

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: National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration

4. Name of this Capital Asset: NOAA/OCIO CS/ Financial Management IT Operations

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 006-48-01-01-01-3801-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Mixed Life Cycle

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2001 or earlier

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

This investment supports the NOAA Information Technology Center (ITC) which consolidates myriad NOAA administrative and financial systems. Consolidation of these systems at the ITC eliminates the redundancy and inefficiency resulting from having systems scattered across the agency. This investment closes performance gaps in IT Security, server administration, database administration and archiving, and network performance.

This initiative is critical to ensure the functional systems hosted at the ITC and services provided to NOAA (and DOC) are offered in the most cost-efficient environment. Below is a list of major systems managed and supported by the ITC: Interactive FIMA (IFIMA), NFA Table of Organization, (NFATO), NOAA Table of Organization (NOAATO), NOAA Payment System (NPS), Monument Budget System, WebCIMS Correspondence Control, Voluntary Leave Bank System (VLBP), International Agreements Database (IAD), Financial Analysis and Commitment Tracking System (FACTS), Telecommunications Operations (TELOPS), NOAA Staff Directory, E-Learning, FOIA, NOAA Grants System (NGS), Distribution System, HR Tracking, Cross Agency Agreements, Commerce Business System (CBS), Travel Manager, BankCard (CPCS), Discoverer Reporting, Executive Dashboard, NOVO Knowledge Base, NOAA Speech Tracking and Reporting System (NSTARS).

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/17/2004

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? 7/1/2001

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? 9/1/2009

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 (including computers)? Yes

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

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

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

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

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

If "yes," check all that apply:

Financial Performance
Budget Performance Integration
Human Capital

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 Information Technology Center (ITC) has provided central computing services for NOAA financial and administrative activities since the mid 1970's. This document addresses the continuing systems support and services provided by the ITC to meet the financial and administrative management requirements of NOAA Management.

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? No

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 1

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? Yes

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

1. If "yes," which compliance area: Systems Security

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
Financial Management System

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

Hardware	2
Software	6
Services	67
Other	25

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.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010					
Planning:	1.256	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	3.835	0.6	2.4	0.3					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	5.091	0.6	2.4	0.3					
Operations & Maintenance:	25.2688	4.188	4.252	4.415					
TOTAL:	30.3598	4.788	6.652	4.715					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	7.217	1.442	1.478	1.515					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	22	11	11	11					

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

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

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

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

The budget realities over the past two years have proven that E2E can not be procured through a single funding instrument. To accommodate multiple-year funding, the E2E project has been restructured into 5 phases. The deployment of E2E will now be achieved through a phased implementation, where functionality is added at the end of each phase. For example, the first phase deploys the programming functionality, the second phase deploys the budget formulation and execution functionality and the third phase deploys the planning functionality. The acquisition strategy has been updated to reflect the change in approach where a competitive award has been made for the entire project but only the first few phases of Programming, budget formulation/execution, and publishing of the budget have been funded and awarded.

The phased implementation strategy has the advantage of reducing project risks by testing software design concepts for a confined scope and limited number of users. It also allows NOAA to begin with the phase with the least risk, due to well established and documented business processes and data flows. However the phased approach also means that the project will have a longer development period, resulting in a greater duration overall and greater cost. The impact on the summary of spending from the adoption of the phased implementation strategy is an increase of \$2.7 million over the life of the investment.

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)
DG133004CT0030	Firm Fixed Price	Yes	5/4/2004	5/4/2004	5/3/2009	15	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes		morie.gunter-henderson@noaa.gov	Level 3	Yes
263-01-D-0091, Task Order: DG133007NC0645	NIH CIOsp2i	Yes	4/27/2007	4/26/2007	9/30/2009	0.004974	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes		morie.gunter-henderson@noaa.gov	Level 3	Yes
GS-00F-0026M Task Order: DG1330-06-NC-0612	T&M	Yes	3/24/2007	3/24/2007	3/23/2008	0.0006	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes		morie.gunter-henderson@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:

DG133004CT0030: Contract is Firm Fixed Price in support of Steady State Operations and Maintenance. 263-01-D-0091, Task Order: DG133007NC0645 is a firm fixed price contract.; EVM not applicable for Firm-Fixed Price contracts per NOAA acquisition policy.

