

**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:

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 FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&amp;M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&amp;M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Full Acquisition

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2003

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, and the lower 48 states (CONUS) in FY 2007. Following nationwide ozone deployment (FY 2010), initial deployment for PM forecasts over NE US is targeted by the end of FY 2015. 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

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

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned? 12/16/2002

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? 5/29/2009

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? Yes

(including computers)?

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](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 3

17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), 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 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a 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 FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware 44

Software 0

Services 56

Other 0

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Yes

Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?

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 (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 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010					
Planning:	12.472	3.74	3.6	3.6					
Acquisition:	5.615	2.71	2.85	2.85					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	18.087	6.45	6.45	6.45					
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	0	0					
TOTAL:	18.087	6.45	6.45	6.45					
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	0	0	0	0					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	0	0	0	0					

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

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

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

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

**Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)**

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

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)
IBM DG133W02C N0013	Firm-fixed Price, Performance Based	Yes	8/1/2005	8/1/2005	9/30/2011	191.595	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes		morie.gunter-henderson@noaa.gov	Level 3	Yes
EA133R-05-NC-3160	Blanket Purchase Agreement/LOE	Yes	9/30/2005	3/1/2008	8/31/2009	0.85	No	Yes	No	NA	No	Yes		Marion.Weber@noaa.gov	Level 3	Yes
DG133W03C Q	Firm Fixed Price; Performance Based	Yes	10/1/2007	10/1/2007	3/31/2009	0.65	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	No		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 (WCROSS) 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 WCROSS Exhibit 300, "The WCROSS 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 not or how this is being done? 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 reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? No

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

1. Is it Current?

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

There are no active procurements for the NAQFC. If procurements are needed in the future, an acquisition plan reflecting FAR Subpart 7.1 will be developed.

**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
2006	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth&apos;s environment to meet America&apos;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%



Exhibit 300: NOAA/NWS/ National Air Quality Forecast Capability (Revision 20)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	; amp; amp; amp; amp; apos; s environment to meet America& amp; a mp; amp; amp; a mp; apos; s economic, social, and environmental needs.							
2007	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth& amp; amp; amp; amp; apos; s environment to meet America& amp; a mp; amp; amp; a mp; apos; 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	95% on-time delivery of CONUS operational products
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	Demonstrate ozone forecast capability for outside the CONUS	Only CONUS	Develop prototype for Alaska and Hawaii	Ozone prototype capabilities (prediction models) developed
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%	95% hit accuracy for CONUS-- ozone
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	All CONUS ozone products archived
2009	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth& amp; amp; amp; amp; apos; s environment to meet America& amp; a mp; amp; amp; a mp; apos; s economic, social, and	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	% on-time delivery of smoke forecast products	No capability	95%	

Exhibit 300: NOAA/NWS/ National Air Quality Forecast Capability (Revision 20)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	environmental needs.							
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	
2010	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 for Nationwide smoke products	No capability	95%	
2010	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	Ozone forecast capability	Prototype ozone capability for CONUS demonstrated	Nationwide	
2010	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 ozone test products Nationwide (demonstrated by experimental testing)	No capability	90%	
2010	3.1 Advance understanding	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Expanded archive of ozone	No capability	Nationwide	



<b>4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:</b> Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
WW-AQL-AFS: 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%.

<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.				
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., USA.gov, 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?      8/27/2008
  - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
  - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

Only alternative 1 can provide an operational capability to provide national Air Quality forecast information. Alternative 2 is not viable because these capabilities are tuned to the national environments of foreign countries and subject to different standards, laws, regional population centers. The capabilities are driven by weather models tailored to their areas, with chemical transport models for air pollution problems over their specific cities or regions. The closest model, running in Canada, is optimized for pollution over Canada and linked to the Canadian National Weather Forecast model. There is no return on investment to leverage other countries' data, processes and models due to the processing and infrastructure required to make operational over limited areas of overlap and there is no free expansion nationally. Alternative 3, obtaining the necessary computer capacity at NCEP for implementing the AQ forecast system by displacing current operational functions, has been analyzed (NCEP, initially April 2003, and confirmed in successive years). In order to obtain sufficient capacity for running the AQ forecast system, NCEP would have to curtail operations in either (or both) the Global Forecast System (GFS) and the WRF mesoscale weather prediction model. However, both these systems are required to drive the AQ forecasting system: The GFS establishes boundary conditions for the WRF, which in turn drives the AQ forecasting system. Under this alternative, there would be no AQ forecasts and no return on investment. Neither alternative is useful in terms of leveraging technology to assist in the national AQ forecast system.

