

Exhibit 300 (BY2008)

| PART ONE | |
|--|---|
| OVERVIEW | |
| 1. Date of Submission: | 2007-02-05 |
| 2. Agency: | 009 |
| 3. Bureau: | 70 |
| 4. Investment Name: | ACF GrantSolutions.gov / Grants Administration Tracking Evaluation System (GATES) - Grants Center of Excellence |
| 5. UPI: | 009-70-04-00-01-1326-24 |
| 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? | |
| Mixed Life Cycle | |
| 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? | |
| FY2002 | |
| 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. | |
| <p>The ACF Grants Center of Excellence (CoE) operates GrantSolutions.gov / Grants Administration, Tracking and Evaluation System (GrantsSolutions.gov/GATES). GrantSolutions.gov/GATES is one of two component systems of the Department's Enterprise-wide Grants Management System: (1) GrantSolutions.gov/GATES enables ACF to function as a full-fledged grants processing organization capable of supporting its expanded customer base of HHS service grant-making OPDIVs and (2) the NIH IMPAC II system supports research grants. This investment provides for system enhancements and service delivery improvements as the various service grant management and reporting processes currently in use at HHS OPDIVS are unified, streamlined and standardized across the Department. This initiative is pursuant to the Secretary's "One HHS" goal, and is consistent with the HHS Strategic Plan goal to achieve excellence in management practices, and will enhance the use of information technology in service delivery and record keeping by improving the accessibility and functionality of the technology. The CoE has been named a Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) consortia provider. Functionally, GrantSolutions.gov/GATES is used by grants officers and specialists to manage their grant programs and process grant applications from receipt through award. Financial information is exchanged electronically with the HHS accounting system (the Unified Financial Management System – UFMS). GrantSolutions.gov/GATES is undergoing some modernization effort by moving from client-server to web based architecture, along with redesigning its data architecture, to enable GrantSolutions.gov/GATES to support the E-Gov initiatives in the President's Management Agenda. This investment positions the CoE to support other PMA strategies e.g. Improved Financial Performance, Budget and Performance Integration, and Strategic Management of Human Capital. ACF will follow the agency's capital programming process and related techniques to determine GrantSolutions.gov/GATES' effectiveness in supporting the HHS and ACF mission and strategic goals, and identify and implement needed improvements. Funding for the mixed life-cycle of this project encompasses operations and maintenance of the legacy GATES system, the migration of HHS OPDIVs to GrantSolutions.gov/GATES, and other improvements in support of the GMLoB, and other PMA initiatives.</p> | |
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | |
| yes | |
| 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | |
| yes | |
| 12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. | |
| yes | |
| 12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? | |
| yes | |
| 12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) | |
| no | |
| 13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives? | |
| yes | |

If yes, select the initiatives that apply:

Budget Performance Integration

Competitive Sourcing

Expanded E-Government

Faith Based and Community

Financial Performance

Human Capital

13.a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?

Expanded E-Government: In the past, GATES consolidated some 40 separate ACF grants programs into one system. Due to this success, HHS chose GATES to support other OPDIVS within the Department. By 2005, GATES was providing grant support to AoA, IHS, OPHS, and CMS. In 2006, OMB chose GrantSolutions.gov/GATES as a GMLoB consortia provider. USDA was the first non-HHS agency to link to GrantSolutions.gov/GATES, achieving E-Gov performance gains across agency borders in support of the PMA. See Question 8.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?

no

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

no

15. Is this investment for information technology (See section 53 for definition)?

yes

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

Level 2

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's 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 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's high risk memo)?

no

19. Is this a financial management system?

yes

19.a. If yes, does this investment address a FFMA compliance area?

yes

19.a.1. If yes, which compliance area:

Obligations and costs are in compliance with applicable law

19.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 A11 section 52.

GrantSolutions.gov/GATES - Grants Center of Excellence

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Hardware | 0 |
|-----------------|---|

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Software | 0 |
|-----------------|---|

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| Services | 100 |
|-----------------|-----|

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Other | 0 |
|--------------|---|

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

n/a

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

Name

David Jenkins

Phone Number

202-690-5802

Title

Senior Privacy Official

Email

david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov

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

yes

SUMMARY OF SPEND

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.