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? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 8/14/2008

1. Is it Current? Yes

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

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. 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's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Customer satisfaction for ITC Hosting customers	70% satisfaction	10% increase in satisfaction	17% increase in customer satisfaction
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	Financial Management	Reporting and Information	Customer data storage availability.	Implementation of President's Management Agenda.	Deploy data warehouse server in response to NFR NOAA 2005-05 and NFR NOAA 2005-06.	Data warehouse server deployed in 1st quarter FY 2006.
2006	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Cycle Time	Full system backups are critical to successful recovery of systems	Full backups taking greater than 10 hours	Reduce full backups to less than 4 hours	Full backups are taking 3.8 hours

Exhibit 300: NOAA/OCIO CS/ Financial Management IT Operations (Revision 2)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	needs.							
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	Security and Privacy	Privacy	Customer data storage availability.	CBS Production systems, training system and application interface development system	Tech Refresh of production systems with 2 HP Alpha ES80 and EVA5000 storage arrays for CBS.	Devices installed and implemented 1st quarter Fy2006
2006	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	System availability	95% system availability	2% increase in system uptime?	97.8% system availability
2007	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Customer satisfaction for ITC Hosting customers	77% satisfaction	10% increase in satisfaction	6% increase in satisfaction
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 Accessibility	Access	Maximum concurrent customer access	Single front-end systems - 800 users	100% increase in concurrent users via load balancing across multiple servers	100% increase in concurrent users
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	Security and Privacy	Security	Customer data security and privacy between operational and D-R site	Data backups transported by contract courier between Operational and D-R sites	Encrypted communications with real-time transaction-level database replication to D-R site	Replication goal no met due to funding constraints
2007	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	System availability	97% system availability	1% increase in system uptime	98.7% system availability
2008	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Customer satisfaction for ITC Hosting customers	85% satisfaction	10% increase in satisfaction	7% increase in satisfaction
2009	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Customer satisfaction for ITC Hosting customers	93.5% satisfaction	95% satisfaction	TBD

Exhibit 300: NOAA/OCIO CS/ Financial Management IT Operations (Revision 2)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	meet America's economic, social, and 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	Disaster Management	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Implement reduced scale D-R site with replicated data	D-R site has media, documentation, and space	Full coverage of production systems using multi-homed and virtualized servers	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	Financial Management	Reporting and Information	Availability of financial commitment tracking and reporting	96% availability	2% increase in availability	TBD
2009	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	System availability	98% system availability	1% increase in system uptime	TBD
2010	3.1 Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Customer satisfaction of system owners hosted at ITC	94%	95.5%	TBD
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	Financial Management	Cost Accounting / Performance Measurement	Availability of financial commitment tracking and reporting	96.5% availability	1% increase in availability	TBD
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	Financial Management	Reporting and Information	System availability	97% availability	1 % increase in availability	TBD
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	Internal Risk Management and Mitigation	Continuity Of Operations	Implement reduced scale D-R site with replicated data	D-R site has media, documentation, and space	Full coverage of production systems using multi-homed and virtualized servers	TBD

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

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
End-to-End (E2E) Resource Management System	Yes	No	3. No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.
NOAA Information Technology Center	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 the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Financial Management IT Operations
 - b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? No
 - a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. 600-000

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)
MS-ITS NOAA Administrative Systems	Travel Management	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting			No Reuse	0
MS-ITS NOAA Administrative Systems	Data Warehouse	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting			No Reuse	0
MS-ITS NOAA Administrative Systems	Credit/Charge	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Credit / Charge			No Reuse	0
MS-ITS NOAA Administrative Systems	This capability provides IT support for	Support Services	Collaboration	Document Library			No Reuse	100

Exhibit 300: NOAA/OCIO CS/ Financial Management IT Operations (Revision 2)

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)
	NOAA's administrative processes including Grants, Finance, and Procurement. These services include: operation of the Information Technology Center, local desk top support for office automation for NOAA administrative offices and NOAA Headquarters, and maintenance of major applications.							

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)
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Dell and Sun Microsystems servers
Travel Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Dell servers
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	H-P Alpha servers
Credit / Charge	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Sun Microsystems servers

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

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

Retrieves personnel and payroll data from USDA/NFC.
 Issues payment requests through Treasury FMS.

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? 3/20/2008
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results:			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			* Costs in millions
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
1	Retain existing non-integrated cuff systems	0.013023	0.013023
2	Implement a Commercial Off-the-Shelf solution.	0.0121	0.0144
3	Implement a Government Off-the-Shelf solution.	0.008058	0.0128
4	Interface or Integrate Existing Systems.	0.0107	0.0129

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

For Financial Management IT Operations, alternatives were reviewed in FY2006-Q3. Alternatives included (1) continuance of existing operation, (2) relocation of operation to other Commerce data center, (3) hosting agreement at other Commerce data center, and (4) outsourcing contract. Alternative (1) was selected based on highest security, lowest risk and lowest cost.

For E2E, no Alternative has been selected at this time. The investment is still in the planning stage and collecting selection information. Because eCPIC requires a selected Alternative, Alternative 1 (COTS) is selected due to its superior B/CA results. Ten of the 14 alternatives were eliminated by the initial screening criteria. Of the four remaining alternatives, the status quo (Alternative 4) was eliminated because it does not meet the criteria of an integrated NOAA E2E resource management solution, and the interface/integrate solution (Alternative 3) is more likely than Alternatives 1 (COTS) or 2 (GOTS) to be eliminated because of its high cost and high risk. The COTS alternative (Alternative 1) has a slightly higher ROI than the GOTS alternative (Alternative 2), but the results are not conclusive.

NOAA has chosen Alternative 1, the COTS alternative, as the most desirable alternative. The results of an RFI issued in November 2005 showed that no single COTS exists that could meet E2E requirements. Rather, NOAA used the responses to the RFI to formulate a performance based acquisition Statement of Objectives which specified what E2E objectives and requirements were, rather than dictate how to achieve them. The selected offeror proposed a solution that used a mix of COTS and GOTS. The resulting alternative emphasizes the use of COTS products for reporting, document management and workflow, and uses a GOTS solution (which leverages COTS components such as MS Word and Excel) for the production of budget documents. This approach demonstrated real, proven value to NOAA due to its ability to leverage available technology products to realize the bulk of desired functionality while limiting reliance on a GOTS product for business functionality and processes that were truly unique to NOAA. Therefore, the chosen alternative lowers overall risk and cost.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, 2011
when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

The quantifiable benefits of using PPBES as an integrated NOAA E2E resource management system are the same for all three viable alternatives.

These benefits are achieved by the following:

- Reduction in data call preparation resources. Responding to data calls, preparing ad hoc reports, and responding to enquiries (department, Congress, OMB, public, etc.) are generally manual processes requiring employees to extract and manipulate data, often handing it off for additional manual processing or consolidation. An estimated 2,160 hours can be saved per year with an integrated automated system and consolidated database. The assumption is 10 hours for a small report, 20 for medium, and 30 for large. The estimated number of reports or responses is 7 small per month, 4 medium per month, and 1 large per month.
- Reduction in budget administration and closeout efforts. NOAA has 45 programs within five strategic goals, encompassing hundreds of PPAs. The monthly, quarterly, and annual tasks to manage and administer these budgets and close them are labor-intensive processes. The processes, however, are well defined and repeatable, making it possible to significantly automate them and save about \$488,000 annually.
- Reduction in content preparation. Employees manually create and convert data to produce web content materials. They have to pull data from multiple sources and manipulate it for the web. An automated process that would extract and prepare this

information will reduce the content preparation costs by about \$173,000 annually.

