

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: 09/07/2007
- 2 Agency: US Army Corps of Engineers 202
- 3 Bureau: 00
- 4 Name of this Capital Asset: ENGLink Interactive
- 5 Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: 202-00-01-02-01-1020-00
- 6 What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? **Mixed Life Cycle**
(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.)
- 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:

ENGLink Interactive began as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Emergency Management system and is rapidly becoming the premier USACE command and control system. When a natural or man-made disaster strikes the United States, the USACE is tasked to provide immediate comprehensive relief to the thousands impacted by the disaster. ENGLink has transformed the way USACE responds to emergencies by providing the framework for processing information and performing command and control of USACE elements. ENGLink represents “ground truth” reporting and allows deployed personnel real-time access to critical information. The system represents a single data entry point that standardizes and integrates methods of collecting, analyzing, forecasting and presenting information for decision makers. ENGLink Interactive continues to revolutionize the way the Corp handles its contingency planning and response.

ENGLink’s key functionality includes the deployment module and its reporting capabilities. The deployment module tracks personnel and mission requirements from the beginning to the end of a response. Interactive Taskers allow users to request staff and materials from other USACE organizations. Once personnel are deployed in ENGLink, they are tracked from the beginning to the end of their deployment, resulting in increased management and accountability of personnel. ENGLink’s reports, viewable by all command elements, allow access to just-in-time, critical information. The Deployment Module reports provide answers to staffing needs, logistical concerns and the management of personnel.

ENGLink was first developed to fulfill the role of a deployment tracking and personnel management software. It has grown well past those boundaries and now encompasses many new and varied USACE job responsibilities, from handling volunteers, performing communication checks, to processing threats and suspicious incidents. With this expansion has come a need for a redesign and technical refresh of the ENGLink application. ENGLink has become a tool of immense capability, but little consistency. The redesign will be implemented using modern web technologies. Key areas of improvements that are vital to the system's redesign include: increased automation and integration; improved user interface; increased reporting capabilities; and increased information sharing.

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

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **02/22/2007**

10 Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **Yes**

11 Contact information of Project Manager?

Name

Phone Number

E-mail

a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?

Mid/Journeyman-level

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? **Yes**

a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? **Yes**

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

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

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

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

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

If "yes," check all that apply:

Expanded E-Government

Human Capital Budget
Performance Integration
Financial Performance
Expanded E-Government
Competitive Sourcing
Faith Based and Community
Real Property Asset Management
Eliminating Improper Payments
Privatization of Military Housing
Research & Development Investment Criteria
Housing & Urban Development Management & Performance
Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives
Right Sized” Overseas Presence Coordination of VA & DoD Programs and Systems

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?)

ENGLink provides a single point of entry/dissemination for Command and Control decisions. It has automated the process of deploying personnel and equipment to disaster sites; and it has enabled an unprecedented degree of collaboration, ensuring that bureaucratic hurdles and breakdowns in communications associated with manual and paper processes no longer delay the provision of necessary emergency response services and the delivery of goods to those struck by disasters.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.) No

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

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?

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

Effective, Moderately Effective, Adequate, Ineffective, Results not Demonstrated

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 2

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 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?

If “yes,” which compliance area:

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	2.13%
Software	0.17%
Services	97.70%
Other	0.00%

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:

Privacy Act Officer

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration’s approval? Yes

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? 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:	0.000	0.368	0.608	0.758		0.000	0.000	0.000	2.509
Acquisition :	0.331	0.165	1.263	1.266		0.000	0.000	0.000	4.600
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0.331	0.533	1.871	2.024		0.000	0.000	0.000	7.109
Operations & Maintenance:	2.509	1.025	0.929	0.788		1.580	1.616	1.653	10.796
TOTAL:	2.840	1.558	2.800	2.812		1.580	1.616	1.653	17.905
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.640	0.550	0.535	0.540	0.563	0.576	0.589	0.602	4.594
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	3.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	13.5

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? **N/A**

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

For the FY2008 President's budget request, this investment was categorized as a steady state investment. ENGLink has since transitioned to a mixed life cycle status due to the upcoming redesign and technology upgrade of the current system. The Summary of Spending table reflects the DME spending that is required for the redesign. The redesign will occur over 3 years, from FY08-FY10.

