

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 Environmental Information |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | BY09 Passback - eRulemaking |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | 020-00-01-16-01-0060-24 |
| 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.) | Multi-Agency Collaboration |
| 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? | FY2002 |
| 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>OMB Implementation Guidance, (M-03-18, August 1, 2003), for the E-Government Act of 2002, directed Federal Agencies to make their regulatory docket information accessible and searchable to the public using the Regulations.gov web site, the public facing side of the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS). The FDMS was developed under the auspice of a Federal-wide Inter-Agency workgroup (over 40 Federal Agencies participated) to meet specific Agency strategic strategies (making Information More Accessible; Innovation in Information Management; and Excellence in Information Services (reference EPA's Strategic Plan, Cross-Goal Strategies)); the law; and to remove the institutional barriers that made it extremely difficult for the public to navigate the vastness of Federal regulatory activities. The FDMS is a centralized "Web" application incorporating COTS technology to provide a secure, robust electronic repository (meeting DOD 5015.2 Records Management Standards) to maintain Agency Rulemaking and Non-Rulemaking Docket materials, supporting analyses materials, and public submissions. Through a customizable agency interface, FDMS provides agency users with the ability to manage docket materials through the use of role-based access controls; workflow and collaboration processes; creating/managing/revising content; comment management; and integrated COTS scanning solutions. Regulations.gov serves as a trusted source of Federal information providing the public with easy, one-stop access to all posted agency information. Through June 30, 2007, the Regulations.gov web site has received over 108 million hits, provided over 40 million page views, and accepted over 53,000 electronic Public Comments. Over 3,000 federal users representing 113 Federal Agencies have used FDMS to post over 6,500 Rules and Proposed Rules; over 24,000 Federal Register Notices; and have posted over 375,000 supporting analysis documents; and have posted over 166,000 public submissions. This access has revolutionized the way the federal government writes rules, solicits comments, and involves the public in its decision-making by moving from paper-based processes to new innovative processes has lead to more efficient interactions between the Federal government and the public it serves. In a recent analysis of the design and management of FDMS, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that the eRulemaking Program fulfilled 28 out of 30 key management practices.</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 | Micielli, Patrick |
| Phone Number | 202-564-2741 |
| Email | micielli.patrick@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 techniques or practices for this project? | Yes |
| a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? | Yes |

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (Revision 8)

- 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?) The purpose of the eRulemaking Initiative is to improve citizen access to, participation in, and understanding of the Federal rulemaking process and related processes as well as improving Agency's (Federal wide) efficiency and effectiveness in developing rulemakings. This project (managed by EPA), consolidates electronic rulemaking systems and paper based processes across the various Federal Departments and Agencies into a centrally managed Web-based application easily accessible by all users.
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.) No
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?
- b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?
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 3
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) Yes
19. Is this a financial management system? No
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFIA 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 | 4 |
| Software | 13 |
| Services | 72 |
| Other | 11 |
21. 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? Yes

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? Yes

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:	1.825	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	17.581	2.845	0.5	0.5					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	19.406	2.845	0.5	0.5					
Operations & Maintenance:	19.46	6.2	6.4	6.825					
TOTAL:	38.866	9.045	6.9	7.325					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	3.15	0.8	0.8	0.85					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	56	8	9	9					

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 primary differences between the current Summary of Spending table and previously submitted tables is do to the way that dollars were accounted for Federal FTE's. In previous submissions, FTE costs were included in either Acquisition, sub-part Infrastructure Expenses or under Operation and Maintenance. Now, FTE dollars are accounted for in the Government FTE Costs sub-section of the table. This change in salary accountability and classification was carried throughout the entire table to maintain table consistency, readability, and tracking. In addition to the change in how the dollars were classified for FTE's, several classification changes were made for other line items to better align with the definitions of Planning, Acquisition, and Operations and Maintenance.

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 - eRulemaking (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)
263-01-D-0054 DO#0001	Cost plus fixed fee (please note, the ceiling of this contract is higher than planned spending)	Yes	9/28/2003	9/29/2003	9/28/2008	98.984	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Paul, Dawson	202-564-4473 / dawson.paul@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:

The FDMS developers used standard 508 compliance toolsets during the development, of FDMS, and continue to use these toolsets for all updates. The US Department of Education's Assisitive Technology Program also tested FDMS for compliance with section 508. They identified a few areas for improvement which were implemented except for two areas dealing with known usability restrictions that exist in the COTS package. The eRulemaking PMO is continuing to work with the Department of Education.