- Elimination of input duplication. One of the most resource-intensive features of stovepiped systems that must share data or pass data among them is the duplication of effort in data entry and processing. Duplicative effort was estimated at about 8 percent of the total effort. This represents a quantitative benefit of \$780,000 from a total effort of about \$9.75 million.
- Improved system operational efficiency. A proliferation of systems and manual processes creates higher error and failure rates, and higher employee lost production time. The additional type and amount of expertise, system down time, and employee lost productivity can be reduced by an estimated \$410,000 annually. This includes reduced time to upgrade equipment and software, reduced overhead for standardization of technology and skills, and reduced productivity losses.

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits				
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	0		
PY 2008	0	0		
CY 2009	0	0		
BY 2010	0	0.4	N/A	Reduction in data call preparation resources, Reduction in budget administration and closeout efforts, reduction in content preparation, and elimination of duplication.
BY + 1 2011	0	0		
BY + 2 2012	0	0		
BY + 3 2013	0	0		
BY + 4 2014 & Beyond	0	0		
Total LCC Benefit	0	0.4	LCC = Life-cycle Cost	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? Yes

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? This 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
Budget Formulation System		9/30/2008
CasaNOSA		12/31/2008
PIRS		9/30/2007

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? 7/17/2008
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
- c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

The contractor selected to develop E2E has updated the risk management plan to reflect their integrated risk management methodology.

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:

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? No

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			
1.1	Document As-Is Environment	3/31/2005	\$0.210000	3/31/2005	3/31/2005	\$0.210000	\$0.210000	0	\$0.000000	100%
1.2	Develop E2E functional requirements	6/1/2005	\$0.095000	6/1/2005	6/1/2005	\$0.095000	\$0.095000	0	\$0.000000	100%
1.3	Develop To-Be environment description	6/30/2005	\$0.210000	6/30/2005	6/30/2005	\$0.210000	\$0.210000	0	\$0.000000	100%
1.4	Prepare acquisition plan	5/27/2005	\$0.030000	5/27/2005	5/27/2005	\$0.030000	\$0.030000	0	\$0.000000	100%
1.5	Conduct additional market research	8/30/2005	\$0.020000	8/30/2005	8/30/2005	\$0.020000	\$0.020000	0	\$0.000000	100%
2.1	Develop detailed technical specifications	2/28/2007	\$0.325000	2/28/2007	11/30/2006	\$0.325000	\$0.300000	90	\$0.025000	100%
2.2	Develop RFP/acquisition materials	5/31/2007	\$0.225000	5/31/2007	2/28/2007	\$0.300000	\$0.300000	92	\$0.000000	100%
2.3	Evaluate proposals	9/29/2007	\$0.025000	9/29/2007	4/27/2007	\$0.033000	\$0.025000	155	\$0.008000	100%
3.1	Acquire E2E hardware	12/1/2007	\$0.335000	12/1/2007	8/29/2007	\$0.080000	\$0.075000	94	\$0.005000	100%
3.2	Acquire E2E software	12/1/2007	\$1.335000	10/31/2009		\$1.000000	\$0.430000		\$0.000000	43%
3.3	Conduct design phase	3/1/2008	\$0.435000	7/31/2009		\$1.900000	\$0.660000		\$0.005000	35%
3.4	Conduct build phase	5/30/2008	\$0.435000	11/30/2009		\$1.700000	\$0.290000		-\$0.001000	17%
3.5	Conduct evaluate phase	9/30/2008	\$0.610000	12/31/2009		\$0.870000				0%