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

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																
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, UEESC, 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)
GS-35F-0306J (Option 2)	Firm Fixed Price	Y	09/30/2005	10/01/2006	09/30/2007	\$1.398	N	Y	N	N/A	Y	Y			3	
SPO700-98-D-4002	Cost Plus Fixed Fee	Y	02/15/2007	03/30/2007	03/29/2010	\$8.212	N	Y	N	N/A	Y	Y			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:

Not applicable as EVM is required by all contracts.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **Yes**

a. Explain why: **USACE does not allow information systems, web developed applications or products to be deployed unless they are made fully accessible to individuals with disabilities; language is included in all contracts for information systems and web products to ensure they are made accessible; ENGLink is a fully web based system that allows users to set browser preferences; its accessibility has been proven by daily use and feedback by a legally blind USACE employee.**

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

a. If “yes,” what is the date? **07/20/2007**

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 Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission & Business Results	Emergency Response	Extent to which RRVs are able to respond to an event to become operational	RRVs respond to an event within 18 hours	Maintain response time within 18 hours	All RRVs responded to an event within 18 hours; on average, the response time was 4.6 hours
2007	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of visitors logging on to the system	36,000 users within 60 organizations	Increase the number of visitors by 50 logins from each organization, or 3000 logins	In FY07, 100,000 visitors logged on to the system
2007	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.1: Attain and maintain	Processes & Activities	Knowledge Management	Number of individuals trained for the ENGLINK Strike Team	0	Maintain 3 teams of 8 (total of 24), with 10 alternates	In FY07, 28 primary and 13

	a high, consistent state of preparedness						alternate ENGLink Strike Team employees were fully trained
2007	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Availability	Number of systems implemented	0	Install CNSS at downlink (Constituting 16 systems)	Two T-1 lines (Napa to WPC & Napa to CPC) were installed
2008	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission & Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response: Percentage of "tasker requests" filled by suspense date	Historically, only 40% of taskers were filled within the requested amount of time	44% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2008	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	In the past year, the number of unique logins was 2,105	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,210 users	TBD
2008	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture	Processes & Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	In the current environment, it takes approx. 40 hours to build a customized report	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 32	TBD

	and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness						
2008	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The current system has 11 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data to 12 GB	TBD
2009	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission & Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response: Percentage of "tasker requests" filled by suspense date	44% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	49% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2009	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,210 users	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,320 users	TBD
2009	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology	Processes & Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 32 hours of personnel time	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 24	TBD

	aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness						
2009	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The system has 12 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data to 13 GB	TBD
2010	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission & Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response: Percentage of "tasker requests" filled by suspense date	49% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	55% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2010	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,320 users	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,436 users	TBD
2010	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work	Processes & Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 24 hours of personnel time	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 16	TBD

	efficiencies and effectiveness						
2010	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The system has 13 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data to 14 GB	TBD
2011	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission & Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response: Percentage of "tasker requests" filled by suspense date	55% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	61% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2011	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,436 users	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,558 users	TBD
2011	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes & Activities	Efficiency	Maintain turnaround time for customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 16 hours of personnel time	Maintain a 16 hour turnaround time for customized reports	TBD

2011	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The system has 14 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data to 15 GB	TBD
2012	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission & Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response: Percentage of "tasker requests" filled by suspense date	61% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	68% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2012	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,558 users	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,686 users	TBD
2012	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes & Activities	Efficiency	Maintain turnaround time for customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 16 hours of personnel time	Maintain a 16 hour turnaround time for customized reports	TBD
2012	Strategic Goal 5, Objective	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and	The system has 15 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data	TBD

	5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information			reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system		to 16 GB	
2013	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission & Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response: Percentage of "tasker requests" filled by suspense date	68% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	75% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2013	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,686 users	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,820 users	TBD
2013	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes & Activities	Efficiency	Maintain turnaround time for customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 16 hours of personnel time	Maintain a 16 hour turnaround time for customized reports	TBD
2013	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users:	The system has 15 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data to 17 GB	TBD

	means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information			The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system			
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 is planned, include the investment in both the “Systems in Planning” table (Table 3) and the “Operational Systems” table (Table 4). 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 supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system(s) to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system(s).

