# 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 (Nws) |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | NOAA/NWS/ National Air Quality Forecast Capability |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | 006-48-01-12-01-3112-00 |
| 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.) | Full Acquisition |

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:

Poor air quality (AQ) leads to significant loss of life and property. Estimated US annual impacts are: 40,000 deaths from airborne particulate matter (PM) [Science, 2002 and 2004], up to 10,000 additional deaths from ground-level ozone [JAMA, 292:10, 2372], and up to $150 B spent treating air pollution-related illness. These losses can be mitigated with accurate, timely AQ forecasts (AQF) so that people can take action to limit harmful effects of predicted poor AQ. Progress in understanding AQ over several decades, including NOAA research efforts to evaluate AQ models for Northeastern (NE) US in 2002 and 2004, is the basis for AQF in other countries, e.g. Canada and UK. The US government does not forecast AQ; instead it is building the capability to provide comprehensive AQF guidance. Interpretive AQ forecasting is done by a number of states and local communities, with growing reliance on NOAA's AQF guidance. For other communities NOAA's guidance provides information on onset, severity, duration and location of predicted poor AQ otherwise unavailable. Prior to availability of NOAA's AQF guidance, most state and local AQF were based on simple statistical approaches to estimate next-day peak ozone at a chosen site. Such approximations fail when conditions deviate markedly from past AQ, or for forecasts longer than a day. Because of lack of available operational AQ prediction guidance, AQ managers requested NOAA provide consistent, reliable forecast guidance. Congress also directed NOAA to provide AQF operationally, in appropriations to NWS beginning in FY 2003. NOAA/NWS is meeting this direction by establishing an operational, national AQ forecast capability (NAQFC), in partnership with the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The NAQFC began over NE US (built and deployed by end of FY 2004).

Operational capabilities for next-day ozone forecasts (hourly intervals) at 12km resolution over cities, suburbs and rural areas alike, were expanded to cover Eastern US in FY 2005. Following nationwide ozone deployment (FY 2010), initial deployment for PM forecasts over NE US is targeted by the end of FY 2014. NAQFC is an integrated system based on NCEP's weather prediction models linked operationally to AQ modules: pollutant emissions inventories, simulations of photochemical processes and reactive chemical transport. Forecast products are available on operational NWS and EPA dataservers.

| | |
|---|---|
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 4/30/2007 |
| 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?) | The NAQFC project supports the PMA E-Government area by disseminating air quality information and products through the National Weather Service Telecommunication Gateway and the new National Digital Guidance Database to the public and to its partner agency, the EPA. The EPA also makes the predictions available to additional sources via a variety of electronic media formats including the internet, television, and radio to public and commercial sectors of the U.S. population. |
| 14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.) | No |
| a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? | |
| b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? | |
| c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? | |
| 15. Is this investment for information technology? | Yes |

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

For information technology investments only:

| | |
|---|---|
| 16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) | Level 3 |
| 17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) | (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment |
| 18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) | No |
| 19. Is this a financial management system? | No |
| a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? | |
| 1. If "yes," which compliance area: | |
| 2. If "no," what does it address? | |

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Hardware | 38 |
| Software | 0 |
| Services | 62 |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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.

| | PY-1 and earlier | PY 2007 | CY 2008 | BY 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planning: | 9.962 | 2.616 | 4.755 | 4.775 |
| Acquisition: | 4.115 | 1.5 | 3 | 2.97 |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition: | 14.077 | 4.116 | 7.755 | 7.745 |
| Operations & Maintenance: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL: | 14.077 | 4.116 | 7.755 | 7.745 |
| Government FTE Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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:

FTE salary has never been considered part of the NAQFC and, therefore, is not included as part of the NAQFC funding/spending tables.

## *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.

**Contracts/Task Orders Table:** * Costs in millions

| Contract or Task Order Number | Type of Contract/ Task Order | Has the contract been awarded (Y/N) | If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date? | Start date of Contract/ Task Order | End date of Contract/ Task Order | Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M) | Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N) | Is it performance based? (Y/N) | Competitively awarded? (Y/N) | What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A) | Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N) | Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N) | Name of CO | CO Contact information (phone/email) | Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A) | If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IBM DG133W02CN0013 | Firm-fixed Price, Performance Based | Yes | 8/1/2005 | 8/1/2005 | 9/30/2011 | 301.9 | No | No | Yes | NA | No | Yes | Gunter-Henderson, Morie | morie.gunter-henderson@noaa.gov | Level 2 | Yes |
| EA133R-05-NC-3160 | Blanket Purchase Agreement/LOE | Yes | 9/30/2005 | 3/1/2008 | 2/28/2009 | 0.85 | No | Yes | No | NA | No | Yes | Weber, Marion | Marion.Weber@noaa.gov | Level 3 | Yes |
| DG133W03CQ | Firm Fixed Price; Performance Based | Yes | 10/1/2007 | 10/1/2007 | 9/30/2008 | 0.65 | No | Yes | Yes | NA | No | No | Middleton, Anita | anita.middleton@noaa.gov | Level 3 | 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:

NCEP's Weather and Climate Operational Supercomputer Systems (WCOSS) contract with IBM does not include EVMS language; it is an operational system. The portion of the system used by the NAQFC is solely for development and testing on the NCEP supercomputer. The NAQFC development work on this investment is done on-site at NOAA, and progress on the development work with supercomputing is part of the basis for NAQFC's Earned Value analyses. Per the WCOSS Exhibit 300, "The WCOSS contract is an operating lease within this steady state investment. As such, EVM is not required for the contract."

