur dioxide emissions		TBD end of Q1 FY08
2007	Goal 1: Clean Air	Processes and	Cycle Time and	Cycle Time	% of users	Agency process	50% processing	TBD end of Q1

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 8)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	and Global Climate Change	Activities	Resource Time		processing facility/unit/rep data	facility/unit and representative identification information within 5 business days	by users.	FY08
2007	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% of users with access to real-time processing capabilities	Agency process program information within 5 business days.	72% of users with access to real-time processing capabilities	TBD end of Q1 FY08
2008	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Automation	% of users converted to new tool	High volume program data submitted on different platforms with no relation and limited accessibility. Quality assurance of high volume data conducted by the Agency. Feedback on program data within 3 days.	Use of new tool to submit and check all high volume program data and provide a single set of feedback on that data to facilitate accuracy. Projected 70% of users converted to new tool.	TBD end of Q1 FY09
2008	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	# of tons of sulfur dioxide emissions	11.2 million tons of sulfur dioxide emissions		TBD end of Q1 FY09
2008	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	% of users processing facility/unit/rep data	Agency process facility/unit and representative identification information within 5 business days	60% of users processing facility/unit/rep data	TBD end of Q1 FY09
2008	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% of users with access to real-time processing capabilities	Agency process program information within 5 business days.	80% of users with access to real-time processing capabilities	TBD end of Q1 FY09
2009	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Automation	% of users converted to new tool	High volume program data submitted on different platforms with no relation and limited accessibility. Quality assurance of high volume data conducted by the Agency. Feedback on program data within 3 days.	Use of new tool to submit and check all high volume program data and provide a single set of feedback on that data to facilitate accuracy. Projected 100% of users converted to new tool	
2009	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	# of tons of sulfur dioxide emissions	11.2 million tons of sulfur dioxide emissions		
2009	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	% of users processing facility/unit/rep data	Agency process facility/unit and representative identification information within 5 business days	70% of users processing facility/unit/rep data	
2009	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% of users with access and utilization of real-time processing capabilities	Agency process program information within 5 business days	Process program information by users using a client-server real-time application and central database. Percentage of program data updated on-line. Projected 90% on-line processing	

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

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).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

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

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

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 26

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

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
CAMD Business System	Government Only		

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, NIST 800-26, Other, N/A)	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
CAMD Business System	Government Only	Moderate	Yes	9/18/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/20/2006	2/1/2007

5. 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? Yes

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

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

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

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

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
CAMD Business System	No	Yes	This system does not collect PII on members of the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
<p>Details for Text Options:</p> <p>Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.</p> <p>Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.</p> <p>Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.</p>					

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes
 - a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Clean Air Markets Division Business System
 - b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? No
 - a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:								
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.eqov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CBS)	An extranet application for industry users. Users can access and manage data relating to their accounts or facilities and units, including their facilities' representatives, owners and operators. It also allows users to record allowance transfers.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management			Internal	25
Data and Maps (D&M)	An internet application with enhanced query and navigation capability that allows public user access, review, and	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			Internal	10

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 8)

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table: 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.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	retrieval of inventory, allowances, emissions, and deposition data to answer scientific, policy, regulatory or general interest questions.							
Source Management System (SMS)	An intranet application for agency and state staff to enter and update program data, allowance transfers, account and compliance information, and submittal of standard forms, such as the Certificate of Representation and New/Retired Unit	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			Internal	25
Emissions Collection Monitoring Plan System (ECMPS)	A single submission and evaluation tool allowing industry to quality assure and submit large volumes of hourly emissions data each quarter.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture			Internal	40

- a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.
- b. 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.
- c. '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.
- d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table: 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.				
FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 8)

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
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.				
FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Information Retrieval	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Customer / Account Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Customer / Account Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	

a. 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

b. 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.

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No

a. If "yes," please describe.

Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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.

