

**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: 1/7/2008
- 2. Agency: Department of Commerce
- 3. Bureau: NOAA (NESDIS)
- 4. Name of this Capital Asset: NOAA/NESDIS/ Environmental Satellite Processing Center (ESPC)
- 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 006-48-01-16-01-3213-00
- 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Mixed Life Cycle
- 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? 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:

Environmental Satellite Processing Center (ESPC) will combine two existing National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service (NESDIS) operations: Central Environmental Satellite Computer System (CEMSCS) and Satellite Environmental Processing Systems (SATEPS). The combined system(s) ingest environmental data from NOAA's polar and geostationary spacecraft and produce environmental products and imagery, thus directly supporting the NESDIS Mission: "To deliver accurate, timely and reliable satellite observations and integrated products and to provide long term stewardship for global environmental data in support of the NOAA mission."

CEMSCS ingests, processes, distributes, and archives short term environmental data and information received from all of NOAA's satellites, several foreign countries' satellites and Department of Defense's satellites. The primary product applications residing in SATEPS computers are real-time remapping, interactive products, and automated products. Remapping is the process of mapping imagery data into conventional map projections required by National Weather Service (NWS) field office meteorologists to generate timely and accurate weather forecasts and warnings. The real-time remapping system generates infrared, water vapor, and visible sectors, converting the perspective from the satellite to a standard map, (e.g. Mercator) in the process.

ESPC will maximize the benefits of the common IT environment by combining processes, eliminating redundancies, and lowering refresh costs. Consolidation of systems and staff at NOAA Satellite Operations Facility (NSOF) will allow ESPC to reduce operator/admin and telecommunication expenses. The ESPC will utilize current CEMSCS management schema, which has been subjected to NOAA Information Technology Review Board (NITRB) and the Department of Commerce (CITRB) reviews. This requires the ESPC project to be managed / reviewed by a project management team which meets weekly for a staff meeting and monthly for a complete progress review of all tasks. Senior management will review major decisions monthly. Review by both the NITRB and the CITRB will be conducted as required.

NOAA has identified a performance gap in the computational resources available to support climate change and other environmental research, ESPC partially fills this gap by supporting NOAA's ability to transition space weather models, products, and data into operations.

- 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
  - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 7/31/2007
- 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
- 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: Expanded E-Government

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)  
 ESPC data and products are disseminated and archived electronically thru other NESDIS vehicles such as Comprehensive Large Array Data Stewardship System (CLASS), Satellite Active Archive (SAA), and the NOAA's National Data Centers (NNDC). ESPC is the managing partner for this dissemination.

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.)) Yes

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

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? Weather and Related Programs

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

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

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

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 3

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

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

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFIA compliance area? No

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

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

b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52

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

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| Hardware | 20 |
| Software | 5  |
| Services | 35 |
| Other    | 40 |

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

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.

| <b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES<br/>(REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>                    |                  |         |         |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|------------------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions) |                  |         |         |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PY-1 and earlier | PY 2007 | CY 2008 | BY 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planning:  | 0                | 0       | 0       | 0       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acquisition:   | 5.753            | 2.043   | 3.617   | 1.352   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:   | 5.753            | 2.043   | 3.617   | 1.352   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operations & Maintenance:  | 44.28            | 8.655   | 14.154  | 16.188  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL:   | 50.033           | 10.698  | 17.771  | 17.540  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>                    |                  |         |         |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government FTE Costs   | 49.011           | 8.613   | 8.861   | 9.117   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs:  | 172              | 86      | 83      | 83      |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: For the multi-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

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

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

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

**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: NOAA/NESDIS/ Environmental Satellite Processing Center (ESPC) (Revision 16)

| Contracts/Task Orders Table:                     |                                   |                                     |  |                                    |                                  |                                     |  |                                |                              |  |                               |  |            |                                | * Costs in millions                                       |   |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Contract or Task Order Number                    | Type of Contract/ Task Order      | Has the contract been awarded (Y/N) | If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date? | Start date of Contract/ Task Order | End date of Contract/ Task Order | Total Value of Contract/ Task Order | 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 (email) | Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A) | If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N) |
| Contract CM130105C T0044/ TO CM130105C T0081 QSS | Hybrid Fixed Price, Cost and CPFF | Yes                                 | 9/30/2005  | 9/30/2005                          | 9/30/2011                        | 175                                 | No   | Yes                            | Yes                          | NA   | Yes                           | Yes  |            | julia.whitmore-sevin@gsa.gov   |   |   |

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:

Based on current ESPC and contractor capabilities, the EVM numbers reported to date for FY08 are correct. The ESPC Project Management team is committed to remedying the Earned Value issues identified by OMB. To that end, an ESPC Earned Value Remediation Plan is being prepared and will be provided to the OCIO. The DOC CIO is in the process of disseminating further EVM guidance to the Department's Project Managers, the EVM solution proposed in the remediation plan will be developed in accordance with OMB, FAR and DOC policies.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why:

The Department of Commerce and NOAA Contracting Offices require the inclusion of Section 508 compliance language in the statement of work for all IT development service contracts. In order to procure all COTS equipment and software, requestors are required to include with their purchase order or file the Government purchase card invoices as well as the vendors statement of compliance (Voluntary Product Assessability Template VPAT)).

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

a. If "yes," what is the date? 7/1/2005

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 FY 2009.

| Performance Information Table |   |                              |                              |  |   |          |        |                |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|----------|--------|----------------|
| Fiscal Year                   | Strategic Goal(s) Supported   | Measurement Area             | Measurement Category         | Measurement Grouping                     | Measurement Indicator   | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| 2006                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Customer Results             | Service Quality              | Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered | Customer Requirements Reviewed per Year   | 1        | 1      | 2              |
| 2006                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Mission and Business Results | Environmental Management     | Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting | Customer Requirements Reviewed per Year   | 6        | 6      | 15             |
| 2006                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Processes and Activities     | Cycle Time and Resource Time | Cycle Time                               | % of data processed and delivered within X (based on a daily volume received of 43 GB). | 98%      | 98%    | 99.5%          |

Exhibit 300: NOAA/NESDIS/ Environmental Satellite Processing Center (ESPC) (Revision 16)

| Performance Information Table |   |                              |                              |  |  |          |        |                |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|----------|--------|----------------|
| Fiscal Year                   | Strategic Goal(s) Supported   | Measurement Area             | Measurement Category         | Measurement Grouping                             | Measurement Indicator  | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| 2006                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Technology                   | Effectiveness                | IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission | Percent of non-NOAA Satellite data processed and distributed within 180 minutes.                           | 85%      | 85%    | 85%            |
| 2007                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Customer Results             | Service Quality              | Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered         | Customer Requirements Reviewed per Year  | 1        | 1      | 1              |
| 2007                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Mission and Business Results | Environmental Management     | Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting         | Products Transitioned Per Year   | 6        | 6      | 7              |
| 2007                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Processes and Activities     | Cycle Time and Resource Time | Cycle Time                                       | % of data processed and delivered within X (based on a daily volume received of 43 GB).                    | 98%      | 98%    | 98%            |
| 2007                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Technology                   | Effectiveness                | IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission | Percent of non-NOAA Satellite data processed and distributed within 180 minutes.                           | 85%      | 85%    | 90%            |
| 2008                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Customer Results             | Service Quality              | Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered         | Customer Requirements Reviewed per Year  | 1        | 1      | TBD            |
| 2008                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Mission and Business Results | Environmental Management     | Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting         | Products Transitioned per Year   | 6        | 6      | TBD            |
| 2008                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Processes and Activities     | Cycle Time and Resource Time | Cycle Time                                       | % of data processed and delivered within timeliness threshold (based on a daily volume received of 43 GB). | 98%      | 98%    | TBD            |

| Performance Information Table |   |                              |                              |  |  |          |        |                |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|----------|--------|----------------|
| Fiscal Year                   | Strategic Goal(s) Supported   | Measurement Area             | Measurement Category         | Measurement Grouping                             | Measurement Indicator  | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|                               | and environmental needs.  |                              |                              |  |  |          |        |                |
| 2008                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Technology                   | Effectiveness                | IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission | Percent of non-NOAA Satellite data processed and distributed within 180 minutes.                           | 85%      | 85%    | TBD            |
| 2009                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Customer Results             | Service Quality              | Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered         | Customer Requirements Reviewed per Year  | 1        | 1      | TBD            |
| 2009                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Mission and Business Results | Environmental Management     | Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting         | Products Transitioned per Year   | 6        | 6      | TBD            |
| 2009                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Processes and Activities     | Cycle Time and Resource Time | Cycle Time                                       | % of data processed and delivered within timeliness threshold (based on a daily volume received of 43 GB). | 98%      | 98%    | TBD            |
| 2009                          | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Technology                   | Effectiveness                | IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission | Percent of non-NOAA Satellite data processed and distributed within 180 minutes.                           | 85%      | 85%    | TBD            |