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

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

9/30/2003

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
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of Federal Entities using the new Federal Docket Management System (FDMS). Note: an Entity is defined as a Department, Agency, or Bureau that participates in the eRulemaking Program.	14 of 32 Federal Entities implemented into the FDMS (USDA*, NARA, DHS*, HUD, EPA, DOD, GSA, NASA, Energy, Commerce*, NSF, VA, Labor*, SSA).	Implement 18 additional Federal Entities into FDMS (USDA(remaining), Labor(OSHA), OPM, SBA, State, USAID, Education, Treasury, FTC, PBGC, DOJ, Commerce(remaining), DOT, DHS(remaining), Interior(partial), HHS(partial), OMB, EEOC).	This information will be available 10/30/2007.
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Regulatory Development	Rule Publication	Percentage of Federal Rules promulgated by Federal Entities implemented in FDMS with associated dockets available to the public on www.regulations.gov	40% of total Federal rules are promulgated by Federal entities implemented in FDMS and have associated dockets available and posted in www.regulations.gov	90% of total Federal rules are promulgated by Federal entities implemented in FDMS and have associated dockets available and posted in www.regulations.gov	This information will be available 10/30/2007.
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Number of Federal Docket Management System version updates per year.	Federal Docket Management System - Version 1.3b (fourth version of FY2006: V1.1-Nov 2005, V1.2-	Four (4) FDMS version updates per year.	This information will be available 10/30/2007.

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (Revision 8)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
						Regs.gov Feb 2006, V1.3a standard documents & dockets-July 2006, V1.3b upgrade to Documentum 6.0-Sept 2006).		
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Percentage of time regulations.gov and FDMS are available to public. Calculation Formula: (Hours FDMS application accessible to public and agencies)/(total hours in measurement period - scheduled maintenance hours + Network downtime) = Availability.	Regulations.gov available 99.9% of the time to the public and agencies. Calculations Formula: Availability = (Hours FDMS accessible to public and Federal entities)/(total hours in measurement period less scheduled maintenance + plus Network downtime)	Maintain regulations.gov and FDMS system availability at 99.9%	This information will be available 10/30/2007.
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of Federal Entities using the new Federal Docket Management System (FDMS). Note: an Entity is defined as a Department, Agency, or Bureau that participates in the eRulemaking Program.	28 of 32 Federal Entities implemented in FDMS (USDA, NARA, HUD, DHS, EPA, DOD, Energy, GSA, NASA, Commerce, NSF, VA, SSA, Labor, OPM, SBA, State, USAID, Education, Treasury, FTC, PBGC, DOJ, DOT, Interior (partial), HHS (partial), OMB, EEOC).	Complete implementation of 3 Federal Entities into FDMS (Interior (FWS), HHS (FDA, CMS), NRC).	This information will be available 10/30/2008.
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Regulatory Development	Rule Publication	Percentage of Federal Rules promulgated by Federal Entities implemented in FDMS with associated dockets available to the public on www.regulations.gov	90% of total Federal rules are promulgated by Federal entities implemented in FDMS and have associated dockets available and posted in www.regulations.gov.	90% of total Federal rules are promulgated by Federal entities implemented in FDMS and have associated dockets available and posted in www.regulations.gov.	This information will be available 10/30/2008.
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Number of Federal Docket Management System version updates per year.	Federal Docket Management System - Version 1.7 (fourth version of FY2007: v1.4 offer eAuthentication-Dec 2006; v1.5 public email notification & bookmarks-March 2007, v1.6 electronic records management-June 2007; v1.7 search engine-Sept 2007).	Four (4) FDMS version updates per year.	This information will be available 10/30/2008.
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Privacy	Updated FDMS Security Plan and completed C&A process for FDMS.	Existing FDMS Security Plan and C&A certification (2005).	Complete process to update and approve the FDMS Security Plan and complete C&A	This information will be available 10/30/2008.

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (Revision 8)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							re-certification by Q4FY2008	
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Percentage of time regulations.gov and FDMS are available to public. Calculation Formula: (Hours FDMS application accessible to public and agencies)/(total hours in measurement period – scheduled maintenance hours + Network downtime) = Availability.	Regulations.gov available 99.9% of the time to the public and agencies. Calculations Formula: Availability = (Hours FDMS accessible to public and Federal entities)/(total hours in measurement period less scheduled maintenance + plus Network downtime)	Maintain regulations.gov and FDMS system availability at 99.9%.	This information will be available 10/30/2007.
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of Federal Entities using the new Federal Docket Management System (FDMS). Note: an Entity is defined as a Department, Agency, or Bureau that participates in the eRulemaking Program.	29 of 32 Federal Entities implemented in FDMS (USDA, NARA, HUD, DHS, EPA, DOD, Energy, GSA, NASA, Commerce, NSF, VA, SSA, Labor, OPM, SBA, State, USAID, Education, Treasury, FTC, PBGC, DOJ, DOT, Interior, HHS, OMB, EEOC, NRC).	Complete implementation of 3 Federal Entities into FDMS.	
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Regulatory Development	Rule Publication	Percentage of Federal Rules promulgated by Federal Entities implemented in FDMS with associated dockets available to the public on www.regulations.gov	90% of total Federal rules are promulgated by Federal entities implemented in FDMS and have associated dockets available and posted in www.regulations.gov.	90% of total Federal rules are promulgated by Federal entities implemented in FDMS and have associated dockets available and posted in www.regulations.gov.	
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Number of Federal Docket Management System version updates per year.	Federal Docket Management System - Version 2.3 (fourth version of FY2008: v2.0- Regs.gov GUI search & metrics-Dec 2007; v2.1 TBD possibly "workflow" "roles" & "Inbox"-March 2008; v2.2 TBD-June 2008; v2.3 TBD-Sept 2008).	Four (4) FDMS version updates per year.	
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Percentage of time regulations.gov and FDMS are available to public. Calculation Formula: (Hours FDMS application accessible to public and agencies)/(total hours in measurement period – scheduled maintenance	Regulations.gov available 99.9% of the time to the public and agencies. Calculations Formula: Availability = (Hours FDMS accessible to public and Federal entities)/(total hours in measurement period less scheduled	Maintain regulations.gov and FDMS system availability at 99.9%.	