All amounts represent Budget Authority

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

| | PY-1 & Earlier | PY | CY | BY |
|--|----------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | -2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Planning Budgetary Resources | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Acquisition Budgetary Resources | 0.770 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 0.000 |
| Maintenance Budgetary Resources | 3.580 | 3.580 | 3.585 | 3.664 |
| Government FTE Cost | 0.180 | 0.180 | 0.180 | 0.190 |
| # of FTEs | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Note: For the cross-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

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

Budget estimates differ slightly due to a re-baselining

PERFORMANCE

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 Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Table 1

| | Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Performance Measure | Actual/baseline (from Previous Year) | Planned Performance Metric (Target) | Performance Metric Results (Actual) |
|---|-------------|---|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | 2005 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | Number of HHS OPDIV service grant management programs transitioning to the GATES business processes | One HHS OPDIV-specific (AoA) service grants management business process | Three additional OPDIVs transitioned to GATES business processes by end of FY 2005 | Three (IHS, OPHS, and CMS) |
| 2 | 2006 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | Number of HHS OPDIV service grant management programs transitioning to the GrantSolutions.gov/GATES business processes | Four HHS OPDIV-specific service grants management business processes | Two additional OPDIVs transitioned to GrantSolutions.gov/GATES business processes by end of FY 2006 | TBD |
| 3 | 2005 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | Number of OPDIV-specific service grant management systems consolidated to the GATES system | One HHS OPDIV-specific (AoA) service grants management IT systems in operation | Three additional OPDIV-specific grants systems retired; consolidated on the GATES system by end of FY 2005 | Three (IHS, OPHS, and CMS) |
| 4 | 2006 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | Number of OPDIV-specific service grant management systems consolidated to the GrantSolutions.gov/GATES system | Four HHS OPDIV-specific service grants management IT systems in operation | Two additional OPDIV-specific grants systems retired; consolidated on the GrantSolutions.gov/GATES system by end of FY 2006 | TBD |
| 5 | 2005 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | Percent of electronic applications for ACF competitive discretionary grants opportunities posted through the GATES interface with Grants.gov | 60% of ACF competitive discretionary grants opportunities on Grants.gov have application packages posted electronically via the portal as of end of FY 2004 | 100% of ACF competitive discretionary grants opportunities posted on Grants.gov have corresponding application packages posted by end of FY 2005 | 100% |
| 6 | 2005 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; | Percent of electronic applications for ACF competitive discretionary grants opportunities posted through the | 1% of HHS service grant applications received electronically via | 20% of GATES grant applications received via Grants.gov by end of FY 2005 | 20% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|---|---|--|-----|
| | | ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | GATES interface with Grants.gov | Grants.gov portal | | |
| 7 | 2006 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | Percent of electronic applications for ACF competitive discretionary grants opportunities posted through the GrantSolutions.gov/GATES interface with Grants.gov | 10% of HHS service grant applications received electronically via Grants.gov portal | 20% of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES grant applications received via Grants.gov by end of FY 2006 | TBD |
| 8 | 2005 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | Percent of HHS grant submission progress and financial reports filed electronically through the GATES-OLDC system | 10% of HHS grantee progress and financial reports received electronically through the GATES-OLDC system | 50% of GATES grantee progress and financial reports received through GATES-OLDC system by end of FY 2005 | 50% |
| 9 | 2006 | HHS Goal 8: Achieve Excellence in Management Practices; ACF Goal 4: Manage Resources to Improve Performance | Percent of HHS grant submission progress and financial reports filed electronically through the GrantSolutions.gov/GATES-OLDC system | 20% of HHS service grants applications received electronically from the Grants.gov portal | 65% of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES grantee progress and financial reports received through GrantSolutions.gov/GATES-OLDC system by end of FY 2006 | TBD |

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. 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 at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

