

**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 The Chief Financial Officer
- 4. Name of this Capital Asset: Preliminary BY2011 Legacy Financial Systems (LFS)
- 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-01-01-01-1060-00
- 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? FY2002
- 8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

The LFS investment includes the following modules:  
 Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS), the Agency's core financial system  
 Contract Payment System (CPS)  
 Budget Automation System (BAS)  
 Superfund Cost Recovery Package and Image On-Line System (SCORPIOS)  
 Small Systems (IDOTS and GPAS), support systems for inter-agency and grant transactions

EPA's operational analysis of LFS found the following shortcomings: 1) inconsistent data, 2) limited system interoperability, 3) information latency, 4) multiple reporting systems, 5) low system usability, 6) proliferation of cuff systems, and 7) costly maintenance. To modernize its financial systems, EPA instituted its Financial Replacement System (FinRS) initiative, which will eliminate repetitive data entry, integrate new and legacy systems, enable EPA staff to manage workflow among the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) business lines and between OCFO and related business lines (e.g., acquisitions and grants management), and maximize usage of enabling technologies, e-Government initiatives, and EPA enterprise initiatives.

Since 2002 EPA has accomplished several milestones in modernizing its financial systems including migrating its payroll system to DFAS under ePayroll, and constructing an administrative data warehouse (ADW) to manage data and ensure financial data integrity. In FY07, in alignment with OMB's FMLoB, EPA issued an award to a Shared Service Provider (SSP) to manage and host the Agency's core financial system. The award was protested and EPA resolved the protest in April 2008. Based on the Integrated Baseline Reviews (IBRs) completed in June 2008, EPA will replace its core financial system (IFMS, plus BAS, CPS, IDOTS, and GPAS) by October 2010. In addition, EPA will replace SCORPIOS by October 2013.

Replacing LFS with FinRS will enable effective decision-making by capturing and accounting for business event information, ensuring budgetary integrity, and establishing financial control over obligations and costs, performance, other financial assets, and information. These activities will produce accurate and comprehensive financial data to facilitate the OCFO's mission of providing "leadership in financial and performance-based management to achieve a cleaner, healthier environment" in support of the Agency's overall mission of protecting human health and the environment.

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

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?) EPA continues to integrate financial and contracts information to enhance system capabilities and reporting platforms. Progress is monitored and reported in the Agency's Green Plan.

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 FFMLA compliance area? Yes

1. If "yes," which compliance area: 1) Compliance with Federal accounting standards (e.g. FASAB #4 implementing managerial cost accounting) 2) Compliance with Federal financial management system requirements 3) Compliance with the US Std General Ledger (US SGL) at transaction level

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

BAS - Budget Automation System (moved to the FinRS investment in the Planning component)

- CPS - Contracts Payment System
- IDOTS - Inter-Agency Document Online Tracking System
- IFMS - Integrated Financial Management System
- SCORPIOS - Superfund Cost Recovery Package and Image On-line System
- GPAS - Grant Payment Allocation System

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

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| Hardware | 0  |
| Software | 1  |
| Services | 99 |
| Other    | 0  |

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? No

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<br>(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                | 0       | 0       | 0       |           |           |           |                 |       |
| Acquisition:   | 10.082           | 0       | 0       | 0       |           |           |           |                 |       |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:   | 10.082           | 0       | 0       | 0       |           |           |           |                 |       |
| Operations & Maintenance:  | 135.661          | 9.105   | 7.787   | 7.82    |           |           |           |                 |       |
| TOTAL:   | 145.743          | 9.105   | 7.787   | 7.82    |           |           |           |                 |       |
| <b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>                    |                  |         |         |         |           |           |           |                 |       |
| Government FTE Costs   | 27.371           | 2       | 1.689   | 1.767   |           |           |           |                 |       |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs:  | 266              | 15      | 12      | 12      |           |           |           |                 |       |

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:  
The Operations and Maintenance cost for FY 2009 decreased from last year's Exhibit 300 by \$1,850K due to the transfer of the Budget Automation System (BAS) to the Legacy Financial Systems (LFS) business case (020-00-01-01-01-1060-00). Since the scope of the core financial system replacement contract replaces the operations and functions performed

by BAS, EPA moved the BAS system (part of the Planning system component) to the LFS business case.