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					hours + Network downtime) = Availability.	maintenance + plus Network downtime)		

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: 5
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)
eRulemaking	Contractor and Government		

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
eRulemaking	Contractor Only	Low	Yes	5/23/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	10/16/2006	10/16/2006

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? No
 - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?
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
eRulemaking	No	Yes	http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/fdms.htm	Yes	http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-govt-2.htm
Details for Text Options: 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. 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. Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.					

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. eRulemaking

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.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)
FDMS GPO/OFR Data Feed Module	The interface that accepts publications from GPO/OFR and posts them in Regs.gov and FDMS	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	2
FDMS	The Federal Docket Management System is the application that allows agencies to create dockets and manage the posting of information to	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			No Reuse	10

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (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)
	public							
eRulemaking FDMS Reporting Module	Provides users the capability to select a number of search variables to return query results	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	2
eRulemaking Ad Hoc and Report Generation Model	Provides users the capability to select a number of search variables to return query results	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	4
eRulemaking Change Control Log	Tracks enhancements or changes to functionality	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Change Management			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking Change Control Log	Tracks enhancements or changes to functionality	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			No Reuse	2
FDMS Workflow Module	Component that allows the identification of a task and assignment to an individual or role	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Governance / Policy Management			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking PMO	Program Management Office responsible for the management and communication of services provided by the eRulemaking program	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking Quality Management Program	Series of procedures established and followed to ensure services are provided in the manner expected	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Quality Management			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking Footprints Requirements Module and PMO/CCB	Tool to allow input and track suggested enhancements, modifications to existing features or to report defects	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Requirements Management			No Reuse	2
eRulemaking Risk Management Plan	Series of processes and procedures that are designed to prevent interruptions in services and provide expedited recovery to mitigate interruptions when they occur	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Risk Management			No Reuse	2
eRulemaking Network Module	Software and hardware necessary to properly communicate with the computer center and provide services to various users	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Network Management			No Reuse	5

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (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)
eRulemaking Infrastructure Supporting Components	Software and hardware necessary to properly communicate with the computer center and provide services to various users	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Workgroup / Groupware			No Reuse	26
eRulemaking Agency Authentication Interface	A series of user prompts requesting information to substantiate and verify that a user correctly matches the profile maintained for their level of access and permissions	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service			No Reuse	2
Regulations.gov - eRulemaking Communications Plan	Products and procedures that provide descriptive information of the eRulemaking program and the services it offers	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Brand Management			No Reuse	1
FDMS Call Center Management Component	Accepts and logs questions from users and tracks the status of issue resolution.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Call Center Management			No Reuse	1
FDMS User Account Module	Logs user access information	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Contact and Profile Management			No Reuse	1
FDMS User Account Module	Logs user access information	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking Help Desk Survey Module	Feature that promotes consistency and completeness in information collected.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Customer Feedback			No Reuse	1
FDMS	The application that provides agencies the ability to create dockets and post Federal Register publications, supporting materials, and accept and post public comments. It allows the public to review agency posted materials and submit comment on those documents that are eligible.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Product Management			No Reuse	8
FDMS Rendition Services Module	Provides the ability to display file contents originally created in a variety of native software types	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Conversion			No Reuse	3
FDMS Imaging Module	Provides the ability to display file contents originally created in a variety of native	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR			No Reuse	4

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (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)
	software types							
FDMS Document Management Module	Provides the ability to uniquely identify materials added to the system and retrieve uncorrupted materials based on associated metadata	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Review and Approval			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking FDMS Storage Solution Module	Provides the ability file and store uniquely identified materials added to the system and retrieve uncorrupted materials based on associated metadata	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Library / Storage			No Reuse	3
FDMS Workflow Module	Component that allows the identification of a task and assignment to an individual or role	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	2
FDMS Public/Agency /Internal Communications Module	This is the communications link between the application and the infrastructure.	Support Services	Communication	Computer / Telephony Integration			No Reuse	2
eRulemaking Ad Hoc and Report Generation Module	Component that allows users search, locate, and retrieve materials contained in FDMS based on a variety of parameters or to select from a list of predefined searches.	Support Services	Search	Query			No Reuse	4
eRulemaking Agency Authentication Interface	A series of user prompts requesting information to substantiate and verify that a user correctly matches the profile maintained for their level of access and permissions	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking FDMS Activity Module	The audit requirement ensures that all system activities are properly captured and archived	Support Services	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking Agency Authentication Interface	A series of user prompts requesting information to substantiate and verify that a user correctly matches the profile maintained for their level of access and permissions	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking	Combination of	Support Services	Security	Intrusion			No Reuse	1

