

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: | 4/10/2009 |
| 2. Agency: | Environmental Protection Agency |
| 3. Bureau: | Office Of Air And Radiation |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | BY2010 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 FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 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? | FY2001 or earlier |

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:

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.

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.

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.

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 will be in the Operations & Maintenance phase of its life cycle beginning in 2010. 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.

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 3/27/2008 |
| 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | Yes |
| 11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager? | |

Name

Phone Number

Email

- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager?

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned?

c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification?

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)? No

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 forms 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?

10001131 - 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. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 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 FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware 0
 Software 16
 Services 84
 Other

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

Phone Number

Title

E-mail

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 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.9	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	16.73	1.5	1.1	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	17.63	1.5	1.1	0					
Operations & Maintenance:	32.35	3.7	3.7	3.7					
TOTAL:	49.98	5.2	4.8	3.7					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	10.356	1.2	1.3	1.3					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	21	10	10	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 FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

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: BY2010 Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 11)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	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 FAC-C or DAWIA 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)
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				

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 not or how this is being done? 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 reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 7/30/2008

1. Is it Current? Yes

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 the next President's Budget.

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 that is collected, maintained, and stored in CAMDBS	75%	85%	80%
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 as reported in the Acid Rain Progress Report 2006	11.2 million tons	8.95 million tons	9.4 million tons
2006	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	% of users processing facility/unit/rep data maintained and stored in CAMDBS	10%	40%	26%
2006	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% of users with access to real-time processing capabilities of data captured in CAMDBS	64%	69%	75%
2007	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	% of program data available via the web that is collected, maintained, and stored in CAMDBS	80%	87%	85%
2007	Goal 1: Clean Air	Mission and	Environmental	Environmental	# of tons of	9.4 million tons	8.95 million tons	8.9 million tons

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 11)

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	Business Results	Management	Monitoring and Forecasting	sulfur dioxide emissions as reported in the Acid Rain Progress Report 2007			
2007	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	% of users processing facility/unit/rep data maintained and stored in CAMDBS	26%	50%	30%
2007	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% of users with access to real-time processing capabilities of data captured in CAMDBS	75%	78%	77%
2008	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Automation	% of users converted to new tool, one of four components of the CAMDBS	10%	50%	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 as reported in the Acid Rain Progress Report 2008	8.9 million tons	8.95 million tons	TBD end of Q1 FY09
2008	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	% of users processing facility/unit/rep data maintained and stored in CAMDBS	30%	60%	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 of data captured in CAMDBS	77%	86%	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, one of four componenets of the CAMDBS	Cumulative % FY08	100%	TBD end of Q1 FY10
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 as reported in the Acid Rain Progress Report 2009	Cumulative # of tons FY08	8.95 million tons	TBD end of Q1 FY10
2009	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	% of users processing facility/unit/rep data maintained and stored in CAMDBS	Cumulative % FY08	70%	TBD end of Q1 FY10
2009	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% of users with acess and utilization of real-time processing capabilities of data captured in CAMDBS	Cumulative % FY08	94%	TBD end of Q1 FY10
2010	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Automation	% of users converted to new tool, one of four components of the CAMDBS	Cumulative % FY09	100%	TBD end of Q1 FY11
2010	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	# of tons of sulfur dioxide emissions as reported in the Acid Rain Progress Report 2010	Cumulative # of tons FY09	8.95 million tons	TBD end of Q1 FY11
2010	Goal 1: Clean Air	Processes and	Cycle Time and	Cycle Time	% of users	Cumulative %	80%	TBD end of Q1

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	Timeliness		processing facility/unit/rep data maintained and stored in CAMDBS	FY09		FY11
2010	Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% of users with access and utilization of real-time processing capabilities of data captured in CAMDBS	Cumulative % FY09	90%	TBD end of Q1 FY11

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	4/1/2009	2/27/2009

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, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
CAMD Business System	Government Only	Moderate	yes	7/7/2008	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	7/7/2008	1/8/2008

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of No

the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

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.
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. Clean Air Markets Division Business System

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? No

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.