The Summary of Spending table includes budgeted costs for IT support services provided through EPA's Working Capital Fund (WCF) while the Acquisition/Contract Strategy table does not.

***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 Legacy Financial Systems (LFS) (Revision 12)

| 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) |
| 9W-3428-NBLX                             | Fixed Labor Rate  | Yes                                 | 10/1/1999  | 10/1/1999                          | 9/30/2009                        | 30  | No   | No                             | Yes                          | NA   | No                            | Yes  |            |                                      |   |   |
| GS-35F-0151L, Task Order No. EPO7H001036 | TM  | Yes                                 | 2/28/2007  | 3/1/2007                           | 2/29/2012                        | 4.069                                     | No   | No                             | Yes                          | NA   | No                            | Yes  |            |                                      |   |   |
| GS35F0306J, Task Order 62426             | TM  | Yes                                 | 7/25/2006  | 7/25/2006                          | 7/25/2011                        | 3.551                                     | Yes  | 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:

In accordance with OMB Memorandum M-05-23 dated August 4, 2005 titled, "Improving Information Technology (IT) Project Planning and Execution," all IT projects will use an approved EVMS except "for steady state projects, [which] perform operational analyses." The applications contained in the LFS Exhibit 300 are in the operational or steady state phase of the system life-cycle and therefore do not require the use of an EVMS. EPA periodically performs operational analysis for the legacy systems supported by the LFS Exhibit 300 to comply with the OMB Memorandum M-05-23, the 1997 OMB Capital Programming Guide, and internal EPA guidance. This analysis determines whether the systems are meeting program objectives and the needs of the owners and users, as well as performing within baseline cost, schedule and performance goals.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? It is not cost beneficial to modify legacy systems for Section 508 compliance since they are soon to be replaced. Instead all LFS contracts and task orders ensure 508 compliance by providing alternative means of access including a mix of assistance technology (screen readers, Braille devices, specialized keyboards), hardware (compatibility with screen readers and Braille devices, high resolution monitor readability, one-handed operation), & software (eg, closed captioning, sticky keys).

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? 11/21/2005

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](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                  |
| 2008                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Customer Results             | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time        | Maintain Percent of Non-credit card invoices paid on time         | 99 %      | 99 %      | 98.8 % As of March 31, 2008     |
| 2008                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Mission and Business Results | Financial Management          | Payments             | Percent of vendor payments that are made electronically           | 96 %      | 97 %      | 97.4 % As of March 31, 2008     |
| 2008                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Processes and Activities     | Productivity                  | Efficiency           | Average elapsed time between opening and closing a trouble ticket | 1.5 hours | 1.4 hours | .875 hours as of March 31, 2008 |
| 2008                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Technology                   | Reliability and Availability  | Availability         | Maintain Percent Availability of IFMS during core working hours   | 99 %      | 99 %      | 100 % As of March 31, 2008      |
| 2009                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Customer Results             | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time        | Maintain Percent of non-credit card invoices paid on time         | 99 %      | 99 %      | Available 12/2009               |

| Performance Information Table |                             |                              |                               |                      |   |           |           |                   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-------------------|
| Fiscal Year                   | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area             | Measurement Category          | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator   | Baseline  | Target    | Actual Results    |
| 2009                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Mission and Business Results | Financial Management          | Payments             | Maintain Percent of vendor payments that are made electronically  | 97 %      | 97 %      | Available 12/2009 |
| 2009                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Processes and Activities     | Productivity                  | Efficiency           | Average elapsed time between opening and closing a trouble ticket | 1.4 hours | 1.3 hours | Available 12/2009 |
| 2009                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Technology                   | Reliability and Availability  | Availability         | Maintain Percent Availability of IFMS during core working hours   | 99 %      | 99 %      | Available 12/2009 |
| 2010                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Customer Results             | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time        | Maintain Percent of non-credit card invoices paid on time         | 99 %      | 99 %      | Available 12/2010 |
| 2010                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Mission and Business Results | Financial Management          | Payments             | Maintain Percent of vendor payments that are made electronically  | 97%       | 97 %      | Available 12/2010 |
| 2010                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Processes and Activities     | Productivity                  | Efficiency           | Average elapsed time between opening and closing a trouble ticket | 1.3 hours | 1.2 hours | Available 12/2010 |
| 2010                          | Cross-Goal Strategies       | Technology                   | Reliability and Availability  | Availability         | Maintain Percent of IFMS Availability during core working hours   | 99 %      | 99 %      | Available 12/2010 |

**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 Yes and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?:

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the 7 budget year:

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

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Legacy Financial Systems (LFS) (Revision 12)

| 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 |
| BAS                                      | Contractor and Government              | Moderate  | yes  | 7/31/2008           | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53   | 9/20/2007                                | 6/26/2008                        |
| CPS                                      | Government Only                        | Moderate  | yes  | 6/17/2008           | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53   | 9/26/2007                                | 1/31/2008                        |
| GPAS                                     | Government Only                        | Moderate  | yes  | 6/17/2008           | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53   | 9/19/2007                                | 8/7/2008                         |
| IDOTS                                    | Government Only                        | Moderate  | yes  | 6/17/2008           | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53   | 9/19/2007                                | 8/7/2008                         |
| IFMS                                     | Contractor and Government              | Moderate  | yes  | 3/10/2008           | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53   | 9/25/2007                                | 1/29/2008                        |
| SCORPIOS                                 | Contractor and Government              | Moderate  | yes  | 2/27/2008           | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53   | 7/23/2008                                | 9/26/2007                        |

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? Yes

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

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

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

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

| 8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table: |                                 |   |   |  |   |
|--|---------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| (a) Name of System                                 | (b) Is this a new system? (Y/N) | (c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N) | (d) Internet Link or Explanation  | (e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N) | (f) Internet Link or Explanation  |
| BAS  | No                              | Yes   | This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.               | No   | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.  |
| CPS  | No                              | Yes   | <a href="http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/cps.htm">http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/cps.htm</a>           | Yes  | <a href="http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-29.htm">http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-29.htm</a> |
| GPAS   | No                              | Yes   | This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.               | No   | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records   |
| IDOTS  | No                              | Yes   | This system does not collect PII from the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.               | No   | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records   |
| IFMS   | No                              | Yes   | <a href="http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/ifms.htm">http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/ifms.htm</a>         | Yes  | <a href="http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-29.htm">http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-29.htm</a> |
| SCORPIOS   | No                              | Yes   | <a href="http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/scorpios.htm">http://www.epa.gov/privacy/assess/scorpios.htm</a> | Yes  | <a href="http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-39.htm">http://www.epa.gov/privacy/notice/epa-39.htm</a> |

**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? 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?

These investments were not included in the 2008 EA Transition Strategy because they did not meet the criteria set forth by the Chief Architect for inclusion. To be included, an investment needed to have some money going towards 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 <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) |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the communication between newer generation hardware/software applications and the previous, major generation of hardware/software application. | Back Office Services   | Development and Integration | Legacy Integration        |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support a defined, specific set of finance-related tasks for a given objective.  | Back Office Services   | Financial Management        | Activity-Based Management |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the examination and verification of records for accuracy.  | Back Office Services   | Financial Management        | Auditing                  |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the charging, collection and reporting of an organization's accounts.  | Back Office Services   | Financial Management        | Billing and Accounting    |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of credit cards or electronic funds  | Back Office Services   | Financial Management        | Credit / Charge           |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Legacy Financial Systems (LFS) (Revision 12)

**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) |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                       | transfers for payment and collection of products or services.   |                        |                      |                       |                                   |                                  |                                 |                           |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the calculations and difference between multiple mediums of exchange.                    | Back Office Services   | Financial Management | Currency Translation  |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 1                         |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the process of accounts receivable.  | Back Office Services   | Financial Management | Debt Collection       |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the management and reimbursement of costs paid by employees or an organization.          | Back Office Services   | Financial Management | Expense Management    |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the process of accounts payable.   | Back Office Services   | Financial Management | Payment / Settlement  |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |
| LFS                   | Defines the set of capabilities that support the allocation and re-investment of earned net credit or capital within an organization. | Back Office Services   | Financial Management | Revenue Management    |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 11                        |