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

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

The impact of poor air quality on the national economy is estimated at \$150 Billion/year, from health effects alone [American Lung Association, 1990]. Accurate air quality forecast guidance, provided in time to take action, can realize significant savings. Due to the magnitude of this impact, even a 0.5% change due to air quality forecasting would have a significant effect, saving about \$750M a year nationally. The below calculation assumes a regional implementation reaching nationwide operations in FY09. Although good quantitative data on the impacts of air quality forecasting on changing behavior and in turn mitigating health and other impacts does not exist, the assumption used for the below NPV benefits uses the 0.5% to demonstrate the possible benefits of air quality forecasting until better data is available. Using a more conservative assumption of positive impacts as low as 0.006% of the \$150B figure, sensitivity analyses show that net positive impacts would start to accrue in FY06 with the entire project breaking even in the relevant period through FY08 and continue to net positive benefits indefinitely into the future.

<b>5. Federal Quantitative Benefits</b>				
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2007 & Prior	0	1181.101		See above justification
PY 2008	0	551.883		See above justification
CY 2009	0	520.791		See above justification
BY 2010	0	507.501		See above justification
BY + 1 2011	0	493.023		See above justification
BY + 2 2012	0	803.272		See above justification
BY + 3 2013	0	529.145		See above justification
BY + 4 2014 & Beyond	0	2039.53		See above justification
Total LCC Benefit	0	6626.246	LCC = Life-cycle Cost	

- 6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part      No or in-whole?
  - a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this

investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment?

b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

5b. List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement

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

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

- 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
  - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 7/21/2008
  - 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?

Exhibit 300: NOAA/NWS/ National Air Quality Forecast Capability (Revision 20)

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	Implement Ozone Forecast Guidance Nationwide (DME)	9/30/2010	\$22.138000	9/30/2010	9/18/2007	\$19.320000	\$16.525600	1108	-\$9.357880	37.1%
1.1	Develop ozone forecast capability for the NE US	9/30/2004	\$6.250000	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$6.250000	\$6.250000	0	\$0.000000	100%
1.2	Implement ozone forecast capability CONUS-wide	9/30/2007	\$2.414000	9/30/2007	9/18/2007	\$2.414000	\$2.172600	12	-\$1.255280	38%
1.3	Develop ozone forecast capability Nationwide	9/30/2010	\$13.474000	9/30/2010		\$10.656000	\$8.103000		-\$8.103000	0%
2	Implement Particulate Matter (PM) Forecast Guidance Nationwide (DME)	9/30/2015								
2.1	Implement smoke forecast capability CONUS-wide	9/30/2007	\$0.362500	9/30/2007	3/1/2007	\$0.362500	\$0.325000	213	-\$0.325000	0%
2.2	Develop smoke forecast capability for OCONUS	6/30/2008	\$0.200000	6/30/2008	6/30/2008	\$0.200000	\$0.200000	0	-\$0.200000	0%
2.3	Implement smoke forecasts for OCONUS	6/30/2009	\$0.220000	6/30/2009		\$0.220000	\$0.095000		-\$0.095000	0%
3	Product Preparation, Generation, and Delivery (DME)	9/30/2015								
3.1	Ozone Products	9/30/2010	\$26.623800	9/30/2010		\$26.623800	\$5.814400		-\$5.814400	0%
3.2	Smoke Products	6/30/2009	\$4.437300	6/30/2009		\$4.437300	\$1.190000		-\$1.190000	0%