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (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)
Intrusion Detection Component	software and hardware that identifies and prevents external sources attempting to enter the eRulemaking infrastructure.		Management	Detection				
eRulemaking Intrusion Prevention Component	Combination of software and hardware that identifies and prevents external sources attempting to enter the eRulemaking infrastructure.	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Prevention			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking Anti-Virus Component	Combination of software and hardware that identifies and prevents external sources attempting to enter the eRulemaking infrastructure.	Support Services	Security Management	Virus Protection			No Reuse	1
eRulemaking Footprints Module	Tracking tool to accept system usage questions or report defects	Support Services	Systems Management	Issue Tracking			No Reuse	1

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)
Workgroup / Groupware	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Workgroup / Groupware	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Workgroup / Groupware	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Workgroup / Groupware	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Brand Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Call Center Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Change Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (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)
Requirements Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Customer Feedback	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Configuration Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Governance / Policy Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Quality Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Risk Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Library / Storage	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Document Review and Approval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Document Conversion	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Ad Hoc	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Computer / Telephony Integration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Query	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Issue Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Contact and Profile Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Virus Protection	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Intrusion Detection	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Intrusion Prevention	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Computer / Telephony Integration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (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)
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	

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)? Yes

a. If "yes," please describe.

FirstGov, GPO Access, and eAuthentication have been integrated with the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) to provide the public and the agencies access to docket content included in the FDMS and allow the public to submit documents and comments to agencies. In addition, FDMS receives a daily (Monday - Friday) feed from NARA's EDOCS which provides rules, proposed rules, final rules, notices, and some of their associated metadata that are open for comment. These documents are then posted on FDMS for review and comment where appropriate.

Exhibit 300: Part IV: Planning For "Multi-Agency Collaboration" ONLY

Section A: Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (All Capital Assets)

Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative, a Line of Business(LOB) Initiative, or a Multi-Agency Collaboration effort. The "Multi-Agency Collaboration" choice should be selected in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. Investments identified as "Multi-Agency Collaboration" will complete only Parts I and IV of the exhibit 300.

Multi-agency Collaborations, such as E-Gov and LOB initiatives, should develop a joint exhibit 300.

1. Stakeholder Table:
 As a joint exhibit 300, please identify all the agency stakeholders (all participating agencies, this should not be limited to agencies with financial commitment). All agency stakeholders should be listed regardless of approval. If the partner agency has approved this joint exhibit 300 please provide the date of approval.

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Joint Exhibit Approval Date
Agriculture, Department of	005	7/31/2007
Commerce, Department of	006	7/9/2007
Defense-Military, Department of	007	7/30/2007
Education, Department of	018	7/31/2007
Energy, Department of	019	7/30/2007
Environmental Protection Agency	020	8/1/2007
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	350	8/10/2007
Executive Office of the President	100	
Federal Communications Commission	356	8/1/2007
Federal Election Commission	360	
Federal Trade Commission	370	9/4/2007
General Services Administration	023	7/30/2007
Health and Human Services, Department of	009	
Homeland Security, Department of	024	8/15/2007
Housing and Urban Development, Department of	025	9/5/2007
Interior, Department of	010	8/14/2007
International Assistance Programs	184	
Justice, Department of	011	8/10/2007
Labor, Department of	012	8/31/2007
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	026	7/30/2007
National Archives and Records Administration	393	7/30/2007
National Science Foundation	422	7/30/2007
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	429	8/14/2007
Office of Personnel Management	027	8/1/2007
Securities and Exchange Commission	449	
Small Business Administration	028	
Social Security Administration	016	9/4/2007
State, Department of	014	7/30/2007
Transportation, Department of	021	7/31/2007
Treasury, Department of	015	8/10/2007
Veterans Affairs, Department of	029	7/27/2007

2. Partner Capital Assets within this Investment:
 Provide the partnering strategies you are implementing with the participating agencies and organizations. Identify all partner agency capital assets supporting the common solution (section 300.7); Managing Partner capital assets should also be included in this joint exhibit 300. These capital assets should be included in the Summary of Spending table of Part I, Section B. All partner agency migration investments (section 53.4) should also be included in this table. Funding contributions/fee-for-service transfers should not be included in this table. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53)

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Partner Agency Asset Title	Partner Agency Exhibit 53 UPI (BY)
---------------------	----------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------

3. Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):
 For jointly funded initiative activities, provide in the "Partner Funding Strategies Table": the name(s) of partner agencies; the UPI of the partner agency investments; and the partner agency contributions for CY and BY. Please indicate partner contribution amounts (in-kind contributions should also be included in this amount) and fee-for-service amounts. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53. For non-IT fee-for-service amounts the Partner exhibit 53 UPI can be left blank) (IT migration investments should not be included in this table)

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY)	CY Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
Agriculture, Department of	005	005-03-01-81-04-0060-24	0.000735	0	0	0.001308
Commerce, Department of	006	006-05-01-50-04-0060-24	0.000735	0	0	0.000453
Defense-Military,	007	007-00-01-99-04-	0.000535	0	0	0.000252

Exhibit 300: BY09 Passback - eRulemaking (Revision 8)

3. Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):						
For jointly funded initiative activities, provide in the "Partner Funding Strategies Table": the name(s) of partner agencies; the UPI of the partner agency investments; and the partner agency contributions for CY and BY. Please indicate partner contribution amounts (in-kind contributions should also be included in this amount) and fee-for-service amounts. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53. For non-IT fee-for-service amounts the Partner exhibit 53 UPI can be left blank) (IT migration investments should not be included in this table)						
Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY)	CY Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
Department of		0060-24				
Education, Department of	018	018-24-01-07-04-0060-24	0.000135	0	0	0.00003
Energy, Department of	019	019-99-01-99-04-0060-24	0.000241	0	0	0.000099
Environmental Protection Agency	020	020-00-01-16-01-0060-24	0.000535	0	0	0.001531
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	350	350-00-01-03-04-0060-24	0	0	0	0.000009
Executive Office of the President	100		0	0	0	0.000006
Federal Communications Commission	356		0	0	0	0.000204
Federal Election Commission	360		0	0	0	0.000007
Federal Trade Commission	370	370-00-01-01-04-0060-24	0	0	0	0.000042
General Services Administration	023	023-00-01-11-04-0060-24	0.000241	0	0	0.000122
Health and Human Services, Department of	009	009-00-01-99-04-0060-24	0.000735	0	0	0.000325
Homeland Security, Department of	024	001-10-01-09-02-1010-00	0.000735	0	0	0.000636
Housing and Urban Development, Department of	025	025-00-01-09-04-0060-24	0.000241	0	0	0.000303
Interior, Department of	010	010-00-01-07-04-0060-24	0.000535	0	0	0.000349
International Assistance Programs	184		0	0	0	0.00001
Justice, Department of	011	011-03-01-10-04-0060-24	0.000241	0	0	0.000151
Labor, Department of	012	012-25-01-99-04-0060-24	0.000535	0	0	0.000186
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	026	026-00-01-99-04-0060-24	0.000241	0	0	0.000029
National Archives and Records Administration	393	393-00-01-04-04-0060-24	0	0	0	0.000088
National Science Foundation	422	422-00-01-04-04-0060-24	0.000135	0	0	0.000005
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	429	429-00-01-02-03-0060-24	0	0	0	0.000064
Office of Personnel Management	027	027-00-01-99-04-0060-24	0.000135	0	0	0.000074
Securities and Exchange Commission	449		0	0	0	0.000078
Small Business Administration	028	028-00-01-99-04-0060-24	0.000135	0	0	0.000036
Social Security Administration	016	016-00-01-02-04-0060-24	0.000135	0	0	0.000048
State, Department of	014	014-00-01-08-04-0060-24	0.000135	0	0	0.000044
Transportation, Department of	021	021-04-01-14-04-0060-24	0.000735	0	0	0.001051
Treasury, Department of	015	015-00-01-13-04-0060-24	0.000535	0	0	0.000484
Veterans Affairs, Department of	029	029-00-01-21-04-0060-24	0.000135	0	0	0.000082

An Alternatives Analysis for multi-agency collaborations should also be obtained. At least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline (i.e., the status quo), should be included in the joint exhibit 300. 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.

4. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this investment? Yes

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

5/17/2007

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

c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

5. Alternatives 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: eRulemaking			
Alternative 2: Multiple Agency/Office Systems			
Alternative 3: Departmental/Agency-Wide Systems			
Baseline			

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

Alternative 1 was selected because it was the lowest cost alternative and produced an equivalent level of benefits to other alternatives considered. In 2007, an in-depth revised benefit cost analysis was conducted which identified and quantified cost savings and costs avoided associated with the baseline and the three alternatives. The results of this analysis showed that Alternative 1 was the lowest cost alternative compared to other alternatives. Costs included the cost of all hardware, software, development, implementation and O&M for each alternative plus the cost of residual manual processing of rules as required by law.

Please note, the costs of Alternative 1 does not match the costs of the eRulemaking as shown in the budget tables because: (1) Alternative 1 includes additional costs beyond those included in the budget (e.g., the cost of residual manual processing); and (2) they are presented in present value terms.

7. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Qualitative benefits realized by both the General Public, and Federal Agencies that participate in the eRulemaking program are listed below:

General Public Benefits:

Ease of citizen access and participation in rulemaking by providing one central location to search, retrieve, read, and print all federal regulatory material without having to know the details of the rulemaking process.

Provide the ability for the public to clearly ascertain the status of each regulation, docket, or rulemaking within the rulemaking process.

Provide the ability to electronically file a comment on any docket that is currently open for comment (not via e-mail but directly via a Web-form).

Provide the ability to search, retrieve, read, and print all supporting regulatory documents (including previously posted comments).

Enhance the public's participation in the Federal rulemaking process by simplifying the process of identifying Federal rules open for comment, submitting comments, and reviewing supporting materials that form the basis for the actions being proposed and how conclusions were derived.

Reduce the expense and difficulty of responding to proposed federal government regulatory activity.

Provide high-quality customer service via phone and Web form.

Increase access for persons with disabilities to agency Web sites and E-Gov applications.

Federal Agency Benefits:

Improve the federal rulemaking process by utilizing an integrated, electronic rulemaking system for developing, and reviewing Federal regulations and similar documents--many federal agencies currently do not have this capability.