- 1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? 7/14/2006
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results: * Costs in millions			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Alternative 1: Maintain Status quo			
Alternative 2: System Modernization Approach			
Alternative 3: COTS/GOTS Solution(s)			
Alternative 4: COTS/GOTS and Alter Acquisition Strategy			

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

Based upon the risk-adjusted cost comparison, the quantified benefits, the NPV and ROI, it is recommended that the CAMDBS Project Team select Alternative #2. The data shows that this will use EPA dollars most effectively and provide the greatest benefit to the organization. Alternative #2 offers the quickest solution to supporting the CAIR and CAMR Programs (a regulatory mandate). Additionally, it proposes the lowest costs of the 4 alternatives and the highest quantified benefits.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

From a qualitative perspective, there are a number of benefits that would be realized by proceeding with Alternative #2. First, customer/user satisfaction would increase tremendously, as users could receive instant feedback on their data submissions in terms of error handling and acceptance. This also reduces waiting times for feedback on data submissions. From an EPA perspective, Alternative #2 supports faster cycle times in processing data that has already been checked for errors. This will allow FTEs to re-focus their efforts on more value-added activities. Furthermore, Alternative #2 suggests consolidating systems to reduce data redundancy, rendering the system easier to update and maintain. Finally, it is conceivable that this system could be leveraged across other agencies to realize efficiencies. Alternative #2 would support such a requirement.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole?

- a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment.
- b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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.

- 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 7/16/2007
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No
- c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

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

- a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
- b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

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

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

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.

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

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

- a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
- b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
- c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? Yes

