

**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: 9/15/2008
2. Agency: Environmental Protection Agency
3. Bureau: Office Of Administration And Resources Management
4. Name of this Capital Asset: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-04-00-01-1306-00
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.) Operations and Maintenance
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:
- IGMS is a grants system designed to reduce weaknesses in grants management and improve service to states through integration of grant and financial systems. It consists of a series of integrated modules that support grant and financial management functions from application to closeout. IGMS improves grant financial management through accurate and timely recording of commitments/obligations, integrated financial reporting, timely state awards and closeout.
- IGMS is integrated with the Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS). Commitments approved in IGMS are transmitted in real time to IFMS, increasing the accuracy and timeliness of commitments and eliminating double entry of data and reconciliation activities. Obligations are also made electronically in IGMS and transmitted electronically to IFMS, replacing a labor intensive manual process.
- IGMS also improves funds management by providing data to the Financial Data Warehouse for integrated grant/financial reports. These reports are used to monitor status of funds and reduction of un-liquidated obligations. IGMS supports a streamlined closeout process, important in reducing un-liquidated obligations. Alerts to project officers and grants specialists on pending closeouts and closeout tracking views make it easier for them to meet closeout goals for grants.
- IGMS addresses state concerns about lengthy delays in grant awards. Approximately 70% of EPA's grant funds are awarded to states. Much of this funding is awarded for continuing environmental program grants used to operate delegated environmental programs. IGMS supports timely award of grants to states, ensuring seamless support to environmental programs and aiding state fiscal management. IGMS also improves service to states by facilitating use of Grants.gov for mandatory state grant programs.
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
- a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/28/2008
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 Yes

effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?

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

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

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

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

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

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

If "yes," check all that apply:

Financial Performance

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?)

Under EPA's PMA "Green Plan for Data Integration", IGMS created a real time interface with IFMS to improve consistency of financial reporting. IGMS supports integration of grant and financial data for better expenditure tracking, reduction of unliquidated obligations and reduction in negative financial findings and erroneous payments among non-profit recipients. The system also supports increased timeliness in the award of state grants for continuing environmental programs.

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](http://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 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) Yes

19. Is this a financial management system? Yes

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

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

IGMS integrates with the financial management system, IFMS, addressing the FFMI area Non-integrated Financial Management systems. Grant commitments and obligations are made in IGMS addressing the FFMI area, Lack of Accurate and Timely Reporting

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

Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS)

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

Hardware 0  
 Software 14  
 Services 79  
 Other 7

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? N/A

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:	3.42	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	10.65	0	0	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	14.07	0	0	0					
Operations & Maintenance:	11.149	1.4	2.666	2.848					
TOTAL:	25.219	1.4	2.666	2.848					
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	1.094	0.447	1.017	0.81					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	10	3	7	6					

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?

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:

In FY2010, the proposal requests a decrease of \$0.227m in payroll funds (2 FTE) due to realignment of responsibilities in legacy system support and resource considerations.

**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: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

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-05-024/34 (Support for Ex 300 Development) Contractor is SRA	FFP	Yes	6/14/2006	6/14/2006	4/14/2009	0.116	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes				
GS00T99ALD0203/215 (Operations and Maintenance for IGMS) Contractor is CSC	CPIF	Yes	6/14/2006	6/14/2006	3/28/2009	2.259	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes				
(Risk Assessment and Security Plan Development Support for IGMS C&A) Contractor is SRA	FFP	Yes	4/3/2008	4/3/2008	7/29/2008	0.101	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	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:

The IGMS investment is in the Operations and Maintenance lifecycle phase for 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 and therefore EVM will not be a contract requirement for those years.

The contracts table does not include \$600,000 in Working Capital Funds costs. The contract table includes \$926,000 in contract funds expended prior to FY2008.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? IGMS uses EPAAR clause 1552.211-79 "COMPLIANCE WITH EPA POLICIES FOR INFORMATION RESOURCE MANAGEMENT" in all EPA contracts to ensure contractor 508 compliance. IGMS also utilizes EPA's electronic Information Technology Procurement Checklist and [intranet.epa.gov/accessibility/](http://intranet.epa.gov/accessibility/) and tests all software products for 508 compliance prior to release using Federally approved "checkers," including InFocus and InSight-for accessibility - and IBM Homepage reader or JAWS to ensure webpages can be read.