Provide each agency with the ability to efficiently analyze and aggregate all public comments related to a rulemaking under consideration.

Agencies will be able to quickly gain access to all public submissions and consider their viewpoints on a on a particular issue, and can therefore have the information they need to make better-informed decisions. Provide each agency with the ability to economically maintain a Web-based regulatory and comment dialog with the public without having to focus on the technology required to administer this service.

Provide a central point to receive and create a repository for all public comments, similarly as the Federal Register serves as the central point for published rules and notices.

Economically store, maintain and manage docket content based on agency policies, and by 2008 manage it as records.

Reduce operating costs.

8. Federal Quantitative Benefits: (\$millions):				
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2006 & Prior				
PY 2007				
CY 2008				
BY 2009				
BY + 1 2010				

8. Federal Quantitative Benefits: (\$millions):				
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
BY + 2 2011				
BY + 3 2012				
BY + 4 2013 & Beyond				
Total LLC Benefit				

9. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part No 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:

8b. 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? 7/31/2007
 - 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?

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

You should also periodically be measuring the performance of operational assets against the baseline established during the planning or full acquisition phase (i.e., operational analysis), and be properly operating and maintaining the asset to maximize its useful life. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements.

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.

- 1. Are you using EVM to manage this investment? Yes
 - a. If "yes," does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748? Yes
 - b. If "no," explain plans to implement EVM:
 - c. If "N/A," please provide date operational analysis was conducted and a brief summary of the results:

Questions #2 are NOT applicable for capital assets with ONLY O&M

- 2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x Yes

100; $SV\% = SV/PV \times 100$)

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

The eRulemaking Initiative experienced funding problems at the start of FY07 when the Continuing Resolution delayed receipt of the eRulemaking FY/CY07 funding from its partners. With the eRulemaking Program receiving all of its funding from its 25 contributing partner agencies, (with no single Partner Agency contributes more than 8% of the annual eRulemaking Program budget) this delay required the eRulemaking PMO to re-structure its approved FY06 budget by lowering its monthly expenditures until sufficient funding was received from its partner Agencies.

- c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

By reducing development expenditures, the eRulemaking Initiative was able to maintain system O&M, Agency Implementations, and Records Management Deployment per direction of its Executive Committee. With the passage of the Federal budget resolution, partner agencies have received authority to make their FY07 payments and the eRulemaking Program has received its projected budget of 10.2 million. While the current scheduled variance of -13.8 is above +or- 10%, it has been steadily declining since FY2006 when eRulemaking reported a schedule variance of -17.3. By reducing spending to account for funding delays, the eRulemaking PMO insured that sufficient dollars were available to maintain operations and maintenance of the system and to meet the directions given by the eRulemaking Executive Committee.

Questions #3-4 are applicable to ALL capital assets

- 3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? No
- a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

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	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				
1	Regs.gov Development & Deployment	3/30/2003	\$0.4	3/31/2003	3/31/2003	\$0.4	\$0.4	0	\$0	100%	EPA
1.1	Planning	3/30/2003	\$0.02	3/31/2003	3/31/2003	\$0.02	\$0.02	0	\$0	100%	EPA
1.2	Design, Testing, Deployment	1/31/2003	\$0.38	1/31/2003	1/31/2003	\$0.38	\$0.38	0	\$0	100%	EPA
1.2.1	hardware	1/31/2003	\$0.15	1/31/2003	1/31/2003	\$0.15	\$0.15	0	\$0	100%	EPA
1.2.2	software	1/31/2003	\$0.08	1/31/2003	1/31/2003	\$0.08	\$0.08	0	\$0	100%	EPA
1.2.3	contractor support	1/31/2003	\$0.15	1/31/2003	1/31/2003	\$0.15	\$0.15	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2	FDMS Development & Deployment										EPA
2.1	FY03 Planning/Acquisition	9/30/2003	\$0.25	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.25	\$0.25	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.2	Preliminary Design	9/30/2004	\$1.175	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$1.175	\$1.175	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.3	BPR/Functional Requirements	9/30/2004	\$0.115	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.115	\$0.115	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.4	Design	9/30/2005	\$4.225	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$4.225	\$4.225	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.4.1	Risk Assessment	9/30/2004	\$0.015	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.015	\$0.015	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.4.2	Coop Analysis	9/30/2004	\$0.01	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.01	\$0.01	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.4.3	FY04 Contractor Support	9/30/2004	\$3.2	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$3.2	\$3.2	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.4.4	FY05 Contractor Support	9/30/2005	\$1	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$1	\$1	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.5	Testing	9/30/2005	\$3.315	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$3.315	\$3.315	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.5.1	FY04 Hardware	9/30/2004	\$0.6	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.6	\$0.6	0	\$0	100%	EPA