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

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

a. If “yes,” provide the “Percentage IT Security” for the budget year: **5.21%**

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

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s) – Security Table:			
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)
ENGLink Interactive	Both	03/31/2010	02/28/2010

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, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
ENGLink Interactive	Both	Moderate	No (DIACAP)	12/14/2006	Other (DoD)	09/06/2006	07/14/2007

			8510.bb Interim Guidance & DITSCAP 5200.40)		8500.2)		
--	--	--	---	--	---------	--	--

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

a. If “yes,” have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency’s plan of action and milestone process? N/A

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

No

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

N/A

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

All individual contractor personnel making changes to ENGLink, installing upgrades and performing other programming activities that affect the system’s configuration, sign security agreements prior to beginning work and almost all contractor staff assigned to the maintenance, upgrade and configuration development/management of ENGLink have Secret security clearances. The ENGLink servers are located in government-owned sites with permanent government staff collocated on site for monitoring and oversight. All information systems security personnel (government or contractor) are appointed in writing and have had security training and received appropriate, where required, certification. All personnel (government or contractor) who require access have had a personnel security background check and/or security investigation completed, consistent with the project’s sensitivity designation. Separation of duties is strictly enforced. All operations personnel (government or contractors) have secret level clearances.

ENGLink resides on the central USACE servers, which are managed by the CEEIS Program, identified above. CEEIS provides centralized IT support (for the Corps-wide Network and Processing Centers), which is government owned and contractor operated. The servers are maintained by contractors in government-owned space. Government USACE personnel are permanently co-located on site with these contractors and monitor, verify, and validate contractor security procedures. Additionally, GAO, the Army Audit Agency, and the Inspector General audit the Corps IT security annually. Internal security scans and on-site inspections/audits are performed annually on every Corps site to validate that the correct patches and security procedures are in compliance with government-wide and Army/DoD policy. The Corps Headquarters Acquisition Office provides local sites assistance with their contract language for generic and specific security requirements. USACE policy requires a review of all IT contract and acquisitions to ensure that background investigation requirements are appropriate for all contractors.

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
ENGLink Interactive	No	Yes	The PIA for ENGLink is posted on the USACE's intranet, behind the firewall.	No	ENGLink has not published a SORN to date; however it is a planned item within the ENGLink Capital Assets Plan for the EPRP
<p>Details for Text Options: Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted. Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN. Note: Links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites.</p>					

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates 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. **ENGLink Interactive**

b. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture.

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 Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Information Sharing	ENGLink is a web-based application that allows simultaneous access to its table structures based on the predefined roles and responsibilities of the user	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	15%
Knowledge Capture	ENGLink is a web-based application that allows the collection of data through thin and thick client tools. ENGLink's data collection directly follows USACE business rules and practices.	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture			No Reuse	15%
ENGLink Auto-Notification Emails	ENGLink sends automatic email notifications when an action is requested of a user and/or when USACE employees are to be notified of actions performed within the ENGLink system.	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery			No Reuse	10%
Dynamic Reporting	Based on requirements, ENGLink	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	5%

	creates ad hoc reporting on predefined modules. Users can create dynamic reports and save for future use.						
Deployed Reports, Organization Reports, Medical Reports	ENGLink has an extensive reporting capability. Over 40 reports have been created to support deployment tracking. Command and control reports allow Headquarters to view the situation from a high level.	Reporting	Standardized/Canned			No Reuse	5%
CEFMS Integration	ENGLink pulls financial information from CEFMS to support mission, facilities, and funding tracking.	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	5%
GeoTools, Oracle Spatial	ENGLink has an extensive GIS module. The GIS module allows for customized mapping and user-defined queries and mapping of threats and suspicious incidents.	Visualization	Mapping/Geospatial (GIS) /Elevation, GPS			No Reuse	10%
Access Control	ENGLink has user management to manage user accounts	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	2.5%
Encryption	Enables secure transmission and storage of encrypted sensitive and/or private information.	Security Management	Cryptography			No Reuse	2.5%

Instrumentation and Testing	Support the validation of application or system capabilities and requirements	Development and Integration	Instrumentation and Testing			No Reuse	5%
Configuration Management	ENGLink utilizes the applications for managing source code, documentation, and change requests.	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			No Reuse	15%
Reporting	ENGLink audits, creates, updates, finalizations and releases for all reports.	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis			No Reuse	5%
Process Tracking	The ENGLink Feedback system tracks all requests for modifications, error tracking and enhancements. The system has the ability to assign personnel, track estimates, actuals and status. The ENGLink Feedback System tracks issues through the entire software development lifecycle.	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	5%