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)
Clean Air Markets Division	An extranet application for	Customer Services	Customer Relationship	Customer / Account	Customer / Account	020-00-01-16-02-6006-00	Internal	25

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 11)

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)
Business System (CBS)	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.		Management	Management	Management			
Data and Maps	An internet application with enhanced query and navigation capability that allows public user access, review, and retrieval of inventory, allowances, emissions, and deposition data to answer scientific, policy, regulatory or general interest questions.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval	Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	020-00-01-16-01-0120-24	Internal	10
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	Inventory management	020-00-01-16-02-6006-00	Internal	25
Emissions Collection and 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	Data Classification	020-00-01-16-02-6006-00	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.
--

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 11)

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 Technologies	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	User 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	
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Information Sharing	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	

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 11)

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	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	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Customer / Account Management	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	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web 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	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	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	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	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	

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Clean Air Markets Division Business System (CAMDBS) (Revision 11)

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	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., USA.gov, 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	Regulations mandate that the CAIR and the CAMR Programs are incorporated into any solution that is chosen. Because of this, what would typically be identified as a solution has to, in fact, be enhanced to support such mandates. This Alternative suggests that all new development on the current solution is stopped, and what is currently in production is enhanced to accommodate the CAIR and CAMR requirements.	0.0436	0
Alternative 2: System Modernization Approach	Continue the CAMDBS project, as currently planned, enhancing the allowance management system, adding auction and reconciliation functionality, and enhancing the submission and evaluation tool.	0.0406	0.067
Alternative 3: COTS/GOTS Solution(s)	The CAMDBS team conducted a market assessment to see if there are any available COTS/GOTS products currently available to the marketplace that could be integrated into the CAMDBS system. The Department of Labor (GOTS) was selected in performance of a vendor selection	0.0464	0.0477
Alternative 4: COTS/GOTS and Alter Acquisition Strategy	Vendor selection for a COTS product to support AMS and CPTS, but continues in-house development of ECMPS. Therefore this alternative only includes integrating 1 off-the-shelf solution.	0.0456	0.0477

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.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, 2008
when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

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. Federal Quantitative Benefits				
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

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits				
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 2007 & Prior	11.958	7.905	Increased customer satisfaction, faster cycle time, reduced waiting times, reduced error handling, reduced redundancy of data, cross agency potential	Avoid increased risk, avoid increased government FTE, avoid increased processing time, avoid increased error handling.
PY 2008	4.929	7.236	Increased customer satisfaction, faster cycle time, reduced waiting times, reduced error handling, reduced redundancy of data, cross agency potential	Avoid increased risk, avoid increased government FTE, avoid increased processing time, avoid increased error handling.
CY 2009	4.604	8.996	Increased customer satisfaction, faster cycle time, reduced waiting times, reduced error handling, reduced redundancy of data, cross agency potential	Avoid increased risk, avoid increased government FTE, avoid increased processing time, avoid increased error handling.
BY 2010	3.749	8.408	Increased customer satisfaction, faster cycle time, reduced waiting times, reduced error handling, reduced redundancy of data, cross agency potential.	Avoid increased risk, avoid increased government FTE, avoid increased processing time, avoid increased error handling.
BY + 1 2011				
BY + 2 2012				
BY + 3 2013				
BY + 4 2014 & Beyond				
Total LCC Benefit				

6. 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:

5b. 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:

At the project planning and initiation phase, CAMD recognized that significant technological changes had occurred since the early 1990's (primarily the internet and small powerful servers) and that considerable knowledge had been gained from 4 years of experience running an emissions trading program. This led us to believe that we could develop an integrated system that was more efficient and cost-effective to operate. An analysis of the business processes and data systems identified redundant processes and data storage among the various functions within 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. This analysis was performed due to the identified risks of: 1) inability to handle new programs effectively, 2) old technology no longer easily supported, 3) customer dissatisfaction with data quality and access (redundant data and multiple platforms), and 4) customer dissatisfaction with options for meeting program requirements (paper forms, etc.). Based on the findings a project business plan was developed; implementation began in 2001.

During the design, development, and testing phase, in order to manage cost and schedule and to mitigate risks, strategies have been initiated by instituting a number of requirements and controls on the project. The contract requires that an Earned Value Management System (EVMS) be used for tracking schedules and costs, to be used for monthly progress reporting. MS Project is used as the schedule tracking tool for the project. Schedules are maintained for the overall project and each sub-task or module. To reduce the risk that application development will not meet requirements, requirements definition is performed by a team that includes both the application developers and the subject matter experts. Requirements are tracked and monitored.

For the implementation or operational portion of the investment, a number of procedures have been established to mitigate risks. These procedures included twice-monthly meetings with OEI to track system performance and usage, address problems and continually improve performance. CAMDBS is regularly monitored for cost of operations and evaluation of the EPA computer infrastructure and security requirements. Formal feedback sessions are held annually with developed procedures for user feedback and customer service.