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	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				
	Purchases										
2.5.2	FY05 Hardware Purchases	9/30/2005	\$0.6	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.6	\$0.6	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.5.3	FY04 Software Purchases	9/30/2004	\$0.5	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.5	\$0.5	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.5.4	Vulnerability Testing	6/30/2005	\$0.03	6/30/2005	6/30/2005	\$0.03	\$0.03	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.5.5	FY04 Contractor Support	9/30/2004	\$0.065	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.065	\$0.065	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.5.6	FY05 Contractor Support	9/30/2005	\$1.52	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$1.52	\$1.52	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.6	Deployment/Production										EPA
2.6.1	FY05 Hardware Purchases	9/30/2005	\$0.9	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.9	\$0.9	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.6.2	FY06 + 1st Qtr FY07 Hardware Purchases	12/31/2006	\$0.046	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.046	\$0.046	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.6.3	CY07 Hardware Purchases	12/31/2007	\$0.3	12/31/2007		\$0.3	\$0.258		\$-0.258	0%	EPA
2.6.4	CY08 Hardware Purchases	12/31/2008	\$0.3	12/31/2008		\$0.3				0%	EPA
2.6.5	CY09 Hardware Purchases	12/31/2009	\$0.6	12/31/2009		\$0.6				0%	EPA
2.6.7	Software CY05	12/31/2008	\$0.65	12/31/2008		\$0.65				0%	EPA
2.6.8	FY04 Contractor Support	9/30/2004	\$0.4	12/31/2009		\$0.4				0%	EPA

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 'O' for any milestone no longer active.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				
2.7	Agency Implementation	12/31/2008	\$3.555	12/31/2008	12/31/2006	\$3.555	\$1.043	731	\$1.211936	63.43%	EPA
2.7.1	FY05 Migration	9/30/2005	\$0.75	9/30/2005	7/24/2005	\$0.75	\$0.75	68	\$0	100%	EPA
2.7.2	FY06 + 1st Qtr FY07 Migration	12/31/2006	\$1.505	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$1.505	\$0.135	0	\$1.37	100%	EPA
2.7.3	CY07 Migration	12/31/2007	\$1.3	12/31/2007		\$1.3	\$0.158		\$-0.158	0%	EPA
2.7.4	CY08 Migration	12/31/2008	\$0	12/31/2008		\$0				0%	EPA
2.8	Enhancements										EPA
2.8.1	FY06 + 1st qtr FY07 Enhancements	12/31/2006	\$2	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$2	\$0.867	0	\$1.133	100%	EPA
2.8.2	CY07 Enhancements	12/31/2007	\$1.5	12/31/2007		\$1.5	\$1.277		\$-1.277	0%	EPA
2.8.3	CY08 Enhancements	12/31/2008	\$0.5	12/31/2008		\$0.5				0%	EPA
2.8.4	CY09 Enhancements	12/31/2009	\$0.5	12/31/2009		\$0.5				0%	EPA
2.9	Security Line Of Business	12/31/2009	\$0.075	12/31/2009	12/30/2005	\$0.075	\$0.005	1462	\$0.000002	6.67%	EPA
2.9.1	Develop an inventory of current sources and contractual obligations for information security products and services	12/31/2005	\$0.005	12/31/2005	12/30/2005	\$0.005	\$0.005	1	\$0	100%	EPA
2.9.2	Develop migration plan for acquiring	9/30/2007	\$0.025	9/30/2007		\$0.025				0%	EPA

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	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				
	information security products and services from Centers of Excellence establish under the Information Systems Security Line of Business										
2.9.3	Implement plan to migrate from current information security acquisition processes to the procurement of information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the Information Systems Security Line of Business.	12/31/2009	\$0.045	12/31/2009		\$0.045				0%	EPA
2.10	Program Management	9/30/2005	\$2.795	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$2.795	\$2.795	0	\$0	100%	EPA
2.10.1	FY04 Program Mgmt	9/30/2004	\$1.795	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$1.795	\$1.795	0	\$0	100%	EPA

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	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				
2.10.2	FY05 Program Management	9/30/2005	\$1	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$1	\$1	0	\$0	100%	EPA
3	System O&M										EPA
3.1	FY03 O&M	9/30/2003	\$0.145	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.145	\$0.145	0	\$0	100%	EPA
3.2	FY04 O&M	9/30/2004	\$0.25	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.25	\$0.25	0	\$0	100%	EPA
3.3	FY05 O&M	9/30/2005	\$3.22	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$3.22	\$3.22	0	\$0	100%	EPA
3.3.1	Operate Regs.gov	9/30/2005	\$0.2	9/30/2005	9/26/2005	\$0.2	\$0.2	4	\$0	100%	EPA
3.3.2	FY05 FDMS Maintenance	9/30/2005	\$2.02	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$2.02	\$2.02	0	\$0	100%	EPA
3.3.3	Hardware Maintenance	9/30/2005	\$0.1	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.1	\$0.1	0	\$0	100%	EPA
3.3.4	FY05 Hosting Services	9/30/2005	\$0.6	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.6	\$0.6	0	\$0	100%	EPA
3.3.5	FY05 Software Licenses	9/30/2005	\$0.2	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$0.2	\$0.2	0	\$0	100%	EPA
3.3.6	FDMS Security Preparations (risk assessment, vulnerability analysis, security plan)	9/30/2005	\$0.1	9/30/2005	7/24/2005	\$0.1	\$0.1	68	\$0	100%	EPA
3.4	FY06 + 1st Qtr FY07 O&M	12/31/2006	\$7.295	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$7.295	\$7.376	0	\$-0.081	100%	EPA
3.4.1	FY06 + 1st Qtr FY07 Hosting Services	12/31/2006	\$0.7	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.7	\$0.723	0	\$-0.023	100%	EPA
3.4.2	FY06 + 1st Qtr FY07 Software Licenses	12/31/2006	\$0.661	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.661	\$0	0	\$0.661	100%	EPA
3.4.3	FY06 + 1st Qtr FY07 FDMS	12/31/2006	\$5.431	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$5.431	\$6.653	0	\$-1.222	100%	EPA