Table 2

| | Fiscal Year | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Planned Improvement to the Baseline | Actual Results |
|---|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2005 | Mission and Business Results | Information Management | Number of service grant system funding development contracts | Four Contracts | Reduce to one contract (Enterprise GATES) | Reduced to one contract |
| 2 | 2005 | Mission and Business Results | Information Management | Number of OPDIV-unique grants processes and policies | Three OPDIV-unique systems | Reduce to one system (Enterprise GATES) | Reduced to one system |
| 3 | 2005 | Customer Results | Customer Impact or Burden | Percent of HHS social service grants managed through GATES | 54% | Increase to 86% | Increased to 86% |
| 4 | 2005 | Processes and Activities | Efficiency | 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 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 5 | 2005 | Technology | Availability | Percent of time for scheduled availability of GATES | 99.0% scheduled availability | Increase to 99.5% scheduled availability | Increased to 99.5% |
| 6 | 2006 | Mission and Business Results | Information Management | Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within Enterprise GATES | Four OPDIVs (AoA, OPHS, HIS, CMS) | Increase to six OPDIVs | TBD |
| 7 | 2006 | Mission and Business Results | Information Management | 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 |
| 8 | 2006 | Mission and Business Results | Information Management | Level of E-Authentication | E-Authentication level 1 | Increase to E-Authentication level 2 | Increased to E-Authentication level 2 |
| 9 | 2006 | Customer Results | Customer Impact or Burden | Percent of grants applications processed via eGrants | 10% of grant applications via eGrants | Increase to 20% of grant applications via eGrants | TBD |
| 10 | 2006 | Customer Results | Customer Impact or Burden | Percent of grants reporting processed via OLDC | 10% of grantees reporting via OLDC | Increase to 50% of grantees reporting via OLDC | TBD |
| 11 | 2006 | Customer Results | Access | 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 | TBD |
| 12 | 2006 | Processes and Activities | Efficiency | Number of days between submission of grant application to initiation of HHS Review | one day | Maintain one day | Maintained one day |
| 13 | 2006 | Processes and Activities | Efficiency | Number of days to review and approve GrantSolutions.gov/GATES grant applications | Up to 90 days to review and approve grant applications | Reduce 20%, or up to 72 days, to review and approve grant applications | TBD |
| 14 | 2006 | Technology | Availability | Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES | 99.5% scheduled availability | Increase to 99.9% scheduled availability | TBD |
| 15 | 2006 | Technology | Load levels | Software requirements for a GrantSolutions.gov/GATES client workstation | 6 MB | Reduce to 0 MB (web browser based access) | TBD |
| 16 | 2007 | Mission and Business Results | Information Management | Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES | Six OPDIVs | Increase to seven OPDIV | TBD |
| 17 | 2007 | Customer Results | Customer Impact or Burden | Percent of grants applications processed via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES | 20% of grant applications via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES | Increase to 25% of grant applications via e GrantSolutions.gov/GATES | TBD |
| 18 | 2007 | Customer Results | Customer Impact or Burden | Percent of grants reporting processed via OLDC | 50% of grantees reporting via OLDC | Increase to 55% of grantees reporting via OLDC | TBD |
| 19 | 2007 | Processes and Activities | Efficiency | Number of days to review and approve GrantSolutions.gov/GATES grant applications | Up to 72 days to review and approve grant applications | Reduce 20%, or up to 58 days, to review and approve grant applications | TBD |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------|------------|--------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 20 | 2007 | Technology | Availability | Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES | 99.9% scheduled availability | Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability | TBD |
|----|------|------------|--------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|

EA

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

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

yes

2.a. If yes, provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

GrantSolutions.gov/GATES - Grants Center of Excellence

3. 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.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

Component: Use existing SRM Components or identify as NEW. A NEW component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

Reused Name and UPI: 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.

Internal or External Reuse?: 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.