- 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 this column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table: To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	HTTP
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware/Infrastructure	Local Area Network/Intranet	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Oracle 10g RDMBS
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration/Communication	Sun Javamail for JDK 1.4; Sun sendmail for Solaris 5.10
Ad Hoc	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Standardized/Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+; Microsoft Excel 2003
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Oracle 10g RDBMS
Mapping/Geospatial (GIS) /Elevation, GPS	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database/Storage	Database	Oracle 10g Spatial
Mapping/Geospatial (GIS) /Elevation, GPS	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Apache SSL 128-bit

Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Oracle Transparent Data Encryption
Instrumentation and Testing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Feedback Issue Tracking system (Interactive Test Suite)
Instrumentation and Testing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Microsoft Word 2000+
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Subversion 1v..44
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Merant PVCS
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Microsoft Visual Source Safe v.6.0
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	JIRA Issue Tracking v.3.6
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+;
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	JIRA Issue Tracking v.3.6

- 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)? **No**

- a. If “yes,” please describe. **N/A**

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

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

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this investment? **Yes**

a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? **07/02/2007**

b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternatives Analysis Results: Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Alternative 1: Baseline	In the Status Quo environment, ENGLink will be maintained as it exists today without doing any Development, Modernization, and Enhancement (DME) work. No major modifications will be made to the system, while yearly maintenance and operations will continue. This is a low-cost solution, but it fails to meet USACE requirements and many user needs. It also fails to add quality/productivity enhancements.	\$8,546,483 (FY09 – FY13)	\$0 (FY09 – FY13)
Alternative 2: ENGLink Redesign Java Enterprise (J2EE)	This option uses the popular J2EE development platform. The J2EE solution would emphasize the use of best practices in web application development. J2EE applications work on both Unix and Windows-based server architectures, requiring no change to existing hardware/software licensing. The redesign would allow the USACE to employ volunteers more rapidly. Advantages include low upgrade cost, large and experienced workforce, best ROI, and low risk due to technical maturity of platform.	\$10,706,729 (FY09 – FY13)	\$20,073,474 (FY09 – FY13)

Alternative 3: ENGLink Redesign Microsoft.net	The Microsoft.net solution consists of the usage of a variety of programming languages and tools. This solution requires Microsoft-based server architecture and upfront costs towards software licensing. USACE IT architecture is based upon the Unix operating system. Advantages include short development time and integration with Microsoft SharePoint portal technology. Disadvantages include higher cost, shortage of knowledgeable IT staff (due to immaturity of technology), and risks involved in architectural requirements.	\$11,406,969 (FY09 – FY13)	\$20,073,474 (FY09 – FY13)
Alternative 4: ENGLink Redesign Oracle Application Express	This option would slightly enhance, upgrade and improve the existing solution for ENGLink to meet future business requirements. Oracle Application Express is a low-cost solution that enables quick-project turnaround, but suffers when application complexity grows. This solution provides less flexibility in the application’s user interface and overall design. It does not meet ENGLink’s need for strict focus on business requirements and long-term viability.	\$9,854,025 (FY09 – FY13)	\$4,572,501 (FY09 – FY13)

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

Alternative 2: ENGLink Redesign using Java Enterprise (J2EE) as the development platform is the selected alternative. The alternatives analysis table above presents the costs and benefits of each alternative based on a 5-year life cycle (FY2009–FY2013). A redesign of the ENGLink system will result in productivity and efficiency gains. With the enhancements, the process for identifying individuals to be deployed during an emergency response will be automated. This will result in a reduction in the amount of time the Corp’s personnel spend manually filling a tasker request. In addition, tasker requests will be addressed in a faster turnaround time, which will prevent delays in deploying resources. ENGLink’s ground truth reporting mechanism will be revitalized by adhering to an entirely dynamic and abstract approach. Functionality will be added to provide users with a variety of options for creating reports and extrapolating data. Various filters will be provided to allow an ENGLink user to dynamically change the scope of report data to fit their criteria. The enhancements will be developed using a flexible architecture, wherein logical and functional changes can be further implemented with little to no changes of source code. These features will significantly reduce the time personnel spend building customized reports for users.