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? 8/22/2008

1. Is it Current?

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](http://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
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Percentage of non-competitive announcements states can apply for using Grants.gov	0%	50%	14%
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Percentage of grant decision memoranda and terms and conditions that explain how grantees plan to measure and report on environmental results.	94%	95%	95%
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Financial Management	Percentage of recipients with negative financial findings (i.e. erroneous payments) in	45.8%	40.80%	22.4% Exceeded goal by 18.2%

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					advanced or on-site audits.			
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	Percentage of electronic applications received from Grants.gov	25%	30%	51.4%
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Percentage of commitment transactions transmitted electronically from IGMS to IFMS	0%	95%	98%
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Percentage of grant funding packages EPA regional personnel submit electronically.	99%	97%	100%
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Percentage of obligation transactions transmitted electronically from IGMS to IFMS	0%	95%	57%
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Percentage of grant funding packages EPA Headquarters personnel submit electronically	25%	85%	94%
2007	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Percentage of electronic applications received from Grants.gov and shared electronically across organizational units	50%	60%	100%
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Percentage of non-competitive announcements state can apply for using Grants.gov	14%	25%	39.6%
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Percentage of grant, decision memoranda and terms and conditions that explain how grantees plan to measure and report on environmental results	95%	98%	Results in October 2008
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Percentage of grants closed within the fiscal year following the closeout date of the grant	90%	90%	Results in November 2008
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Compliance	Percentage of electronic applications received from Grants.gov for eligible grant programs	51%	55%	Results in November 2008
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Percentage of award transactions transmitted electronically to the financial system(IFMS)	57%	95%	Results in October 2008
2008	Cross-Goal	Processes and	Management	Innovation and	Percentage of	94%	100%	Results in

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Strategies	Activities	and Innovation	Improvement	grant funding packages EPA Headquarters personnel submit electronically			October 2008
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Efficiency	Percentage of continuing environmental grant funding awarded to states in the first quarter to fund environmental program costs	0%	50% of continuing environmental grant funding for Fiscal Year	100% of continuing environmental grant funding available under the continuing resolutions in the first quarter
2008	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	Percentage of project officers who rate IGMS as meeting or exceeding their expectations	46%	50%	Results in February 2008
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Percentage of non-competitive announcements states can apply for using Grants.gov	39.6%	50%	Results in October 2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Percentage reduction in unliquidated obligations	Baseline in October 2008	90%	Results in October 2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Percentage of grants closed within the fiscal year following the closeout date of the grant	Baseline in November of 2008	90%	Results in November of 2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Percentage of continuing environmental program funding awarded to states in the first quarter to fund environmental program costs	100% of continuing environmental grant funding available under the continuing resolutions in the first quarter	50% of continuing environmental grant funding for Fiscal Year	Results in March 2009
2009	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Technology Costs	Support Costs	Percentage reduction in cost of handling award documents based on IGMS printing feature	Baseline set in October 2008	Target in October 2008	Results in October 2009
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Percentage of non-competitive announcements states can apply for using Grants.gov	Baseline set in October of 2009	Target in October 2009	Results in October 2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Percentage of continuing environmental program funding awarded to states in the first quarter to fund environmental program costs	Baseline in March 2009	50% of continuing environmental grant funding for Fiscal Year	Results in March 2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Percentage reduction in unliquidated obligations	Baseline in October 2009	90%	Results in October 2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Percentage of grants closed within the fiscal year following the closeout date of the grant	Baseline in November 2009	90%	Results in November 2010
2010	Cross-Goal Strategies	Technology	Technology Costs	Support Costs	Percentage reduction in the cost of handling award documents	Baseline in October 2009	Target in October 2009	Results in October 2010

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					based on the IGMS Printing feature			

**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: 9
- 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)

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
IGMS	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	6/26/2008	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/19/2008	6/30/2008

- 5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? Yes
  - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? Yes
- 6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? No
  - a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

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

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
IGMS	No	Yes	<a href="http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/igms.htm">http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/igms.htm</a>	Yes	<a href="http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-53.htm">http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-53.htm</a>
<b>Details for Text Options:</b> 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? No  
 a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.  
 b. If "no," please explain why?