Funding Percentage: Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

| | Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | Service Type | Component | Reused Component Name | Reused UPI | Internal or External Reuse? | Funding % |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Budget Planning | The budget planning process consists of a series of activities dealing with the preparation of budgets for grant monies for the Awarding Agency offices, review of these budgets, negotiations, congressional approval, and development of operating plans. | Management of Processes | Program / Project Management | Program / Project Management | | Internal | 3 |
| 2 | Funds Allotment and Control | When funds are appropriated by Congress, the funds are allotted to the various Awarding Agency | Management of Processes | Program / Project Management | Program / Project Management | | Internal | 4 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------|---|
| | | offices. Funds planning and control deals with the apportionment, allotment, quarterly allowance, and management of such appropriated funds. | | | | | | |
| 3 | Program Planning | Program offices develop program priorities, action plans, schedules and resource planning, which includes developing a pool of reviewers and reviewer panels. | Management of Processes | Governance / Policy Management | Governance / Policy Management | | Internal | 6 |
| 4 | Announcements | The program announcement is used to advertise to appropriate applicant communities and to solicit proposals for a defined activity. | Customer Preferences | Alerts and Notifications | Alerts and Notifications | | External | 4 |
| 5 | Application Review (Discretionary) | For discretionary grants, the office designated to receive grant applications logs the receipt of each application and screens it to determine whether it is received on time, is an eligible recipient, and that the applicant has submitted the necessary forms. | Management of Processes | Quality Management | Quality Management | | External | 5 |
| 6 | Grantee Eligibility Determination (F/B and Entitlement) | For formula/block grants and entitlement grants eligibility is determined on a fiscal year basis. Approval of eligibility is made and results of such approvals are recorded into GATES. | Management of Processes | Quality Management | Quality Management | | External | 5 |
| 7 | Allocation Determination (F/B) | Annual grant allocations are calculated. The allocation amount defines a ceiling limit for grant awards in a given fiscal year. | Financial Management | Activity-Based Management | Activity-Based Management | | External | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------|---|
| 8 | State Plan Review (Entitlement) | For entitlement grants, program offices request initial state plans. Once these plans are received, they are reviewed. If approved, states are notified of the approvals. | Management of Processes | Quality Management | Quality Management | | External | 5 |
| 9 | Estimated & Actual Expenditures (Entitlement) | Regional review figures are estimated against the actual expenditures for a state. These estimates and actual expenditures are then approved in this process. | Business Intelligence | Decision Support and Planning | Decision Support and Planning | | External | 5 |
| 10 | Grantee Budget Determination (Discretionary) | This process of discretionary grants involves an analysis of grantee budget determination; approval of funding conditions; and, negotiation of revisions. If approvals are made, options for revisions are explained to the grantee and revision results recorded. | Management of Processes | Quality Management | Quality Management | | External | 5 |
| 11 | Award | Upon receiving the decision list, and with a certification that funds are available, the grants office/program team reviews the information to determine the negotiations necessary to award the grant. Following negotiation with the applicant, grant award information is entered into GATES. The award document is then mailed to the grantee. | Financial Management | Activity-Based Management | Activity-Based Management | | External | 4 |
| 12 | Grant Reporting | Grants offices monitor grants through one-on-one communication with the grantee | Management of Processes | Quality Management | Quality Management | | External | 4 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------|---|
| | | and through site visits. Financial and program progress reports are required periodically. | | | | | | |
| 13 | Audit Tracking | Grantees are required to have an audit performed every year. This ensures grantee compliance with proper accounting and usage of grant funds. These audits are either carried out by a governmentally designated auditor or an independent auditing firm. | Financial Management | Auditing | Auditing | | External | 4 |
| 14 | Close Grant | At the end of the project period, the grants office/program team closes out the grant. This requires determining whether the grantee has met the programmatic, fiscal, and administrative requirements of the grant and has complied with all rules and regulations. When satisfied that everything is in order, the grants office/program team notifies the grantee and the program office of its intent to close the grant and, barring any objection, the grant is closed. | Tracking and Workflow | Case Management | Case Management | | External | 5 |
| 15 | Inquiry Response and Accounting Monitoring | Several administrative, management and informative reports are made in response to internal and external inquiries. These inquiries include Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and some Congressional | Customer Relationship Management | Partner Relationship Management | Partner Relationship Management | | External | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|----------|---|
| | | reports made periodically. | | | | | | |
| 16 | Supporting Processes (System & Grant Administration) | Several administrative processes complement the grants management process, including systems processes such as setting up of Project Cycles, Programs, and Reviews. | Management of Processes | Program / Project Management | Program / Project Management | | External | 2 |

4. 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: 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.