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) |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Activity-Based Management | Component Framework  | Business Logic           | Platform Independent Technologies |   |
| Credit / Charge           | Component Framework  | Data Interchange         | Data Exchange                     |   |
| Payment / Settlement      | Component Framework  | Data Interchange         | Data Exchange                     |   |
| Currency Translation      | Component Framework  | Data Interchange         | Data Exchange                     |   |
| Debt Collection           | Component Framework  | Data Interchange         | Data Exchange                     |   |
| Expense Management        | Component Framework  | Data Interchange         | Data Exchange                     |   |
| Auditing                  | Component Framework  | Data Management          | Reporting and Analysis            |   |
| Revenue Management        | Component Framework  | Data Management          | Reporting and Analysis            |   |
| Billing and Accounting    | Component Framework  | Data Management          | Reporting and Analysis            |   |

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Legacy Financial Systems (LFS) (Revision 12)

| <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)<br/>(i.e., vendor and product name)</b> |
| Legacy Integration   | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers                | Application Servers             |  |
| Legacy Integration   | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers                | Application Servers             |  |
| Legacy Integration   | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers                | Application Servers             |  |
| Legacy Integration   | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers                | Application Servers             |  |

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.

The LFS Exhibit 300 submission and the FinRS Exhibit 300 submission are inter-related and complementary documents. The legacy financial systems must be maintained to sustain operations until the components of FinRS are fully implemented. FinRS, in turn, leverages many components and applications across the Government. Together, these two already leverage the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) for payroll. This transition occurred in FY 2006 and will remain in place throughout the lifecycle of the investment. In addition, EPA financial systems leverage eTravel for travel services, and are aligned with the Grants.gov, Integrated Acquisition Environment, e-Security and e-Authorization initiatives.

Furthermore, FinRS is replacing the Agency's core financial system in alignment with the objectives and guidance of OMB's Financial Management Line of Business (FM LoB). Because the FM LoB is a government-wide initiative for financial management improvement, and EPA will ensure that it implements a financial management system solution consistent with the FM LoB vision: to establish the framework for a government-wide financial management solution that is efficient and improves business performance while ensuring integrity in accountability, financial controls, and mission effectiveness. In this way, the goals identified for the FM LoB provide the underpinnings for EPA's FinRS plan:

- Achieve or enhance process improvements and cost savings in the acquisition, development, implementation, and operation of financial management systems through shared services, joint procurements, consolidation, and other means
- Provide for standardization of business processes and data elements
- Promote seamless data exchange between and among federal agencies
- Strengthen internal controls through real-time interoperability of core financial and subsidiary systems.

**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? 8/2/2006
  - 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. 10/26/2005
  - b. If "yes," what were the results?

In compliance with EPA internal guidance and the OMB Capital Programming Guide, EPA conducted an operational analysis on the LFS components to determine whether the initiatives were meeting program objectives and the needs of the owners and users, as well as performing within baseline cost, schedule and performance goals. The analysis identified the following pervasive themes for EPA's business functions and their supporting OCFO systems: Inconsistent Data, Limited System Interoperability, Information Latency, Multiple Reporting Systems, High System Availability, Low System Usability, Proliferation of Cuff Systems, and Costly Maintenance. As part of this analysis, EPA conducted a strategic assessment of EPA's financial systems in FY 2002 to assess the current architecture and identify the target architecture most appropriate for EPA. The purpose of the target architecture was to provide an understanding of the optimal state of the financial IT architecture the EPA would like to achieve to support the Agency's financial management requirements and mission. Since completing the strategic assessment of its financial systems, EPA has regularly conducted operational analyses to ensure its strategies for replacing the legacy financial systems are in line with future plans for modernizing its target financial systems. For example, EPA conducted stakeholder interviews in February 2005 and a series of focus groups with system users from March to May 2005 to identify requirements for core financial system and planning component. The interviews and focus groups included representatives from across EPA, including Regions and Program Offices. Information was gathered about functional weaknesses in the current financial systems and ways in which financial management processes could be improved. These interviews focused on whether business needs and customer expectations were currently being met and how the delivery of services could be improved with the proposed replacement financial systems (as detailed in the FinRS Exhibit 300).