The Corp evaluated three options for implementing the ENGLink Redesign initiative. The current system is Oracle-based and the planned enhancements could be completed using this architecture. Upon further analysis, it was determined that this option would not significantly improve current business processes. The Corp also considered developing the enhanced system on a Microsoft.net architecture. The main drawback to this approach is the Corp’s IT architecture is based upon the Unix operating system. Moving to a Microsoft environment would not only increase costs, but also risks too. It would be more difficult to integrate ENGLink with other systems and there may be a lack of knowledgeable IT support staff.

Both Alternatives 2 and 3 result in the same quantitative and qualitative benefits; however, once costs and risks are considered, Alternative 2 is more desirable.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

The ENGLink redesign will provide the following qualitative benefits to the public, the Corp and its users:

Faster Response in Emergency Situations: The redesign initiative is centered around improving the Corp's preparedness for an emergency situation. The redesign will streamline and automate the process for identifying candidates for deployment when an emergency arises. It will enable the ENGLink system to recommend individuals that have the required qualifications and are available for deployment. This will eliminate the process of manually verifying an individual is approved for deployment and will enable the Corp to respond faster during an emergency.

Dynamic Reporting: ENGLink's reports allow access to just-in-time, critical information. The Deployment Module reports provide answers to staffing needs, logistical concern and the management of personnel. Another reporting feature is the Incident Reporting System, which is used for collecting and analyzing intelligence data. Previously, users only had access to canned reports, but with the redesign, users will have the ability to create their own reports through selecting criteria and report columns. Reports may then be exported to Excel for custom analysis.

User Interface: Users will see an improved and standardized user interface and specialized options depending on their role(s) within the Corps.

Communities of Practice: A centralized and collaborative environment will be created to allow users a mean for communicating and learning from other's best practices.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **No**

a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment? **N/A**

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

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

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **Yes**

a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **09/08/2006**

b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

No

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

There have been no significant changes to the Risk Management Plan. The ENGLink project team meets on a weekly basis to discuss risks. During these meetings, existing risks are tracked and new issues are identified. All risks are monitored by assigning an owner to each risk, developing a mitigation strategy that is incorporated into the project schedule, and tracking the current status of the risk.

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? **N/A**

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

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

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

In conducting the alternatives analysis, risks were identified for each of the alternatives. The risks were quantitatively evaluated for probability and cost impact. To estimate the cost impact, each risk is mapped to the cost elements it is likely to affect. The cost estimates are then adjusted to account for the risk. The investment's life cycle costs were estimated based on technical expertise and prior experience with developing and managing both the existing system and similar systems. The life cycle cost estimates reflect appropriate growth and economic escalation factors to project realistic life cycle costs in future years.

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

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

1 Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard – 748? **Yes**

2 Is the CV% or SV% greater than ± 10%? **No**

a. If “yes,” was it the CV and/or SV? **N/A**

b. If “yes,” explain the causes of the variance: **N/A**

c. If “yes,” describe the corrective actions: **N/A**

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? **Yes**

a. If “yes,” when was it approved by the agency head? **02/22/2007**

b. If “yes”, when was it approved by OMB? **09/11/2007**

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.*

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) Planned : Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned : Actual		Schedule: Cost (# days : \$M)		
1. FY05	09/30/2005	1.457	09/30/2005	09/30/2005	1.457	1.416	4380	0.041	100%
2. FY06 O&M Support	09/30/2006	0.931	09/30/2006	09/30/2006	0.931	0.931	4380	0.000	100%
3. FY06 ODCs and Travel	09/30/2006	0.065	09/30/2006	09/30/2006	0.065	0.046	4380	0.019	100%
4. FY06 Help Desk Support	09/30/2006	0.092	09/30/2006	09/30/2006	0.092	0.092	4380	0.000	100%
5. FY06 Web Page Management	09/30/2006	0.066	09/30/2006	09/30/2006	0.066	0.065	4380	0.001	100%
6. FY06 Training	09/30/2006	0.096	09/30/2006	09/30/2006	0.096	0.094	4380	0.002	100%
7. FY06	09/30/2006	0.042	09/30/2006	09/30/2006	0.042	0.041	4380	0.001	100%