This investment was not included in the 2008 EA Transition Strategy because it did not meet the criteria set forth by the Chief Architect for inclusion. To be included, an investment needed to have some money going toward DME.

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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
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)
Grants Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, postaward management and closeout of grants as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange	020-00-01-16-01-6005-00	Internal	11

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

<b>4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:</b>								
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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
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)
Grant Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, post-award management and closeout of grants, as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Legacy Integration			No Reuse	1
Grants Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, postaward management and closeout of grants, as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Activity-Based Management			No Reuse	21
Grants Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, postaward management and closeout of grants, as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Internal Controls			No Reuse	10
Public Address Book Module	Public Address Book Module is a tool for managing vendor information on grantees and contact and profile information on IGMS users. For IGMS users, it also contains a record of access rights and roles as well as group membership and server access	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Contact and Profile Management			No Reuse	8
Grants Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, post-award	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Review and Approval			No Reuse	8

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
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)
	management and closeout of grants, as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees							
Grants Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, post-award management and closeout of grants, as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Smart Documents			No Reuse	7
Grants Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, post-award management and closeout of grants, as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	11
Grants Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, post-award management and closeout of grants, as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	11
Public Address Book Module	Public Address Book Module is a tool for managing vendor information on grantees and contact and profile information on the IGMS users. For IGMS users, it also contains a record of access rights and roles as well as group membership and server access	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	5
Grants Management Modules	Grant Management Modules provide for the receipt of	Support Services	Security Management	Digital Signature Management			No Reuse	2

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

**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)
	electronic applications from Grants.gov and the review, approval, funding, award, post-award management and closeout of grants, as well as the tracking of past performance of grantees							
Public Address Book Module	Public Address Book Module is a tool for managing vendor information on grantees and contract and profile information on the IGMS users. For IGMS users, it also contains a record of access rights and roles, as well as group membership and server access	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	5

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)
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Document Review and Approval	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Digital Signature Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Document Review and Approval	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Smart Documents	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Activity-Based Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b>				
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.				
<b>FEA SRM Component (a)</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)</b>
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Digital Signature Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Activity-Based Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Contact and Profile Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Digital Signature Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Document Review and Approval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Legacy Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Smart Documents	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Contact and Profile Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Document Review and Approval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Smart Documents	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Legacy Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Activity-Based Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Digital Signature Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Contact and Profile Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Document Review and Approval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Smart Documents	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Legacy Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b>				
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.				
<b>FEA SRM Component (a)</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)</b>
Activity-Based Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Digital Signature Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Contact and Profile Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Document Review and Approval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Smart Documents	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Legacy Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Activity-Based Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Digital Signature Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Contact and Profile Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Document Review and Approval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Smart Documents	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Legacy Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Activity-Based Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Digital Signature Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	

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)? Yes

a. If "yes," please describe.

IGMS leverages the Grants.gov initiative to improve service to citizens, specifically, universities, non-profit organizations, states, tribes, localities and fellows. Recipients can both find and apply for grants from any Federal agency using the Grants.gov Web site. This means that recipients only have to maintain one registration and learn one technology to electronically apply for grants. EPA posts applications packages on Grants.gov for 100% of its competitively announced grants and for many of the mandatory grants, exceeding the current e-gov. goal. In addition, the technology required to use Grants.gov is minimal. On the back end, IGMS saves time in the review, approval, funding and award of grants. This speeds the delivery of grant funds to

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

recipients. Using Grants.gov saves Agency funds that would otherwise be spent in developing and maintaining an electronic application capability for recipients, and in recipient training and account management. It also reduces security risk to IGMS since external users only interface with the Grants.gov server.

The Agency is leveraging another EPA investment, the Central Data Exchange (CDX), initially a portal for environmental information, to pull the Grants.gov applications into the Agency and pass them to IGMS. Reusing this portal saved approximately \$200k in development costs.

The Integrated Financial Management System interface with IGMS, reuses SPODE (single point of data entry) software to update commitments.

**Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)****Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)**

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

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? 6/16/2006
  - 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 B: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)**

1. Was an operational analysis conducted? Yes
  - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed. 6/18/2008
  - b. If "yes," what were the results?

The Agency conducted an operational analysis for IGMS in 2008 as part of its steady state activities. The operational analysis was conducted on the following five factors.

**Customer Satisfaction:** IGMS is improving the capability to receive applications from Grants.gov, reducing applicant burden and simplifying the application process. Within EPA, project officer satisfaction with IGMS is eroding. In a 2008 survey, 46% of the project officers responded that IGMS is meeting or exceeding expectations, a drop of 32% from 2 years ago. The aging Lotus Notes system with its many modules and slower response times no longer can compete with modern, streamlined Web-based systems. EPA is scheduled to begin migrating to HHS' Child and Family Services web-based grant system in FY2011.

**Internal Business:** IGMS continues to address emerging policy needs. In 2008 EPA expanded IGMS to support EPA Order 5700 2A2 Policy on Compliance Review and Monitoring. Changes included alerts on due dates for post award monitoring activities by project officers and grants specialists, on-line forms for documenting results and management tracking to improve the quality of post award monitoring of grants.

**Strategic Impact:** EPA continued to leverage the availability of online recipient past performance information in IGMS to implement the policy restricting award of grant funds to recipients with unresolved corrective actions. During 2008, EPA used IGMS to track and evaluate progress on increasing the proportion of funding recommendations that contain a plan for measuring the environmental results of projects to 100%.

**Innovation:** EPA is a leader among Federal agencies in GMLoB transition planning. In FY 2008 the Agency has established a senior level governance board for the project and selected its consortium provider. The core team is being intensively trained on the HHS GMLoB system and specialized user groups (e.g. project officers) are being organized in preparation for participation in a detailed gap analysis and business process streamlining effort beginning in October 2008.

**e-gov Strategy:** IGMS complies with the goals and objectives of the e-gov initiative of the PMA. The IGMS investment is aligned with both the Grants.gov and the GMLoB initiatives, has consistently met PMA scorecard requirements and been consistently certified non-duplicative. This project also met its milestones to completion with less than 10% variance in cost and time.

- c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

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

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table:

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table							
Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
1	FY1996 - FY2003	9/30/2003	\$18.39	9/30/2003	\$18.39	0	\$0.00
2	FY2004	9/30/2005	\$2.39	3/31/2006	\$1.93	-182	\$0.46
2.1	Develop requirements for modifications	7/30/2004	\$0.13	6/30/2004	\$0.05	30	\$0.08
2.2	Modify CDX to accept Grants.gov data	8/1/2004	\$0.10	8/31/2004	\$0.04	-30	\$0.06
2.3	Develop staging database for Grants.gov application interface	9/30/2004	\$0.23	9/30/2004	\$0.15	0	\$0.08
2.4	Pilot Grants.gov application interface.	12/31/2004	\$0.06	12/30/2004	\$0.03	1	\$0.03
2.5	Revise after Grants.gov pilot	3/31/2005	\$0.18	5/30/2005	\$0.10	-60	\$0.08
2.6	Align IGMS Public Address Book with Business Partner Network	9/30/2005	\$0.14	9/30/2005	\$0.00	0	\$0.14
2.7	Conduct vulnerability assessment. (Security Risk)	8/11/2004	\$0.00	8/11/2004	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
2.8	Train 3 Headquarters program offices on IGMS	12/31/2004	\$0.15	12/15/2004	\$0.10	16	\$0.04
2.9	Transmit award data electronically from IGMS to IFMS JFMIP (Dependencies Risk)	5/31/2005	\$0.21	3/31/2006	\$0.31	-304	(\$0.10)
2.10	Complete FY2004 FISMA assessment (Security Risk)	8/1/2004	\$0.00	7/31/2004	\$0.00	1	\$0.00
2.11	Conduct Risk Assessment (Security Risk)	11/30/2004	\$0.06	3/15/2005	\$0.06	-105	\$0.00
2.12	Maintenance Release	4/30/2004	\$0.19	5/31/2004	\$0.15	-31	\$0.04
2.13	Operations and Maintenance 2004	9/30/2004	\$0.94	9/30/2004	\$0.93	0	\$0.00
3	FY2005	9/29/2006	\$2.25	3/31/2006	\$2.09	182	\$0.16
3.1	Replace FTP insecure interface between IGMS and reporting database with Webshpere integrator tool (Dependencies Risk)	9/30/2005	\$0.32	9/30/2005	\$0.44	0	(\$0.13)
3.2	Revise Security Plan after Risk Assessment (Security Risk)	3/30/2005	\$0.01	6/28/2005	\$0.02	-90	(\$0.01)
3.3	Implement tribal data standard	1/31/2005	\$0.11	2/15/2005	\$0.12	-15	(\$0.01)