The NAQFC uses EVMS as a project management tool to integrate IT activities scope and work accomplished with schedule and cost elements for optimum investment planning and control. NAQFC's EVMS follow the American National Standards Institute/Electronic Industries Alliance (ANSI/EIA) Standard 748:
1) Budgeting, scheduling and work authorization and performance is closely monitored, assessed and evaluated through weekly status updates.
2) Project goals and milestones have been established in the work breakdown structure and are the basis for measuring progress, and tracking cost/schedule/performance for Earned Value.

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 Assessibility 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? | 3/10/2004 |
| b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? | |
| 1. If "no," briefly explain why: | |

## *Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)*

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures (indicators) must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

**Performance Information Table**

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 Coverage | New Customers and Market Penetration | | 95% on-time delivery of NE US ozone products | Demonstrate 95% on-time delivery of ozone products over new area: Eastern US (EUS) | Ozone product on-time delivery: 96% |
| 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 | | Operational ozone for EUS | Develop smoke forecast capability | Experimental testing of an interim smoke capability began March 1, 2006 |

**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. | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | | New capability/no existing baseline | Demonstrate 90% hit accuracy for predictions for new area: EUS | Accuracy for EUS (May-Sept 2006): 98% |
| 2006 | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Technology | Information and Data | Data Reliability and Quality | | New capability/no existing baseline | Demonstrate ozone products archived for new area: EUS | Operational EUS ozone products successfully archived |
| 2007 | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Delivery Time | % on-time delivery rate for operational products over CONUS | No capability | 95% | 96% for EUS (through Sept 2007) |
| 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 | Implement smoke forecast capability over CONUS | No capability | Demonstrate by 4th quarter CONUS smoke forecast capability | Implemented March 2007 |
| 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 | Quality | Errors | % accuracy for ozone predictions for CONUS | No capability | 90% “hit accuracy” | 98% through Sept 2007 (for EUS) |
| 2007 | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Technology | Information and Data | Data Reliability and Quality | Archive ozone data at NCDC | No capability | CONUS | Archiving in place for CONUS |
| 2008 | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Delivery Time | % on-time | No capability | 95% of CONUS operational products | |
| 2008 | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, | Mission and Business Results | Environmental Management | Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting | Demonstrate ozone forecast capability for outside the CONUS | Only CONUS | Develop prototype for Alaska and Hawaii | |

| 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. | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | % hit accuracy for operational products over CONUS | Demonstration of 90% hit accuracy over CONUS | 90% | |
| 2008 | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Technology | Information and Data | Data Reliability and Quality | Archive CONUS ozone data | CONUS | Maintain archiving of CONUS ozone products | |
| 2009 | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Delivery Time | % on-time delivery of smoke forecast products | No capability | 95% | |
| 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 | New prototype ozone delivery | Prototype ozone capability | Alaska and Hawaii | |
| 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 | Quality | Errors | Verification baseline for smoke forecast tool | No capability | Smoke forecast tool verification baseline | |
| 2009 | 3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs. | Technology | Information and Data | Data Reliability and Quality | Archive smoke data at NCDC | No capability | Smoke archive over CONUS | |

## *Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)*

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and

Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: Yes

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 5

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

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? No

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

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

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

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WCOSS | No | No | No because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information. | 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 W&W- AQF

the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

b. If "no," please explain why?

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

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

**4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:**
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | FEA SRM Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component (a) | Service Component Reused Name (b) | Service Component Reused UPI (b) | Internal or External Reuse? (c) | BY Funding Percentage (d) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WW-AQL: Develop, Test, Operate Air Quality Forecast System | Develop, test, and implement the components for the operational AQ forecast capability. FEA SRM Modeling and Product Components: (1) Ozone forecast guidance capability; (2) PM forecast guidance capability | Business Analytical Services | Knowledge Discovery | Modeling | Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | 006-48-01-12-01-3112-00 | Internal | 100 |

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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Modeling | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | IBM Power4; FEA SRM Modeling and Product Components: (1) Ozone forecast guidance capability; (2) PM forecast guidance capability |

a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? Yes

a. If "yes," please describe.

The NAQFC system leverages the NOAA CCS capability and infrastructure.

# Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

## Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? | 7/16/2007 |
| b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? | |
| c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: | |
| 5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? | |
| a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment. | |
| b. If "yes," please provide the following information: | |

## 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? | 7/2/2007 |
| b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? | No |

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?

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

b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

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

Risks are assessed on a regular basis, particularly with respect to budget and schedule, resulting in revisions to existing year and planned milestones.

## 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 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |