

# BY10 Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

## Exhibit 300

### PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION

In Part I, complete Sections A, B, C, and D for all capital assets (IT and non-IT). Complete Sections E and F for IT capital assets.

#### Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

(1) Date of Submission:

(2) Agency: 422

(3) Bureau: 00

(4) Name of this Capital Asset:   
(250 Character Max)

(5) Unique Project Identifier:   
Format xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx  
(For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)

(6) What kind of investment will this be in FY2010? Multi-Agency Collaboration  
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.

(7) What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2005

(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: (2500 Char Max)

GMLOB is a multi-agency initiative to develop a government-wide solution supporting end-to-end grants management activities promoting citizen access, customer service, and agency financial and technical stewardship. GMLOB's goals are to: Improve service to internal and external customers; increase standardization and streamlining; increase value delivered through IT to agencies, grantees, and the public; and reduce the number of grants systems government-wide. This Exhibit 300 reflects the PMO, a non-IT function. The target operating model states that the grants management community will process grants in a decentralized way using common business processes supported by shared technical support services. A "consortia-based" approach is used to execute the operating model. Each consortium provides planning, leadership, business, and program direction to define a common solution to meet its members' needs. The common solution is hosted and operated by a service center under a Consortium Lead that provides the system or system components. The Department of Education (ED), Administration for Children and Families (ACF) within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the National Science Foundation (NSF) were named as Consortium Leads by OMB in the FY2007 President's Budget. The majority of agencies have either signed an MOU with a Consortium Lead to plan migration, or have received a year-long OMB approved exemption from partnering, and are pursuing alternative solutions. Several agencies have not yet signed an MOU with a Consortium, but will be completing specific milestones in alignment

with the initiative. The initiative is supported by the GMLOB PMO which is funded by partner agency contributions. The PMO supports the following work lanes: governance, performance management and reporting, communications and outreach, consortia support, non-consortia support, and standards and streamlining. In August 2007, the Grants Executive Board approved extension of PMO support to the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act and the Grants Policy Committee. GMLOB delivers benefits to the grant community and meets government-wide missions, strategic goals and objectives. GMLOB will: promote inter-agency consolidation and streamlining for grants processes, systems, and forms, resulting in decreased costs and effort for agency grants management; and ease the grantee burden associated with government-wide reporting of grant program performance.

(9) Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? yes  
(9a) If "yes," what was the date of this approval?

(10) Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? yes

(11) Contact Information of Project Manager?

Name:	Mary Santonastasso (NSF), Terry Hurst (HHS) (co-leads)
Phone Number:	Mary Santonastasso: 703-292-4565, Terry Hurst: 202-205-3514
E-Mail:	Mary Santonastasso: msantona@nsf.gov, Terry Hurst: terry.hurst@hhs.gov

(11a) What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the project/program manager?  
Waiver Issued

(11b) When was the Project Manager assigned?

(11c) 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?

(12) Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?  
no

(12a) Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? no

(12b) Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) no

[12b1] If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? Select...

[12b2] If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? Select...

[12b3] If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? Select...

(13) Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives? yes

If "yes," select all that apply:

**President's Management Agenda (PMA) Initiatives**

Expanded E-Government

(13a) 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?)

NSF and HHS are the co-managing partners of GMLOB. GMLOB supports the objectives of the PMA's Expanded Electronic Government goal by: streamlining processes and reducing redundant requirements; reducing administrative burden on grantees; producing more efficient and effective agency execution of grants; reducing government-wide reporting burden; enabling interoperability; developing standardized nomenclature, harmonized processes, and identification of common interface touch points.

(14) Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's no Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?

(14a) If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? Select...

(14b) If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? Select...

(14c) If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Select...

(15) Is this investment for information technology? (see section 53 for definition) no

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

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

(17) In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance): Select...

(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's Memorandum M-05-23)? Select...

(19) Is this a financial management system? Select...

(19a) If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? Select...

[19a1] If "yes," which compliance area:

[19a2] If "no," what does it address?

(19b) 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 %:	Software %:	Services %:	Other %:	Total %
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	1.#QNAN

(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?

Select...

(22) Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

**Name:**

**Phone Number:**

**Title:**

**E-Mail:**

(23) Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? Select...

(24) Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? yes

**Section B: Summary of Funding (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 & Earlier (Spending Prior to 2008)	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY +1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 2014 and beyond	Total
Planning	\$2.743	\$4.488	\$3.310	\$3.811					\$14.352
Acquisition	\$13.735	\$13.722	\$12.379	\$11.071					\$50.907
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	\$16.478	\$18.210	\$15.689	\$14.882	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$65.259
Operations & Maintenance	\$10.750	\$4.935	\$8.101	\$11.188					\$34.974
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$27.228</b>	<b>\$23.145</b>	<b>\$23.790</b>	<b>\$26.070</b>	<b>\$0.000</b>	<b>\$0.000</b>	<b>\$0.000</b>	<b>\$0.000</b>	<b>\$100.233</b>
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	\$2.540	\$2.530	\$3.040	\$2.710					\$10.820
Number of FTE represented by cost	13	15	16	17					61

**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? **yes**

(2a) If "yes," How many and in what year?

ACF: No additional FTEs required by the project. NSF: This project will require NSF to hire a total of seven additional FTEs. NSF hired two FTEs in PY2007 and will hire two additional FTEs in CY 008, two in BY2009, and one in BY 2010. ED: Two additional government FTEs may be required in FY2009, depending on the number of consortium partners.

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

ED: In order to mitigate risk and optimize budget dollars the Department has modified the G5 Integrator contract from a Time and Materials contract to a firm-fixed price contract. Based upon contract negotiations the G5 project funding has been stabilized. NSF: The scope of Research.gov has increased as the result of new legislative mandates such as the America Competes Act and agency requirements for public information dissemination. To address this increased scope, Research.gov plans to take a conservative, phased approach to develop, pilot, and implement services to assure alignment with legislative mandates as they are more fully defined. The scope of Research.gov has also increased to meet stakeholder demand for improved Reviewer Management services, which will be developed and housed on Research.gov. ACF: N/A, ACF's summary of spending has not changed from the FY2009 President's budget request.

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

(1) Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders 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.

Contract or Task Order Number:  
GS-23F-9806H

Type of Contract/TO Used (in accordance with FAR Part 16):  
T&M: Time & Materials

Has the Contract been awarded? yes

If yes, what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date? 03/30/2006

Contract/TO Start Date: 05/01/2006 Contract/TO End Date: 10/15/2008

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$2.342

Is this an Interagency Acquisition? no

Is it performance based? no Competitively awarded? no

What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? NA

Is EVM in the contract? no

Does the contract include the required security and privacy clauses? yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name:  
Steve Strength NSF

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email):  
(703)-292-8242 / sstrengr@nsf.gov

CO FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level: 3

If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? Select...

(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:

The GMLOB PMO itself is not involved in acquisition or development activities. Contract Number: GS23F9806 (SRA Touchstone) does not require earned value because the contract is for program management and is not related to IT development.

(3) Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? n/a

(3a) Explain why not or how this is being done?

N/A

(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

(4a) If "yes", what is the date?

[4a1] Is it current? Select...

(4b) If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? no

[4b1] If "no," briefly explain why:

The GMLOB PMO is not involved in acquisition or development activities.

**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 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 IT	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Mission and Business	Information	ACF: Number of	Four contracts	Reduce to one	Reduced to

		<u>Results</u>	<u>Management</u>	service grant system funding development contracts		contract (Enterprise GATES)	one contract
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of OPDIV-unique grants processes and policies	Three OPDIV-unique systems	Reduce to one system (Enterprise GATES)	Reduced to one system
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of HHS social service grants managed through GATES	54%	Increase to 86%	Increased to 86%
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Number of days between submission of grant application to initiation of HHS Review	21 days	Reduce to one day for electronic submission	Reduced to one day
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GATES	99.0% scheduled availability	Increase to 99.5% scheduled availability	Increased to 99.5%
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within Enterprise GATES	Four OPDIVs (AoA, ACF, IHS, CMS)	Increase to six OPDIVs	Increased to six OPDIVS (added OPHS and HRSA)
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of Enterprise Architecture (EA) framework models completed	One model (As-Is) partially completed	Increase to two models (As-Is and To-Be) completed and integrated	Two models (As-Is and To-Be) completed and integrated
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Level of E-Authentication	E-Authentication level 1	Increase to E-Authentication level 2	Increased to E-Authentication level 2
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grants applications processed via Grants.gov	10% of grant applications via Grants.gov	Increase to 20% of grant applications via Grants.gov	Increased to 30% of grant applications via Grants.gov
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grants reporting processed via OLDC	10% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increase to 50% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increased to 50% of grantees reporting via OLDC
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent alignment of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES OLDC with ACF and HHS Enterprise IT Architecture	60% alignment, excluding some legacy GATES components (e.g., PowerBuilder clients)	Increase to 100% alignment excluding some legacy GATES components (e.g. PowerBuilder clients)	Increased to 100% alignment excluding some legacy GATES components (e.g. PowerBuilder clients)
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Number of days between submission of grant application to initiation of HHS Review	One day	Maintain one day	Maintained one day
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Number of days to review and approve GrantSolutions.gov	Up to 90 days to review and approve grant applications	Reduce 20%, or up to 72 days, to review and approve grant	Reduced 20%, or up to 72 days, to review and



				v/GATES grant applications		applications	approve grant applications
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.5% scheduled availability	Increase to 99.9% scheduled availability	Increased to 99.9% scheduled availability
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of partner grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	6 partners	Increase to seven partners	Increased to seven partners
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grants applications processed electronically	30% of grant applications processed electronically	Increase to 40% of grant applications processed electronically	Increased to 39.6% of grant applications filed electronically
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grant reports submitted electronically	50% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increase to 55% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increased to 55% of grant reports submitted electronically
2007	Effective Manag...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Percent reduction of contractor data entry for grant applications	100% of 2006 processing time	Decrease to 95% of 2006 processing time	Decreased to 95% of 2006 processing time
2007	Effective Manag...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of ACF: GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	maintained 99.9% scheduled availability
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of partner grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	Seven partners	Increase to eight partners	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grants applications processed electronically	40% of grant applications processed electronically	Increase to 45% of grant applications submitted electronically	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grant reports submitted electronically	55% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increase to 60% of grant reports submitted electronically	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Percent reduction of contractor data entry processing time for grant applications	100% of 2007 processing time	Decrease to 95% of 2007 processing time	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of partner grants	Eight Partners	Increase to nine partners	TBD

				management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES			
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF:Percent of grants applications processed electronically	45% of grant applications processed electronically	Increase to 50% of grant applications processed electronically	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF:Percent of grant reports submitted electronically	60% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increase to 65% of grant reports submitted electronically	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF:Percent reduction of contractor data entry processing time for grant applications	100% of 2008 processing time	Decrease to 95% of 2008 processing time	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of partner grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/Enterprise GATES	Nine partners	Increase to ten partners	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF:Percent of grants applications processed electronically	50% of grant applications processed electronically	Increase to 55% of grant applications processed electronically	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF:Percent of grant reports submitted electronically	65% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increase to 70% of grant reports submitted electronically	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF:Percent reduction of contractor data entry processing time for grant applications	100% of 2009 processing time	Decrease to 95% of 2009 processing time	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				

2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2005	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	0	0
2006	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	Consortia Lead agencies selected by OMB	3 designated Consortia Lead agencies and 2 MoUs signed by member agencies to partner with ACF
2007	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	3 designated Consortia Lead agencies and 11 agencies signed MOU's to partner with a Consortium. 7 agencies pursuing alternate solutions.
2008	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2009	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2010	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2011		Select...	Select...				
2008	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	NSF: # of Grants Management service offerings	0	3	3
2008	Stewardship	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	NSF: Grantee satisfaction	0	60%	70%
2008	Stewardship	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	NSF: # of Agencies using	0	2	2

				offerings			
2008	Stewardship	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Participation</u>	NSF: # of Registered Users	0	2,000	2,618
2008	Stewardship	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	NSF: Portal Uptime	0	99%	99.9934%
2009	Stewardship	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation</u>	NSF: # of Grants Management service offerings	3	4	TBD
2009	Stewardship	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Satisfaction</u>	NSF: Grantee Satisfaction	60%	65%	TBD
2009	Stewardship	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>New Customers and Market Penetration</u>	NSF: # of Agencies using offerings	2	3	TBD
2009	Stewardship	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Innovation and Improvement</u>	NSF: # of Registered Users	2,000	3,800	TBD
2009	Stewardship	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	NSF: Portal Uptime	99%	99.5%	TBD
2010	Stewardship	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation</u>	NSF: # of Grants Management service offerings	4	5	TBD
2010	Stewardship	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Satisfaction</u>	NSF: Grantee satisfaction	65%	70%	TBD
2010	Stewardship	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>New Customers and Market Penetration</u>	NSF: # of Agencies using offerings	3	4	TBD
2010	Stewardship	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Participation</u>	NSF: # of Registered Users	3,800	5,400	TBD
2010	Stewardship	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	NSF: Portal Uptime	99.5%	99.9%	TBD
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2006	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ED: Selection as a GMLOB consortia lead in order to achieve the goal of reducing the number of grant management systems in the Federal government.	The GMLOB is a new initiative and there are no consortia providers.	Recommended as a GMLOB consortia Lead	ED received formal approval from OMB to go forward as a consortia lead on 12/2/2005
2006	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ED: # of client agencies by 4th Quarter 06	0	1	As of Q4 FY 06 there are no partners. Progress

							toward performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2006	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ED: Project Management Office (PMO) contract will be awarded by April 2006 to establish internal processes and best practices.	No PMO exists for project	PMO in place	PMO contract awarded 4/3/06
2006	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Data Reliability and Quality</u>	ED: # of COTS products reviewed in market analysis to support ED's grant management business process.	Market analysis prior to legacy system was not conducted.	8	18 vendors were evaluated to assess viability of COTS solution to support ED's grants management business process
2007	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Satisfaction</u>	ED: A formal G5 Governance Structure (consisting of consortia partners and ED) will be adopted and implemented by Q1 FY07	No G5 Consortia Governance structure exists as of Q2 FY06.	A formal governance plan that identifies the governance structure and the roles, responsibilities, and governing procedures will be in place by Q1 FY07.	As of December 06, a formal governance plan has been adopted and is being implemented. The First G5 Executive Steering Committee meeting took place on 1/30/2007.
2007	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Central Fiscal Operations</u>	ED: client agency participation in development decisions	0 - GMLOB is a new initiative. No baseline information exists.	100% of all client agencies will participate in all G5 development decisions	As of December 2006, no partners have joined ED consortia. OMB has decided to delay the 2nd round of consortia leads. The affect is that an incomplete 2nd round makes it harder for current consortia leads to close deals with partner agencies
2007	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>New Customers and Market Penetration</u>	ED: # of client agencies	0	2	ED has no partner agencies
2007	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Standards Compliance and Deviations</u>	ED: Adoption of CMMI Level 3 or better software development lifecycle practices to ensure	CMMI Level 3 or better does not exist for the project as of Q2 FY06	CMMI Level 3 or better will be adopted by the G5 project.	The G5 Integrator is certified at a CMMI level 3 and currently pursuing































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

(2a) If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

(2b) If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

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

You should also periodically be measuring the performance of operational assets against the baseline established during the planning or full acquisition phase (i.e., operational analysis), and be properly operating and maintaining the asset to maximize its useful life. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements.

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.

Answer the following questions about the status of this investment. Include information on all appropriate capital assets supporting this investment except for assets in which the performance information is reported in a separate exhibit 300.

(1) Are you using EVM to manage this investment? no

(1a) If "yes," does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard – 748? Select...

(1b) If "no," explain plans to implement EVM:

At this time, there are no capital assets or technology developmental efforts underway requiring the use of EVM. However, the GMLOB PMO is currently meeting schedule, cost, and performance goals.

(1c) If "N/A," please provide date operational analysis was conducted and a brief summary of the results?

### Question #2 is not applicable for capital assets with ONLY O&M

(2) Is the CV or SV greater than plus/minus (+-)10%?

(2) Is the CV or SV greater than plus/minus (+-)10%? no

(2a) If "yes," was it the CV, SV, or both? Select...

(2b) If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

(2c) If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

**Questions #3-4 are applicable to ALL capital assets.**

(3) Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? no

(3a) 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.

<b>Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline</b>										
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Actual % Comp	Agency
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date - Planned	Completion Date - Actual	Total Cost (\$M) Planned	Total Cost (\$M) Actual	Sched Var (# days)	Cost Var (\$M)		
GATES GCoE Expansion- FY 2005	11/30/06	\$0.770	11/30/06	11/30/06	\$0.770	\$0.770	0	\$0.000	100.0	009
GATES Operations and Maintenance Fixed Price- FY 2005	8/18/06	\$3.912	8/18/06	8/18/06	\$3.912	\$3.910	0	-\$0.002	100.0	009
GrantSolution s.gov	8/18/07	\$1.000	8/18/07	8/18/07	\$1.000	\$0.940	0	-\$0.060	94.45	009

Expansion - FY 2006											
Operations and Maintenance - FY 2006	8/18/07	\$3.912	8/18/07	8/18/07	\$3.912	\$3.550	0	-\$0.363	88.27	009	
Mandatory Capabilities	5/30/09	\$0.813	5/30/09		\$0.813	\$0.390	0	\$0.423	47.96	009	
New Partner (NP3) Migration Preparation	12/31/10	\$1.128	12/31/10		\$1.128	\$0.000	0	-\$1.128	0	009	
Funds Control Upgrade	12/31/08	\$0.679	12/31/08		\$0.679	\$0.440	0	-\$0.239	65.1	009	
CMS Migration Preparation	6/30/08	\$0.855	6/30/08		\$0.855	\$0.850	0	-\$0.005	100	009	
AoA Migration Preparation	9/30/08	\$1.001	9/30/08		\$1.001	\$0.890	0	-\$0.111	88.23	009	
FSIS Migration Preparation	12/31/08	\$1.263	12/31/08		\$1.263	\$0.900	0	-\$0.363	71.11	009	
New Partner (NP1) Migration Preparation	2/28/10	\$1.337	2/28/10		\$1.337	\$0.000	0	-\$1.337	0	009	
New Partner (NP2) Migration Preparation	4/14/10	\$1.286	4/14/10		\$1.286	\$0.000	0	-\$1.286	0	009	
PATS Upgrade	8/31/09	\$1.644	8/31/09		\$1.644	\$1.640	0	-\$0.004	100	009	
New Partner (NP4) Migration Preparation										Select...	
Documentation Updates - FY 2007	8/18/08	\$0.561	8/18/08		\$0.561	\$0.540	0	-\$0.021	95.07	009	
Training & Help Desk Support - FY 2007	8/18/08	\$0.561	8/18/08		\$0.561	\$0.540	0	-\$0.021	95.07	009	
Program Management & Operations - FY 2007	8/18/08	\$0.561	8/18/08		\$0.561	\$0.540	0	-\$0.021	95.07	009	
Documentation Updates - FY 2008	8/18/09	\$0.617	8/18/09		\$0.617	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009	
Training & Help Desk Support - FY 2008	8/18/09	\$0.617	8/18/09		\$0.617	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009	
Program Management & Operations - FY 2008	8/18/09	\$0.617	8/18/09		\$0.617	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009	
Documentation Updates - FY 2009	8/18/10	\$0.618	8/18/10		\$0.618	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009	

Training & Help Desk Support - FY 2009	8/18/10	\$0.618	8/18/10		\$0.618	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009
Program Management & Operations - FY 2009	8/18/10	\$0.618	8/18/10		\$0.618	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009
Documentation Updates - FY2010										Select...
Training and Helpdesk Support -- FY2010										Select...
Program Management & Operations - FY2010										Select...
Documentation Updates -- FY2011										Select...
Training & Helpdesk Support -- FY2011										Select...
Program Management & Operations - FY2011										Select...
GrantSolution s.gov GATES Operations & Maintenance - FY2012										Select...
GrantSolution s.gov GATES Operations & Maintenance - FY2013										Select...
Develop and pilot service offerings	9/30/07	\$7.718	9/30/07	9/17/07	\$7.718	\$7.700	13	-\$0.018	96	422
Deploy service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/08	\$7.227	9/30/08		\$7.227	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	96	422
Operate and maintain service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/08	\$0.675	9/30/08		\$0.675	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	92	422
Deploy service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/09	\$7.409	9/30/09		\$7.409	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422
Operate and maintain service offerings in a shared	9/30/09	\$2.591	9/30/09		\$2.591	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422

services environment										
Perform Ongoing DME Activities	9/30/10	\$11.222	9/30/10		\$11.222	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422
Operate and Maintain Service Offerings in a Shared Services Environment	9/30/10	\$3.778	9/30/10		\$3.778	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422
Operate and Maintain Service Offerings in a Shared Services Environment										Select...
Operate and Maintain Service Offerings in a Shared Services Environment										Select...
Perform Ongoing DME Activities										Select...
Perform Ongoing DME Activities										Select...
Perform Ongoing DME Activities										Select...
Operate and Maintain Service Offerings in a Shared Services Environment										Select...
Facilitation support for project scoping	8/30/04	\$0.060	8/30/04	8/30/04	\$0.060	\$0.061	0	\$0.001	100.0	018
Requirements Analysis	11/30/05	\$0.445	11/30/05	11/30/05	\$0.445	\$0.385	0	-\$0.060	100.0	018
Marketing Support	3/23/06	\$0.120	3/23/06	3/23/06	\$0.120	\$0.126	0	\$0.006	100.0	018
FY07 IV&V Support	9/30/07	\$0.500	9/30/07		\$0.500	\$0.495	0	\$0.000	100	018
FY08 IV&V Support	9/30/08	\$0.600	9/30/08		\$0.600	\$0.495	0	\$0.000	100	018
FY09 IV&V Support	9/30/09	\$0.314	9/30/09		\$0.550	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY06 PMO Support	9/30/06	\$0.513	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.513	\$0.271	0	\$0.240	100	018
FY07 PMO Support	9/30/07	\$0.500	9/30/07		\$0.500	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY08 PMO Support	9/30/08	\$0.500	9/30/08		\$0.500	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY09 PMO Support	9/30/09	\$0.358	9/30/09		\$0.450	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018

Security	9/30/09	\$0.200	9/30/09		\$0.200	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.1.1) Project Initiation /018 - Dept. of Education	12/30/06	\$0.740	12/30/06	12/14/06	\$0.740	\$0.740	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.1.2) Project Management Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.388	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.388	\$0.375	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.2.1) Overall System Requirements Analysis /018 - Dept. of Education	10/9/06	\$0.690	10/9/06	1/4/07	\$0.690	\$0.650	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.2.2) Overall System Design /018 - Dept. of Education	1/30/07	\$0.184	1/30/07	1/10/07	\$0.184	\$0.139	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.1) Analysis Phase I /018 - Dept. of Education	1/29/07	\$0.116	1/29/07	3/2/07	\$0.116	\$0.142	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.2) Design and Construction Phase1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$1.567	9/30/07	12/17/07	\$1.567	\$2.580	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.3) Conversion Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	7/30/07	\$0.119	7/30/07	9/14/07	\$0.119	\$0.700	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.4) A&I Testing Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.412	9/30/07	12/7/07	\$0.412	\$0.691	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.5) Training Development and Delivery Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.630	9/30/07	11/2/07	\$0.630	\$0.101	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.6) Installation Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	8/30/07	\$0.260	8/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.260	\$0.420	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.7) Transition Planning &Support Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	10/15/07	\$0.138	10/15/07	12/17/07	\$0.138	\$0.700	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.8) Planning Package-Post	10/15/07	\$0.300	10/15/07	1/11/08	\$0.300	\$0.300	0	\$0.000	100	018



Production Support Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education										
(1.1.3.9) Planning Package- Operations and Maintenance - Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	11/2/07	\$0.649	11/2/07		\$0.649	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.10) Planning Package - Help Desk - Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	1/30/08	\$0.630	1/30/08	2/29/08	\$63.000	\$0.610	0	\$0.000	100	018
1.1.6.1 Software and Licensing Base Year 1 - Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.398	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.398	\$0.398	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.3.1) G5 Operation & Maintenance Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	12/31/09	\$0.444	12/31/09		\$0.444	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.1.1) Project Management Phase 2 /018 - Dept. of Education	12/15/08	\$0.293	12/15/08		\$0.293	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.1) Phase 2 Requirements Analysis (Elaboration) / 018 - Dept. of Education	7/28/08	\$0.620	7/28/08		\$0.620	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.2) Phase 2 Design and Development / 018 - Dept. of Education	9/26/08	\$0.902	9/26/08		\$0.902	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.3) Phase 2 Conversion Development / 018 - Dept. of Education	12/12/08	\$0.188	12/12/08		\$0.188	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.4) Phase 2 System Testing /	10/20/08	\$0.400	10/20/08		\$0.400	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.5) Phase 2 Training Development and Delivery /	12/1/08	\$0.182	12/19/08		\$0.182	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.6)	12/1/08	\$0.261	12/1/08		\$0.261	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018

Phase 2 Technical Architecture /0 18 - Dept. of Education											
1.1.4.7) Phase 2 Pre- Implementation Support /	12/5/08	\$0.371	12/5/08		\$0.371	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.4.8) Phase 2 End to End Testing /	12/22/08	\$0.216	12/22/08		\$0.216	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.4.9) Phase 2 Transition Planning and Support /	12/15/08	\$0.167	12/15/08		\$0.167	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.4.10) Phase 2 Post Production Support /	12/29/08	\$0.420	12/29/08		\$0.420	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.4.11) Phase 2 Help Desk /	3/9/09	\$0.103	3/9/09		\$0.103	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.4.12) Phase 2 Operations and Maintenance /	12/14/09	\$0.579	12/14/09		\$0.579	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.2.1) Project Management Phase 3 /018 - Dept. of Education	12/15/08	\$0.444	12/15/08		\$0.444	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.5.3) Phase 3 Conversion Development /	10/2/09	\$0.538	10/2/09		\$0.538	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.5.2) Phase 3 Design and Development /	9/14/09	\$1.397	9/14/09		\$1.397	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.5.1) Phase 3 Requirements Analysis /	3/17/09	\$0.495	3/17/09		\$0.495	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.5.4) Phase 3 System Testing/ 018 - Dept. of Education	10/2/09	\$0.419	10/2/09		\$0.419	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.5.5) Phase 3 Training Development and Delivery / 018 -Dept. of Education	12/8/09	\$0.182	12/8/09		\$0.182	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	
(1.1.5.6) Phase 3 Technical Architecture / 018 - Dept. of Education	12/10/09	\$0.474	12/10/09		\$0.474	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018	

(1.1.5.7) Phase 3 Pre- Implementatio n Support/ 018 - Dept. of Education	12/4/09	\$0.310	12/4/09		\$0.310	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.8) Phase 3 End to End Testing/ 018 Dept. of Education	12/2/09	\$0.171	12/2/09		\$0.171	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.9) Phase 3 Transition Planning and Support/ 018 Dept. of Education	12/14/09	\$0.140	12/14/09		\$0.140	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY07 Software/ 018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.200	9/30/07		\$0.200	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY08 Software/ 018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/08	\$0.200	9/30/08		\$0.200	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY09 Software/ 018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/09	\$0.050	9/30/09		\$0.050	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY2005 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/05	\$0.898	9/30/05	9/30/05	\$0.798	\$0.223	0	\$0.000	100	422
FY2006 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/06	\$0.780	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.708	\$0.721	0	\$0.000	100	422
FY2007 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/07	\$1.504	9/30/07		\$1.444	\$0.428	0	\$0.000	92	422
FY2008 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/08	\$1.840	9/30/08		\$1.840	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422
FY2009 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/09	\$1.840	9/30/09		\$1.840	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422