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table							
Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
3.4	Train 3 Headquarters offices on IGMS	7/31/2005	\$0.17	7/31/2005	\$0.12	0	\$0.05
3.5	Revise IGMS to support Grant.gov modifications	6/30/2005	\$0.08	6/30/2005	\$0.06	0	\$0.02
3.6	Organizational implementation of grants .gov	9/30/2005	\$0.23	9/30/2005	\$0.05	0	\$0.19
3.7	Complete higher level background investigations for staff with system manager access (Security Risk)(FISMA - Personnel Security)	9/3/2005	\$0.01	12/29/2004	\$0.00	248	\$0.01
3.8	Security Enhancement Release internal labeling of Fellowship module and Edits (Security Risk) (FISMA - Input/Output Controls and Labeling)	9/30/2005	\$0.06	3/31/2006	\$0.06	-182	\$0.00
3.9	Re-certify users - Account Management (Security/Privacy Risk)	2/28/2005	\$0.01	5/30/2005	\$0.01	-91	\$0.00
3.10	Develop IGMS User Manual (Data/Info Risk)	9/30/2005	\$0.03	12/20/2004	\$0.01	284	\$0.02
3.11	Conduct security training for all users (Data/Info & Privacy Risk)	2/28/2005	\$0.01	6/30/2005	\$0.01	-122	\$0.00
3.12	Test the disaster recovery server (Surety Risk) (FISMA - Contingency Planning))	10/31/2004	\$0.01	3/10/2005	\$0.01	-130	\$0.00
3.13	Develop and distribute disaster recovery procedures.(FISMA)	12/31/2004	\$0.03	11/16/2004	\$0.01	45	\$0.02
3.14	Conduct annual FISMA Assessment (Security Risk)	7/30/2005	\$0.01	9/19/2005	\$0.01	-51	\$0.00
3.15	Maintenance Release	4/30/2005	\$0.18	6/15/2005	\$0.12	-46	\$0.05
3.16	Project Management	9/30/2005	\$0.13	9/30/2005	\$0.14	0	(\$0.01)
3.17	Server Management and Renewal (Technology Risk)	9/30/2005	\$0.15	9/30/2005	\$0.17	0	(\$0.02)
3.18	Working Capital Fund Charges	9/30/2005	\$0.13	9/30/2005	\$0.07	0	\$0.06
3.19	Operations and Maintenance 2005	9/30/2005	\$0.56	9/30/2005	\$0.48	0	\$0.08

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table							
Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
3.20	Develop a single point entry for commitments	9/29/2006	\$0.00	3/30/2006	\$0.17	183	(\$0.17)
4	FY2006	9/30/2007	\$1.72	12/14/2006	\$1.50	290	\$0.22
4.1	Migration Support	9/30/2006	\$0.24	9/30/2006	\$0.05	0	\$0.20
4.2	Re-certify users(account management) (Security/Privacy Risk)	3/28/2006	\$0.01		\$0.00		\$0.01
4.3	Conduct annual disaster recovery test . (Surety Risk)(FISMA Contingency Planning)	10/31/2005	\$0.01	6/15/2006	\$0.01	-227	\$0.00
4.4	Conduct annual security training (Data/Info & Privacy Risk)	9/30/2007	\$0.01	7/27/2006	\$0.01	430	\$0.00
4.5	Conduct annual FISMA assessment (Security Risk)	7/31/2006	\$0.01	7/20/2006	\$0.01	11	\$0.00
4.6	Maintenance Release	4/30/2006	\$0.33	5/30/2006	\$0.24	-30	\$0.09
4.7	Project Management	9/30/2006	\$0.07	9/30/2006	\$0.07	0	\$0.00
4.8	Headquarters server replacement and management (Technology Risk)	9/30/2006	\$0.18	9/30/2006	\$0.17	0	\$0.01
4.9	Working Capital Fund charges	9/30/2006	\$0.13	9/30/2006	\$0.19	0	(\$0.06)
4.10	Operations and Maintenance 2006	9/30/2006	\$0.72	9/30/2006	\$0.75	0	(\$0.03)
4.11	Establish service level agreements with the Regions to formalize operational support for IGMS servers. (Feasibility Risk)	11/30/2005	\$0.00	6/1/2006	\$0.00	-183	\$0.00
4.12	Install regional servers (Reliability Risk)	3/30/2006	\$0.00	6/1/2006	\$0.00	-63	\$0.00
4.13	Develop and distribute disaster recovery procedures to all affected parties. (Surety & Business Risk) (FISMA - Contingency Planning)	12/30/2005	\$0.00	4/10/2006	\$0.00	-101	\$0.00
4.14	Develop agreement for backup processing with the managing	11/30/2005	\$0.00	12/14/2006	\$0.00	-379	\$0.00