Capital Planning Support									
8. FY06 Hardware / Software	09/30/2006	0.046	09/30/2006	09/30/2006	0.046	0.046	4380	0.000	100%
9. FY07 O&M Support	09/30/2007	0.980	09/30/2007	09/30/2007	0.980	0.800	4380	0.100	85%
10. FY07 ODCs and Travel	09/30/2007	0.066	09/30/2007	09/30/2007	0.066	0.035	4380	0.031	85%
11. FY07 Help Desk Support	09/30/2007	0.100	09/30/2007	09/30/2007	0.100	0.080	4380	0.020	85%
12. FY07 Web Page Management	09/30/2007	0.070	09/30/2007	09/30/2007	0.070	0.060	4380	0.010	85%
13. FY07 Training	09/30/2007	0.100	09/30/2007	09/30/2007	0.100	0.070	4380	0.030	85%
14. FY07 Capital Planning Support	09/30/2007	0.080	09/30/2007	09/30/2007	0.080	0.060	4380	0.020	85%
15. FY07 Hardware / Software	09/30/2007	0.030	09/30/2007	09/30/2007	0.030	0.030	4380	0	100%
16. FY08 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	09/30/2008	0.608	09/30/2008	-	0.608	0.081	1825	0.527	13%
17. FY08 ENGLink Redesign	09/30/2008	1.218	09/30/2008	-	1.218	0.121	1825	1.097	10%
18. FY08 Web Page Management	09/30/2008	0.080	09/30/2008	-	0.080	-	0	-	0%
19. FY08 Training	09/30/2008	0.105	09/30/2008	-	0.105	-	0	-	0%
20. FY08 Capital Planning Support	09/30/2008	0.060	09/30/2008	-	0.060	-	0	-	0%
21. FY08 Security	09/30/2008	0.140	09/30/2008	-	0.140	-	0	-	0%
22. FY08 Hardware/ Software	09/30/2008	0.050	09/30/2008	-	0.050	-	0	-	0%
23. FY08 O&M Support	09/30/2008	0.500	09/30/2008	-	0.500	-	0	-	0%
24. FY09 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	09/30/2009	0.758	09/30/2009	-	0.758	-	0	-	0%

25. FY09 ENGLink Redesign	09/30/2009	1.236	09/30/2009	-	1.236	-	0	-	0%
26. FY09 Web Page Management	09/30/2009	0.138	09/30/2009	-	0.138	-	0	-	0%
27. FY09 Training	09/30/2009	0.110	09/30/2009	-	0.110	-	0	-	0%
28. FY09 Capital Planning Support	09/30/2009	0.060	09/30/2009	-	0.060	-	0	-	0%
29. FY09 Security	09/30/2009	0.145	09/30/2009	-	0.145	-	0	-	0%
30. FY09 Hardware/Software	09/30/2009	0.035	09/30/2009	-	0.035	-	0	-	0%
31. FY09 O&M Support	09/30/2009	0.300	09/30/2009	-	0.300	-	0	-	0%
32. FY10 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	09/30/2010	0.775	09/30/2010	-	0.775	-	0	-	0%
33. FY10 ENGLink Redesign	09/30/2010	1.283	09/30/2010	-	1.283	-	0	-	0%
34. FY10 Web Page Management	09/30/2010	0.153	09/30/2010	-	0.153	-	0	-	0%
35. FY10 Training	09/30/2010	0.118	09/30/2010	-	0.118	-	0	-	0%
36. FY10 Capital Planning Support	09/30/2010	0.061	09/30/2010	-	0.061	-	0	-	0%
37. FY10 Security	09/30/2010	0.153	09/30/2010	-	0.153	-	0	-	0%
38. FY10 Hardware/Software	09/30/2010	0.296	09/30/2010	-	0.296	-	0	-	0%
39. FY10 O&M Support	09/30/2010	0.205	09/30/2010	-	0.205	-	0	-	0%
40. FY11 ENGLink O&M	09/30/2011	1.580	09/30/2011	-	1.580	-	0	-	0%
41. FY12 ENGLink O&M	09/30/2012	1.616	09/30/2012	-	1.616	-	0	-	0%
42. FY13 ENGLink O&M	09/30/2013	1.653	09/30/2013	-	1.653	-	0	-	0%

Part III: For “Operation and Maintenance” investments ONLY (Steady State)

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.

Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes No

a. If “yes,” what is the date of the plan?

b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year’s submission to OMB? Yes No

c. If “yes,” describe any significant changes:

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

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 No

a. If “yes,” provide the date the analysis was completed.

b. If “yes,” what were the results?

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)?

2. b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table:					
Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance
	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M)	Schedule:Cost (# days:\$M)