

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: | 9/10/2007 |
| 2. Agency: | Department of Energy |
| 3. Bureau: | Environmental And Other Defense Activities |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | SR Mission Support Systems |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | 019-10-01-15-01-1058-00 |
| 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.) | Operations and Maintenance |
| 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: | |
| SR Mission Support Systems (MSS) supports the FEA BRM Business Area, Management of Government Resources, and the DOE's Environment and Defense LOBs and Missions of the Savannah River Site (SRS). These four systems directly support the President's Management Agenda (PMAs) of Human Capital, Real Property Asset Management, Competitive Sourcing, and expanded E-Gov in support of operations of the sites. MSS supports DOE's Core Mission of Site and Facility Remediation as described in the DOE Enterprise Architecture Transition Plan (EATP), dated February, 2007, and Strategic Theme 4, Environmental Responsibility (page 57). MSS alignment with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM) for data and technology is shown in Table I.F.3. | |
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 8/24/2006 |
| 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | Yes |
| 11. Contact information of Project Manager? | |
| Name | Tam, Lawrence W |
| Phone Number | (803) 952-9614 |
| Email | lawrence.tam@srs.gov |
| a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? | TBD |
| 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: | Human Capital |

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

Expanded E-Government
 Competitive Sourcing
 Real Property Asset Management

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?)

Expanded E-Gov
 Human Capital-Employee skills inventories used to map staffing assignments to work schedules for optimum resource utilization.
 Competitive Sourcing-Compiles technical baseline data for bid specifications. Provides security controls to subcontracted systems.
 Real Property Asset Management-Monitors and controls processes to comply with technical baseline requirements.

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.)

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? Office of Environmental Management

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

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) Yes

19. Is this a financial management system? No

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

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

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

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

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

Hardware	11
Software	9
Services	80
Other	0

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? N/A

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name	Conner, Pauline
Phone Number	803-952-8134
Title	FOIA and Privacy Act Officer
E-mail	pauline.conner@srs.gov

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Yes

Records Administration's approval?

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? Yes

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 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	0	0	0	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0	0	0	0					
Operations & Maintenance:	117.084	38.941	40.112	40.597					
TOTAL:	117.084	38.941	40.112	40.597					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.183	0.063	0.064	0.065					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	2	1	1	1					

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

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

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

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: No changes.

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

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

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

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)
DE-AC09-96SR18500 - WSRC Prime M&O Contract. Total Contract Value of WSRC M&O Contract is \$14,113,000 K. MSS investment contract value is \$156,025.00, assuming IT systems are descoped from M&O with award of SB Set-Aside for IT on October 1, 2007.	Cost + Incentive Fee. WSRC MSS Systems: SR PassPort; SR AIM; SR P&CS (Process and Control Systems); MIPP EM (EM Mission Computer Security), and; MIPP NNSA (NNSA Mission Computer Security) are funded by the General & Administrative (G&A) cost pool.	Yes	8/6/1996	8/6/1996	6/30/2008	156.025	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Lovett, James	803-952-9829 / james.lovett@srs.gov	Level 3	

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:

Systems under discussion are supported under DOE's prime M&O contract with WSRC. The contract contains objective earned value measurement incentive provision, though not directly with regard to the management of the contractor's internal business systems. The Mission Support Systems addressed by this investment are funded by overhead costs under the current DOE prime contract. The contractor is, however, highly motivated to be innovative in improving the efficiency and cost effectiveness of their business systems and processes in that the contract allows savings achieved in those areas to be redirected to accelerated site cleanup and closure deliverables that are incentive-based.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

Yes

a. Explain why:

The current steady state systems were designed and developed to comply with Section 508. This investment uses a several tools such as Bobby (Watchfire), InFocus (SSB Technologies) and STEP508 to ensure that web applications and web sites are accessible to people with disabilities.

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

Yes

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

8/22/2006

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
2007	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Increase customer satisfaction with the functionality and capability of the implemented solution. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM and Passport customer survey baselines. (EOY06 Baseline 80% positive response).	Increase % customer satisfaction with functionality and capability of IT delivered solutions. (EY07 Target 82% positive response).	Customer survey metrics- Increased from 80% to 83% (positive compared to total, 0 negatives) as of March, 2007. Actual results will be available end of FY 2007. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2007	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup - Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Maintain system availability baseline goal for process and control systems (P&CS). Ensure P&CS embedded process control systems are	System Availability - Facility/process/program specific for over 600 entities. Generally > 98%.	P&CS availability to meet or exceed customer requirements, generally >98%. Update standards for efficient and effective	99% system availability.

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	across the U.S. Department of Energy				available to achieve waste processing, nuclear security and environmental cleanup missions at Savannah River Site.		processes and practices to support customers' organizations and their specific Process & Control Services initiatives.	
2007	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup – Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Optimize use of embedded process control systems to reduce the footprint of SR facilities in support of SRS risk reduction and cleanup strategy	Multiple control rooms exist across SRS areas	Reduce/Consolidate number of control rooms.	Metrics are on track. H Tank Farm (HTF) has consolidated 2 control rooms and integrated 2 facility projects into the Central Control Room (CCR). Details are available in the DOE Quarterly Review Template.
2007	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management–Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Increase the number of work order/work requests in the PassPort archive warehouse by running the work order and work request archive to reduce the size of the production database.	113,313 Work Orders and 57,939 Work Requests in the PassPort archive warehouse as of EOY 2006.	Increase the number of work order/work requests in the PassPort archive warehouse to at least 124,644 Work Orders and at least 63,733 Work Requests in the PassPort archive warehouse (10% increase).	Currently (May, 2007), no increase in work order or work request archival has been approved by the customer. Actual results will be available end of FY 2007. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2007	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management–Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Implement Indus Connect with the Equipment Business Object to interface PassPort with AIM to reduce the manual equipment data loads into PassPort.	425 manual equipment data loads in PassPort as of EOY 2006.	Reduce manual data loads in PassPort to < 213 (50% reduction from baseline).	Currently in development for SmartPlant (AIM's replacement in progress). Actual results will be available end of FY 2007. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2007	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management–Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Customer impact. Measure by % positive, negative and not applicable impacts made by application enhancements, releases and outages. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % positive impacts.	MSS/CBA combined impacts metrics for FY2006=94%. MSS metrics for % positive impacts increased from 94% (FY2006) to 95% (1 negative impact) May, 2007. Actual results will be available end of FY 2007. Interim results will be reported quarterly.

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction				
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup - Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting				
2008	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement				
2008	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Risk				
2008	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability				

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.							
2009	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction				
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup – Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting				
2009	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement				
2009	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability				

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2010	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction				
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup - Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting				
2010	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement				
2010	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability				
2011	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management-Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction				

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.							
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup – Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting				
2011	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management–Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement				
2011	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management–Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability				
2012	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management–Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction				

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2012	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup – Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting				
2012	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management–Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement				
2012	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management–Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability				

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:

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

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.

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, NIST 800-26, Other, N/A)	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
SR AIM							
SR Passport (Work Management System)							
SR Process Control and Support							

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?

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?

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

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

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
SR AIM	No	No	No, because the system does not contain personally identifiable information.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
SR Passport (Work Management System)	No	No	No, because the system does not contain personally identifiable information.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
SR Process Control and Support	No	No	No, because the system does not contain personally identifiable 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.

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

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. SR Mission Support Systems (MSS) - USDOE Enterprise Architecture Transition Plan, dated February, 2007

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? Yes

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

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)
Facilities Management	Support the construction, management and maintenance of facilities for an organization.	Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Facilities Management			No Reuse	
Outbound correspondence management	Manage internal initiated communication between an organization and its stakeholders.	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	
Process Tracking	Allow the monitoring of activities within the business cycle.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	

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%.

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

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)
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Facilities Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	
Process Tracking	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

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)
Facilities Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Process Tracking	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	

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.

Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)

Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 6/30/2007
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

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

Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

1. Was operational analysis conducted? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed. 5/15/2007
 - b. If "yes," what were the results?

Operational Analysis (OA) Process

Financial reviews are conducted each month. Performance monitoring is conducted each quarter. Risk management plans are developed annually, with monthly reviews. Performance against milestones (Section III.D.2) is monitored on a quarterly basis. Results are reviewed by the contractor with DOE-SR management to evaluate the need for changes. The need for system upgrades, or DME, is driven by the Risk Management Analysis, as well as performance metrics from customer surveys.

Financial Analysis

Costs are captured from SR financial systems and reported by the site contractor(s) on a monthly basis against Annual Operating Plan (AOP) budgets. Variances greater than 10% (positive or negative) are documented in the Quarterly Control Review Process and a remediation plan developed and implemented.

- c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

- a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor and Government

- 2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table:

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 15)

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table							
Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
FY04	Steady State Operation	9/30/2004	\$41.773	9/30/2004	\$41.773	0	\$0
FY05	Steady State Operation	9/30/2005	\$37.624	9/30/2005	\$34.617	0	\$3.007
FY06	Steady State Operation (Actual cost is through 9 months)	9/30/2006	\$37.87	9/30/2006	\$38.619	0	\$-0.749
FY-06-01	Steady State Operation (October 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006)	6/30/2006	\$27.453	6/30/2006	\$27.453	0	\$0
FY-06-02	Steady State Operation - July 1, 2006 - September 30, 2006	9/30/2006	\$10.416	9/30/2006	\$11.166	0	\$-0.75
FY-06-03	Complete Operational Analysis, Part II	9/22/2006	\$0.001	9/22/2006		0	
FY07	Steady State Operation	9/30/2007	\$39.004	6/30/2007	\$29.003	92	\$10.001
FY-07-01	Steady State Operation	9/30/2007	\$38.607	6/30/2007	\$28.607	92	\$10
FY-07-02	Complete Acquisition Plan for SRS Rebid (IT Services SB Set-Aside).	11/15/2006	\$0.001	8/22/2006	\$0.001	85	\$0
FY-07-03	Issue SRS Rebid Solicitation (Includes IT investment)	11/30/2006	\$0.001	12/15/2006	\$0.001	-15	\$0
FY-07-04	SR Mission Support Systems (SR MSS) - EM Recertification - Last C&A date: June 30, 2004.	6/30/2007	\$0.001	6/8/2007	\$0.001	22	\$0
FY-07-05	Complete evaluation of AIM Smartplant upgrade.	9/28/2007	\$0.001				
FY-07-06	Funding decision on security POAMs	4/30/2007	\$0.001	4/30/2007	\$0.001	0	\$0
FY-07-07	Security - Align site systems to EM eRAMS. Develop and implement NIST-based C&A processes and procedures.	6/29/2007	\$0.391	6/8/2007	\$0.391	21	\$0
FY-07-08	C&A Complete	6/30/2007	\$0.001	6/8/2007	\$0.001	22	\$0
FY-08-02	ST&E Testing Complete	6/30/2008	\$0.001				
FY-08-03	Contingency Plan Testing	6/30/2008	\$0.001				
FY-08-04	Risk Management Plan Update	6/30/2008	\$0.001				