**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: 8

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

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

| 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                              |
| SATEPS   | No                              | No  | This system does not contain or process PII. | No   | No because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| NSOF Admin Lan                                     | No                              | No  | This system does not contain or process PII. | No   | No because the system is not Privacy Act system of records.   |
| CEMSCS / SAA                                       | No                              | No  | The system does not contain or process PII.  | No   | No because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| ESPC   | Yes                             | No  | The system does not contain or process PII.  | No   | No because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |

**Details for Text Options:**  
 Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.  
 Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.  
 Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

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

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

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Weather and Water Sequencing Plan

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? No

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

| 4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:<br>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) |
| MS-SSV Produce Products / Services   | Processing of NOAAs 1A and 1B data sets into approx. 400 products that specifically address atmospheric, oceanographic, land, and solar application requirements   | Back Office Services   | Data Management      | Extraction and Transformation | Risk Management                   | 006-48-01-12-01-3204-00          | Internal                        | 50                        |
| MS-SSV Ingest/Process Satellite Observations   | Allows data/observations to be acquired from both NOAA and non-NOAA satellite sources and processed to a level necessary to prepare the data to be further refined into the required product sets (e.g., level 1B data). | Back Office Services   | Data Management      | Loading and Archiving         |                                   |                                  | No Reuse                        | 50                        |

- 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:<br>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 |
| Extraction and Transformation   | Component Framework                 | Data Management           | Database Connectivity    |
| Knowledge Capture   | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers      |

- a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications
  - b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.
6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No
- a. If "yes," please describe.

|  |
|--|
| <b>Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information</b> |
|--|

**Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)**

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
  - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 7/19/2007
  - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
  - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

A risk analysis was conducted in FY07 to define important risks and associate mitigation plan for the biggest risks facing the ESPC investment. The risks identified and discussed include:

--C&A for ESPC in NSOF  
 --SATEPS migration from NWS network  
 --Migration into the ESPC security zones

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
  - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
  - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

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

ESPC applies a continuous risk management approach to identify, analyze and mitigate risks associated with operating and managing the program. The risk management process includes quantification of both risk event likelihood and cost/performance/schedule impact. The Software Configuration Control Board (SCCB) has been established to minimize risk to the operational environment. Risks identified by government and/or contractor are evaluated by the Board. For developmental risks and operational programmatic risks, an assessment of the priority of the risk is provided by the originator and an assessment is evaluated by the management team. For operational system risks, an assessment of the risk's priority is provided by the originator and the assessment is evaluated by the SCCB. Risk mitigation plans are developed as required and become part of the ongoing prioritization activities that supports the operational environment as well as development environment.

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

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748? Yes
2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No
  - a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
  - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
  - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? No
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '0' for any milestone no longer active.

| Milestone Number | Description of Milestone | Initial Baseline                     |                            | Current Baseline             |           |                  |           | Current Baseline Variance |            | Percent Complete |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------------|------------|------------------|
|                  |                          | Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) | Total Cost (\$M) Estimated | Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) |           | Total Cost (\$M) |           | Schedule (# days)         | Cost (\$M) |                  |
|                  |                          |                                      |                            | Planned                      | Actual    | Planned          | Actual    |                           |            |                  |
| 1                | FY01-04                  | 9/30/2004                            | \$57.914                   | 9/30/2004                    | 9/30/2004 | \$57.914         | \$57.914  | 0                         | \$0        | 100%             |
| 2                | ESPC FY05 IT             | 9/30/2005                            | \$22.4705                  | 9/30/2005                    | 9/30/2005 | \$22.4705        | \$22.4705 | 0                         | \$0        | 100%             |
| 3                | ESPC FY06 IT             | 9/30/2006                            | \$18.66                    | 9/30/2006                    | 9/30/2006 | \$18.66          | \$18.66   | 0                         | \$0        | 100%             |
| 4                | ESPC FY07 IT             | 9/30/2007                            | \$19.311                   | 9/30/2007                    | 9/30/2007 | \$19.311         | \$19.311  | 0                         | \$0        | 100%             |
| 5                | ESPC FY08 IT             | 9/30/2008                            | \$26.632                   | 9/30/2008                    |           | \$26.632         |           |                           |            | 0%               |
| 6                | ESPC FY09 IT             | 9/30/2009                            | \$26.657                   | 9/30/2009                    |           | \$26.657         |           |                           |            | 0%               |