a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? 8/2/2007

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
00-01	Complete and launch on-line allowance transfer system	12/31/2001	\$0.05	12/31/2001	12/31/2001	\$0.05	\$0.05	0	\$0	100%
01-00	2001 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2001	\$2.4	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	\$2.4	\$2.4	0	\$0	100%
01-01	Complete and launch Source Registration System	9/30/2002	\$0.7	9/30/2002	3/31/2003	\$0.7	\$1	-182	\$-0.3	100%
01-01	Define & begin development of Source Registration System	9/30/2001	\$0.4	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	\$0.4	\$0.4	0	\$0	100%
01-03	Complete business plan	3/31/2001	\$0.035	3/31/2001	3/31/2001	\$0.035	\$0.035	0	\$0	100%
01-04	Assess technical architecture and determine direction	9/30/2001	\$0.035	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	\$0.035	\$0.035	0	\$0	100%
01-05	Database design & creation	9/30/2001	\$0.07	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	\$0.07	\$0.07	0	\$0	100%
01-06	Loading historical emissions data	12/31/2002	\$0.2	12/31/2002	12/31/2002	\$0.2	\$0.2	0	\$0	100%
02-00	2002 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2002	\$2.4	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$2.4	\$2.4	0	\$0	100%
02-01	Incorporate GIS capabilities (enhanced interface to database)	9/30/2004	\$0.45	9/30/2004	5/31/2004	\$0.45	\$0.421	122	\$0.029	100%
02-02	Update all systems for	9/30/2002	\$0.15	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$0.15	\$0.15	0	\$0	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	SIP/126									
02-04	Complete and launch on-line interface	9/30/2002	\$0.2	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$0.2	\$0.2	0	\$0	100%
02-05	Assess creating quality assurance and submission tool for sources in current architecture	9/30/2002	\$0.15	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$0.15	\$0.06	0	\$0.09	100%
03-00	2003 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2003	\$2.4	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$2.4	\$2.4	0	\$0	100%
03-01	Define the re-engineering of the Emissions Tracking System and the Monitoring Data Checker	9/30/2003	\$0.1	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.1	\$0.081	0	\$0.019	100%
03-02	Moved to 2004: Define enhanced version of interface to database	5/30/2005	\$0.45	5/30/2005	6/30/2005	\$0.45	\$0.566	-31	\$-0.116	100%
03-04	Create centralized repository managing requirements	6/30/2003	\$0.19	6/30/2003	6/30/2003	\$0.19	\$0.19	0	\$0	100%
03-05	Create centralized system administrator tool for database maintenance and	8/31/2003	\$0.15	8/31/2003	11/30/2003	\$0.15	\$0.136	-91	\$0.014	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	migration purposes									
03-06	Technical support for source registration	9/30/2003	\$0.08	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.08	\$0.08	0	\$0	100%
03-07	Updates to security plan and logical and physical design documents	8/31/2003	\$0.05	8/31/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.05	\$0.05	-30	\$0	100%
03-08	Complete conversion of remaining paper forms via the source registration system	2/28/2004	\$0.15	2/28/2004	1/31/2004	\$0.15	\$0.15	28	\$0	100%
03-09	Revise business plan	9/30/2003	\$0.03	9/30/2003	12/31/2003	\$0.03	\$0.01	-92	\$0.02	100%
04-00	2004 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2004	\$3.31	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$3.31	\$2.4	0	\$0.91	100%
04-01	Define centralized allowance management and compliance & permit tracking system	12/31/2005	\$0.35	12/31/2005	12/31/2005	\$0.35	\$0.293	0	\$0.057	100%
04-05	Complete design of the re-engineered emissions tracking system and monitoring data checker	2/28/2004	\$0.15	2/28/2004	2/28/2004	\$0.15	\$0.135	0	\$0.015	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
04-06	Begin development of the new emissions/monitoring collection system	9/30/2004	\$0.3	9/30/2004	12/31/2004	\$0.3	\$0.3	-92	\$0	100%
04-10	New: Centralized email generation and data driven updates to email text, error messages (via sys admin tool)	3/1/2005	\$0.1	3/1/2005	2/28/2005	\$0.1	\$0.098	1	\$0.002	100%
05-00	2005 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2005	\$3.12	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$3.12	\$3.12	0	\$0	100%
05-02	Complete development of the new emissions/monitoring collection system	12/31/2005	\$0.8	12/31/2005	12/31/2005	\$0.8	\$1.145	0	\$-0.345	100%
06-00	2006 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2006	\$3.47	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$3.47	\$3.47	0	\$0	100%
06-01	Complete final phase of interface to the database	2/1/2008	\$0.3	2/1/2008		\$0.3				
06-03	Assess Business Plan and determine whether to address the remaining systems	5/1/2007	\$0.05	5/1/2007		\$0.05				
06-06	Create allowance management	12/31/2006	\$0.6	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.6	\$0.156	0	\$0.444	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	and compliance & permit tracking system									
06-09	Alpha test client tool and refinement of the new emissions/monitoring collection system	12/31/2006	\$0.8	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.8	\$0.952	0	\$-0.152	100%
06-13	Develop System Management Plan	2/28/2006	\$0.03	2/28/2006	3/31/2006	\$0.03	\$0.017	-31	\$0.013	100%
07-00	2007 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2007	\$3.45	9/30/2007		\$3.45	\$2.588		\$-0.863	50%
07-01	Beta Test Client Tool and make modifications to the new emissions/monitoring collection system	12/31/2007	\$0.95	12/31/2007		\$0.95	\$0.733		\$-0.4195	33%
07-02	Updates to security plan and system documents	1/1/2008	\$0.1	1/1/2008		\$0.1				
07-04	Test and launch allowance management and compliance & permit tracking system	2/28/2007	\$0.25	2/28/2007	6/30/2007	\$0.25	\$0.243	-122	\$0.007	100%
07-05	Define and begin development for the Clean Air Interstate Rule	9/30/2007	\$0.15	9/30/2007		\$0.15	\$0.022		\$-0.022	0%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	(CAIR)									
07-06	Define and begin development for the Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR)	9/30/2007	\$0.137	9/30/2007		\$0.137				
07-07	Assess and begin development for CROMERR requirements	9/30/2007	\$0.043	9/30/2007		\$0.043	\$0.004		\$0.0175	50%
08-00	2008 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2008	\$3.7	9/30/2008		\$3.7				
08-02	Parallel test the emissions / monitoring collection system	12/31/2008	\$1.2	12/31/2008		\$1.2				0%
08-03	Complete CAIR changes to legacy systems	9/30/2008	\$0.07	9/30/2008		\$0.07				
08-04	Complete CAMR changes to legacy systems	9/30/2008	\$0.068	9/30/2008		\$0.068				
08-05	Complete development of CROMERR requirements for legacy systems	9/30/2008	\$0.02	9/30/2008		\$0.02				
09-00	2009 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2009	\$3.7	9/30/2009		\$3.7				
09-01	Final launch of emissions/monitoring collection system	3/31/2009	\$0.25	3/31/2009		\$0.25				
09-02	Integrate CAIR	9/30/2009	\$0.073	9/30/2009		\$0.073				

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	requirements to all other systems									
09-03	Integrate CAMR requirements to all other systems	9/30/2009	\$0.071	9/30/2009		\$0.071				
09-04	Complete CROMERR requirements	3/31/2009	\$0.03	3/31/2009		\$0.03				
09-05	Alternatives Analysis	6/14/2009	\$0	6/14/2009		\$0				0%
Project Totals										