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 'O' for any milestone no longer active.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				
	Operations and Maintenance										
3.4.4	FY06 + 1st Qtr Hardware Maintenance	12/31/2006	\$0.128	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.128	\$0	0	\$0.128	100%	EPA
3.4.5	FY06 + 1st Qtr Security Enhancement	12/31/2006	\$0.375	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.375	\$0	0	\$0.375	100%	EPA
3.5	FY07 O&M	12/31/2007	\$5.9	12/31/2007		\$5.9	\$2.629		\$-2.629	0%	EPA
3.5.1	CY07 FDMS Operations and Maintenance	12/31/2007	\$3.759	12/31/2007		\$3.759	\$1.97		\$-1.97	0%	EPA
3.5.2	CY07 Hardware Maintenance	12/31/2007	\$0.131	12/31/2007		\$0.131	\$0		\$0	0%	EPA
3.5.3	CY07 Hosting Services	12/31/2007	\$0.735	12/31/2007		\$0.735	\$0.302		\$-0.302	0%	EPA
3.5.4	CY07 Software Licenses	12/31/2007	\$0.969	12/31/2007		\$0.969	\$0.335		\$-0.335	0%	EPA
3.5.5	CY07 Security Enhancements and Maintenance	12/31/2007	\$0.306	12/31/2007		\$0.306	\$0.022		\$-0.022	0%	EPA
3.6	FY08 O&M	12/31/2008	\$6.1	12/31/2008		\$6.1				0%	EPA
3.6.1	CY08 FDMS Operations and Maintenance	12/31/2008	\$3.581	12/31/2008		\$3.581				0%	EPA
3.6.2	CY08 Hardware Maintenance	12/31/2008	\$0.365	12/31/2008		\$0.365				0%	EPA
3.6.3	CY08 Host Services	12/31/2008	\$0.775	12/31/2008		\$0.775				0%	EPA
3.6.4	CY08 Software	12/31/2008	\$1.124	12/31/2008		\$1.124				0%	EPA

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	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				
	Licenses										
3.6.5	CY08 Security Enhancements and Maintenance	12/31/2008	\$0.255	12/31/2008		\$0.255				0%	EPA
3.7	FY09 O&M	12/31/2009	\$6.225	12/31/2009		\$6.225				0%	EPA
3.7.1	CY09 FDMS Operations and Maintenance	12/31/2009	\$3.25	12/31/2009		\$3.25				0%	EPA
3.7.2	CY09 Hardware Maintenance	12/31/2009	\$0.65	12/31/2009		\$0.65				0%	EPA
3.7.3	CY09 Hosting Services	12/31/2009	\$0.825	12/31/2009		\$0.825				0%	EPA
3.7.4	CY09 Software Licenses	12/31/2009	\$1.2	12/31/2009		\$1.2				0%	EPA
3.7.5	CY09 Security Enhancements and Maintenance	12/31/2009	\$0.3	12/31/2009		\$0.3				0%	EPA
5	Infrastructure										EPA
5.1	FY03	9/30/2003	\$0.45	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.45	\$0.45	0	\$0	100%	EPA
5.2	FY04	9/30/2004	\$1	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$1	\$1	0	\$-0.9	10%	EPA
5.3	FY05	9/30/2005	\$1	9/30/2005	7/30/2005	\$1	\$1	62	\$0	100%	EPA
5.4	FY06 + 1st Qtr FY07	12/31/2006	\$0.7	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.7	\$0.685	0	\$0.015	100%	EPA
5.5	CY07	12/31/2007	\$0.8	12/31/2007		\$0.8	\$0.425		\$-0.425	0%	EPA
5.6	CY08	12/31/2008	\$0.8	12/31/2008		\$0.8				0%	EPA
5.7	CY09	12/31/2009	\$0.85	12/31/2009		\$0.85				0%	EPA
6	EPA Docket	9/30/2005	\$8.55	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$8.55	\$8.565	0	\$-0.015	100%	EPA
6.1	FY03 and	9/30/2003	\$1.2	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$1.2	\$1.2	0	\$0	100%	EPA

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	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				
	Before										
6.2	FY03 and Before O&M	9/30/2003	\$5.35	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$5.35	\$5.365	0	\$-0.015	100%	EPA
6.3	FY04 O&M	9/30/2004	\$1	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$1	\$1	0	\$0	100%	EPA
6.4	FY05 O&M	9/30/2005	\$1	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$1	\$1	0	\$0	100%	EPA
Project Totals											