- 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

Exhibit 300: BY2010 Legacy Financial Systems (LFS) (Revision 12)

| 2.b 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   | IFMS: System costs prior to FY 2008                                    | 9/30/2007                    | \$95.553000     | 9/30/2007                    | \$95.553000     | 0                 | \$0.000000 |
| 2   | IFMS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance    | 9/30/2008                    | \$5.526000      |                              | \$4.848000      |                   | \$0.678000 |
| 3   | IFMS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance    | 10/30/2009                   | \$4.956000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 4   | IFMS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance    | 10/30/2010                   | \$5.072000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 5   |  |                              |                 |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 6   | EPAYS: System costs prior to FY 2008                                   | 9/30/2007                    | \$37.740000     | 9/30/2007                    | \$37.740000     | 0                 | \$0.000000 |
| 7   | EPAYS: Decommissioned system; costs are for storage of historical data | 9/30/2008                    | \$0.107000      |                              | \$0.047000      |                   | \$0.060000 |
| 8   | EPAYS: Decommissioned system; costs are for storage of historical data | 9/30/2009                    | \$0.107000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 9   | EPAYS: Decommissioned system; costs are for storage of historical data | 9/30/2010                    | \$0.109000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 10  | BAS: System costs prior to FY 2008                                     | 9/30/2007                    | \$14.780000     | 9/30/2007                    | \$14.780000     | 0                 | \$0.000000 |
| 11  | BAS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance     | 9/30/2008                    | \$1.691000      |                              | \$0.800000      |                   | \$0.891000 |
| 12  | BAS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance     | 9/30/2009                    | \$1.850000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 13  | BAS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance     | 9/30/2010                    | \$1.891000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 14  |  |                              |                 |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 15  | CPS: System costs prior to FY 2008                                     | 9/30/2007                    | \$1.201000      | 9/30/2007                    | \$1.201000      | 0                 | \$0.000000 |

| 2.b 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)  |
| 16  | CPS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance                         | 9/30/2008                    | \$0.557000      |                              | \$0.448000      |                   | \$0.109000 |
| 17  | CPS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance                         | 9/30/2009                    | \$0.446000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 18  | CPS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance                         | 9/30/2010                    | \$0.460000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 19  |  |                              |                 |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 20  | SCORPIOS: System costs prior to FY 2008  | 9/30/2007                    | \$16.340000     | 9/30/2007                    | \$16.340000     | 0                 | \$0.000000 |
| 21  | SCORPIOS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance                    | 9/30/2008                    | \$1.284000      |                              | \$1.043000      |                   | \$0.241000 |
| 22  | SCORPIOS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance                    | 9/30/2009                    | \$1.318000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 23  | SCORPIOS: Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance                    | 9/30/2010                    | \$1.346000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 24  |  |                              |                 |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 25  |  |                              |                 |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 26  |  |                              |                 |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 27  | Small Systems (IDOTS, GPAS): Systems cost prior to FY 2008                                 | 9/30/2007                    | \$7.497000      | 9/30/2007                    | \$7.497000      | 0                 | \$0.000000 |
| 28  | Small Systems (IDOTS, GPAS): Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance | 9/30/2008                    | \$0.624000      |                              | \$0.479000      |                   | \$0.145000 |
| 29  | Small Systems (IDOTS, GPAS): Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance | 9/30/2009                    | \$0.622000      |                              |                 |                   |            |
| 30  | Small Systems (IDOTS, GPAS): Security and adaptive, corrective, and functional maintenance | 9/30/2010                    | \$0.647000      |                              |                 |                   |            |

| 2.b 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) |
| 31  |                          |                              |                 |                              |                 |                   |           |
| <b>Project Totals</b>                               |                          |                              |                 |                              |                 |                   |           |