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? 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
		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	\$0.050000	12/31/2001	12/31/2001	\$0.050000	\$0.050000	0	\$0.000000	100%
01-00	2001 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2001	\$2.400000	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	\$2.400000	\$2.400000	0	\$0.000000	100%
01-01	Complete and launch Source Registration System	9/30/2002	\$0.700000	9/30/2002	3/31/2003	\$0.700000	\$1.000000	-182	-\$0.300000	100%
01-01	Define & begin development of Source Registration System	9/30/2001	\$0.400000	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	\$0.400000	\$0.400000	0	\$0.000000	100%
01-03	Complete business plan	3/31/2001	\$0.035000	3/31/2001	3/31/2001	\$0.035000	\$0.035000	0	\$0.000000	100%
01-04	Assess technical architecture and determine direction	9/30/2001	\$0.035000	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	\$0.035000	\$0.035000	0	\$0.000000	100%
01-05	Database design & creation	9/30/2001	\$0.070000	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	\$0.070000	\$0.070000	0	\$0.000000	100%
01-06	Loading historical emissions data	12/31/2002	\$0.200000	12/31/2002	12/31/2002	\$0.200000	\$0.200000	0	\$0.000000	100%
02-00	2002 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2002	\$2.400000	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$2.400000	\$2.400000	0	\$0.000000	100%
02-01	Incorporate GIS capabilities (enhanced interface to database)	9/30/2004	\$0.450000	9/30/2004	5/31/2004	\$0.450000	\$0.421000	122	\$0.029000	100%
02-02	Update all systems for SIP/126	9/30/2002	\$0.150000	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$0.150000	\$0.150000	0	\$0.000000	100%
02-04	Complete and launch on-line interface	9/30/2002	\$0.200000	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$0.200000	\$0.200000	0	\$0.000000	100%
02-05	Assess creating quality assurance and submission tool for sources in current architecture	9/30/2002	\$0.150000	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$0.150000	\$0.060000	0	\$0.090000	100%
03-00	2003 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2003	\$2.400000	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$2.400000	\$2.400000	0	\$0.000000	100%
03-01	Define the re-engineering of the Emissions Tracking System and the Monitoring Data Checker	9/30/2003	\$0.100000	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.100000	\$0.081000	0	\$0.019000	100%
03-02	Moved to 2004: Define enhanced version of interface to database	5/30/2005	\$0.450000	5/30/2005	6/30/2005	\$0.450000	\$0.566000	-31	-\$0.116000	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			
03-04	Create centralized repository managing requirements	6/30/2003	\$0.190000	6/30/2003	6/30/2003	\$0.190000	\$0.190000	0	\$0.000000	100%
03-05	Create centralized system administrator tool for database maintenance and migration purposes	8/31/2003	\$0.150000	8/31/2003	11/30/2003	\$0.150000	\$0.136000	-91	\$0.014000	100%
03-06	Technical support for source registration	9/30/2003	\$0.080000	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.080000	\$0.080000	0	\$0.000000	100%
03-07	Updates to security plan and logical and physical design documents	8/31/2003	\$0.050000	8/31/2003	9/30/2003	\$0.050000	\$0.050000	-30	\$0.000000	100%
03-08	Complete conversion of remaining paper forms via the source registration system	2/28/2004	\$0.150000	2/28/2004	1/31/2004	\$0.150000	\$0.150000	28	\$0.000000	100%
03-09	Revise business plan	9/30/2003	\$0.030000	9/30/2003	12/31/2003	\$0.030000	\$0.010000	-92	\$0.020000	100%
04-00	2004 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2004	\$3.310000	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$3.310000	\$2.400000	0	\$0.910000	100%
04-01	Define centralized allowance management and compliance & permit tracking system	12/31/2005	\$0.350000	12/31/2005	12/31/2005	\$0.350000	\$0.293000	0	\$0.057000	100%
04-05	Complete design of the re-engineered emissions tracking system and monitoring data checker	2/28/2004	\$0.150000	2/28/2004	2/28/2004	\$0.150000	\$0.135000	0	\$0.015000	100%
04-06	Begin development of the new emissions/monitoring collection system	9/30/2004	\$0.300000	9/30/2004	12/31/2004	\$0.300000	\$0.300000	-92	\$0.000000	100%