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table							
Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
	region (Surety & Security Risk)						
4.15	Update system documentation for configuration management, input/output controls and records management (Security Risk) (FISMA - Documentation/Production Controls)	12/30/2005	\$0.00	4/10/2006	\$0.00	-101	\$0.00
4.16	Develop an inventory of current sources and contractual obligations for security products and services	12/31/2005	\$0.00	1/4/2006	\$0.00	-4	\$0.00
4.17	Develop migration plan for acquiring information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the Information Systems Security Line of Business	9/30/2006	\$0.00	9/30/2006	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
5	FY2007	9/30/2007	\$1.56	2/15/2008	\$1.62	-138	(\$0.06)
5.1	Conduct annual re-certification of users (Security/Privacy Risk)	3/28/2007	\$0.00	4/15/2007	\$0.00	-18	\$0.00
5.2	Conduct annual security training (Data/Info & Privacy Risk)	3/28/2007	\$0.00	7/15/2007	\$0.00	-109	\$0.00
5.3	Conduct annual disaster recovery test (Surety Risk)	10/31/2006	\$0.00	5/8/2007	\$0.00	-189	\$0.00
5.4	Conduct annual FISMA assessment (Security Risk)	7/30/2007	\$0.00	9/24/2007	\$0.00	-56	\$0.00
5.5	Maintenance Release	4/30/2007	\$0.18	3/30/2007	\$0.19	31	(\$0.01)
5.6	Conduct Customer Satisfaction Survey	12/30/2006	\$0.00	2/15/2008	\$0.00	-412	\$0.00
5.7	Government FTE Workyears	9/30/2007	\$0.50	9/30/2007	\$0.49	0	\$0.01
5.8	Operations and Maintenance 2007	9/30/2007	\$0.88	9/30/2007	\$0.94	0	(\$0.06)
5.9	Implement plan to migrate from current information security acquisition processes	9/30/2007	\$0.00	9/30/2007	\$0.00	0	\$0.00

Exhibit 300: Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) (Revision 10)

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table							
Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
	to the procurement of information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the Information Systems Security Line of Business						
6	FY2008	9/30/2008	\$1.85	6/30/2008	\$1.58	91	\$0.26
6.1	Operations and Maintenance 2008	9/30/2008	\$1.10		\$0.93		\$0.17
6.2	Government FTE Workyears	9/30/2008	\$0.45		\$0.35		\$0.09
6.3	Update Certification and Accreditation	6/30/2008	\$0.18	6/30/2008	\$0.18	0	\$0.00
6.4	Develop Compliance Order Changes	4/30/2008	\$0.13	4/15/2008	\$0.13	14	\$0.00
7	FY2009	11/30/2009	\$3.68				
7.1	Government FTE Workyears	9/30/2009	\$1.02				
7.2	Operations and Maintenance 2009	9/30/2009	\$1.15				
8	FY2010	7/1/2010	\$3.65		\$0.00		\$3.65
8.1	Government FTE Workyears	9/30/2009	\$0.81		\$0.00		\$0.81
8.2	Operations and Maintenance 2010	9/30/2009	\$1.00		\$0.00		\$1.00