Service Specification: 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.

| | SRM Component | Service Area | Service Category | Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name) |
|----|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 1 | Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Enterprise Server, Mainframe |
| 2 | Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Windows 2000, Windows.net, Mac OS X |
| 3 | Program / Project Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Internet | Internet |
| 4 | Program / Project Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Intranet | Intranet |
| 5 | Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Oracle, SQL Server, Sybase |
| 6 | Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage | NAS, SAN |
| 7 | Program / Project Management | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Dependent | Windows 2000, Windows.net, Mac OS X |
| 8 | Governance / Policy Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Supporting Network Services | SSLTCP, FTP, IP, HTTP, HTTPS |
| 9 | Governance / Policy Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Enterprise Server, Mainframe |
| 10 | Governance / Policy Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) | LAN, VLAN |
| 11 | Alerts and Notifications | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Web Browser | IE, Firefox |
| 12 | Alerts and Notifications | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Internet | Internet |
| 13 | Quality Management | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | XMI, SOAP |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 14 | Quality Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Windows 2000, Windows.net, Mac OS X |
| 15 | Quality Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Oracle, SQL Server, Sybase |
| 16 | Quality Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage | NAS, SAN |
| 17 | Quality Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Virtual Private Network (VPN) | VPN |
| 18 | Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Windows 2000, Windows.net, Mac OS X |
| 19 | Activity-Based Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Intranet | Intranet |
| 20 | Quality Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | JDBC, ADO, DAO |
| 21 | Quality Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | JOLAP, XBRL, OLAP |
| 22 | Quality Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | E-mail, Fax |
| 23 | Quality Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Other Electronic Channels | URL, System to System |
| 24 | Decision Support and Planning | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Dependent | Windows 2000, Windows.net, Mac OS X |
| 25 | Decision Support and Planning | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Intranet | Intranet |
| 26 | Quality Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | E-mail, Fax |
| 27 | Quality Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Intranet | Intranet |
| 28 | Quality Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Internet | Internet |
| 29 | Quality Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | JOLAP, XBRL, OLAP |
| 30 | Activity-Based Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | JDBC, ODBC, ADO |
| 31 | Activity-Based Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | E-Mail, Fax |
| 32 | Activity-Based Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Intranet | Intranet |
| 33 | Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Windows 2000, Windows.net, Mac OS X |
| 34 | Quality Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | E-mail, Fax |
| 35 | Quality Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | JOLAP, XBRL, OLAP |
| 36 | Auditing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Windows 2000, Windows.net, Mac OS X |
| 37 | Auditing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Enterprise Server, Mainframe |
| 38 | Case Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | XBRL, JOLAP, OLAP |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 39 | Case Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Oracle, SQL Server, Sybase |
| 40 | Case Management | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Internet | Internet |
| 41 | Case Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Windows 2000, Windows.net, Mac OS X |
| 42 | Case Management | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | XMI, SOAP |
| 43 | Partner Relationship Management | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | XMI, SOAP |
| 44 | Partner Relationship Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | E-mail, Fax |
| 45 | Program / Project Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Supporting Network Services | TCP, FTP, IP, HTTP, HTTPS |
| 46 | Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Enterprise Server, Mainframe |
| 47 | Program / Project Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) | LAN, VLAN |

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

yes

5.a. If yes, please describe.

The HHS Grants Systems Consolidation initiative is fostering internal consolidation to systems such as GrantSolutions.gov/GATES (for HHS service grants) that are leaders in leveraging the services of the Grants.gov cross-government services. The existing GrantSolutions.gov/GATES system will be the leveraged resource for processing and managing service grants for the HHS service grant-making OPDIVs. Note also that GrantSolutions.gov/GATES has been selected by the OMB as a GMLoB service provider, in addition to the National Science Foundation and Department of Education. The National Science Foundation system supports only research grants, and the Department of Education system is still in the planning and design stages, hence GrantSolutions.gov/GATES is the only OMB-approved grants service provider at present capable of supporting the full range of non-research federal grant types.

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?

no

PART TWO

RISK

You should perform a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of the investment's life-cycle, develop 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.

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

yes

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

2006-06-30

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

no

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: (O&M investments do NOT need to answer.)

All identified risks have been managed or are in the process of being managed. Costs associated with the remaining risks have been incorporated into the life cycle cost estimate and schedule risks have been considered when establishing the

program schedule.

COST & SCHEDULE

Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard 748?

no

2.a. What is the Planned Value (PV)?

0.810

2.b. What is the Earned Value (EV)?

0.809

2.c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?

0.819

What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information?

Contractor Only

2.e. As of date:

2006-12-31

3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)?

1

4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?

-0.001

5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?

0.99

6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)?

-0.010

7. Is the CV or SV greater than 10%?

no

7.d. What is most current Estimate at Completion?

1.792

8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?

no