04-10	New: Centralized email generation and data driven updates to email text, error messages (via sys admin tool)	3/1/2005	\$0.100000	3/1/2005	2/28/2005	\$0.100000	\$0.098000	1	\$0.002000	100%
05-00	2005 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2005	\$3.120000	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$3.120000	\$3.120000	0	\$0.000000	100%
05-02	Complete development of the new emissions/monitoring	12/31/2005	\$0.800000	12/31/2005	12/31/2005	\$0.800000	\$1.145000	0	-\$0.345000	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			
	collection system									
06-00	2006 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2006	\$3.470000	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$3.470000	\$3.470000	0	\$0.000000	100%
06-01	Complete final phase of interface to the database	2/1/2008	\$0.300000	2/1/2008	3/31/2008	\$0.300000	\$0.310000	-59	-\$0.010000	100%
06-03	Assess Business Plan and determine whether to address the remaining systems	5/1/2007	\$0.050000	5/1/2007		\$0.050000				
06-06	Create allowance management and compliance & permit tracking system	12/31/2006	\$0.600000	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.600000	\$0.156000	0	\$0.444000	100%
06-09	Alpha test client tool and refinement of the new emissions/monitoring collection system	12/31/2006	\$0.800000	12/31/2006	12/31/2006	\$0.800000	\$0.952000	0	-\$0.152000	100%
06-13	Develop System Management Plan	2/28/2006	\$0.030000	2/28/2006	3/31/2006	\$0.030000	\$0.017000	-31	\$0.013000	100%
07-00	2007 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2007	\$3.450000	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	\$3.450000	\$3.450000	0	\$0.000000	100%
07-01	Beta Test Client Tool and make modifications to the new emissions/monitoring collection system	12/31/2007	\$0.950000	12/31/2007	12/31/2007	\$0.950000	\$0.001400	0	\$0.948600	100%
07-02	Updates to security plan and system documents	1/1/2008	\$0.100000	1/1/2008		\$0.100000	\$0.010000		\$0.070000	80%
07-04	Test and launch allowance management and compliance & permit tracking system	2/28/2007	\$0.250000	2/28/2007	6/30/2007	\$0.250000	\$0.243000	-122	\$0.007000	100%
07-05	Define and begin development for the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR)	9/30/2007	\$0.150000	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	\$0.150000	\$0.042000	0	\$0.108000	100%
07-06	Define and begin development for the Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR)	9/30/2007	\$0.137000	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	\$0.137000	\$0.071000	0	\$0.066000	100%
07-07	Assess and begin development	9/30/2007	\$0.043000	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	\$0.043000	\$0.030000	0	\$0.013000	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			
	for CROMERR requirements									
08-00	2008 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2008	\$3.700000	9/30/2008		\$3.700000	\$2.775000		-\$0.925000	50%
08-02	Parallel test the emissions / monitoring collection system	12/31/2008	\$1.200000	12/31/2008		\$1.200000	\$0.455000		\$0.085000	45%
08-03	Complete CAIR changes to legacy systems	9/30/2008	\$0.070000	9/30/2008		\$0.070000	\$0.000000		\$0.000000	0%
08-04	Complete CAMR changes to legacy systems	9/30/2008	\$0.068000	9/30/2008		\$0.068000	\$0.006000		\$0.028000	50%
08-05	Complete development of CROMERR requirements for legacy systems	9/30/2008	\$0.020000	9/30/2008		\$0.020000	\$0.000000		\$0.000000	0%
09-00	2009 Operations & Maintenance	9/30/2009	\$3.700000	9/30/2009		\$3.700000				
09-01	Final launch of emissions/monitoring collection system	3/31/2009	\$0.250000	3/31/2009		\$0.250000				
09-02	Integrate CAIR requirements to all other systems	9/30/2009	\$0.073000	9/30/2009		\$0.073000				
09-03	Integrate CAMR requirements to all other systems	9/30/2009	\$0.071000	9/30/2009		\$0.071000				
09-04	Complete CROMERR requirements	3/31/2009	\$0.030000	3/31/2009		\$0.030000				
09-05	Alternatives Analysis	6/14/2009	\$0.000000	6/14/2009		\$0.000000				0%
10-00	2010 Operations and Maintenance	9/30/2011	\$3.700000	9/30/2011		\$3.700000				0%
10-01	2010 FISMA Assessment	9/30/2011	\$0.000000	9/30/2011		\$0.000000				0%
10-02	Updates to Security Plan	1/1/2011	\$0.000000	1/1/2011		\$0.000000				0%
10-03	2010 Operational Analysis	9/30/2011	\$0.000000	9/30/2011		\$0.000000				0%
10-04	Risk Management Plan	7/16/2010	\$0.000000	7/16/2010		\$0.000000				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			
Project Totals										