RCV Modernization

Budget year: FY2008
Agency: 200

This Exhibit was submitted on Sep 6, 2006 2:08:38 PM by GREGG ALDANA.

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary
Part I: Summary Information And Justification

Section A: Overview

1. Date of submission: **Aug 31, 2006**

2. Agency: **200**

3. Bureau: **45**

4. Name of this Capital Asset: **RCV Modernization**

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **200-45-01-03-01-0001-00**

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? **Acquisition**

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? **FY2008**

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: **The Selective Service System's Registration, Registration Maintenance, Registration Compliance, Registration Verification and Health Care Personnel Delivery System applications and data are currently hosted in an IBM z/OS mainframe environment designed and set-up in the late 1980s/early 1990s. SSS seeks to secure a vendor(s) to lead and execute a complete project (from planning through implementation) to redesign all of its existing mainframe applications and migrate all of its mainframe data from a COBOL, CICS, batch JCL, VSAM and SAS SYSTEM 2000 computing environment to an enivronment in alignment with the standards profile the agency's Enterprise Architecture. As part of the Selective Service System's technology standards profile in its Enterprise Architecture, the Microsoft development platform has been standardized across the agency for all future software development efforts. The purpose of this rewrite/migration will be to decrease operating and maintenance costs, ensure system compliance with all Federal Security (FISMA, NIST, etc.) and Information Technology requirements (Clinger Cohen Act, Paperwork Reduction Act, etc.), increase technical capabilities of the applications and allow seamless integration with the other systems/data**

throughout the agency's Enterprise Architecture. Secondarily the SSS would like to reduce its ongoing recurring costs to operate/support the mainframe and the cost of increased or standby capacity. In addition, SSS is now being required by the White House (OMB Memorandum M-06-16) to incorporate more stringent security measures into their systems to protect access to sensitive data. SSS is seeking a vendor that is knowledgeable and has specific experience in building information systems in alignment with the Selective Service System's Enterprise Architecture Standards Profile that comply with all Federal Security and Information Technology mandates.

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

   a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Sep 6, 2006**

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**

11. Contact information of Project Manager?
    Name **Gregg Aldana**
    Phone Number **703 605 4079**
    E-mail **gregg.aldana@sss.gov**

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energyefficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. **no**

    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) **[Not answered]**

       1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? **[Not answered]**

       2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? **[Not answered]**

       3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? **[Not answered]**

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? **yes**
    Expanded E-Government

    a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **Expanded Electronic Government - The new system will be migrating off of the legacy mainframe environment to a modern Windows Environment. All applications will be browser based and enable SSS to offer all pre mobilization and post Mobilization functions via Internet. The new platform will also allow SSS to interface with other government entities to exchange information via secured web services for standard interfaces and rapid turnaround on processing of information requests.**

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? **[Not answered]**

    b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? **[Not answered]**

    c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? **[Not answered]**

15. Is this investment for information technology? **yes**

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **Level 3**

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment**

18. Is this investment 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? **no**

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

      1. If "yes," which compliance area: [Not answered]

      2. If "no," what does it address? [Not answered]

   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 [Not answered]

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following?

   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 **Susan Cappo**

   Phone Number **(847) 688-7911**

   Title **Manager of Data Management Center**

   E-mail **susan.cappo@sss.gov**

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

Section B: Summary of Spending

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 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY+1 2009	BY+2 2010	BY+3 2011	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	45000	0	0	0	0	0	0	45000
Acquisition:	0	0	0	1600000	0	0	0	0	1600000
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0	45000	0	1600000	0	0	0	0	1645000
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	0	0	50000	50000	50000	50000	200000
TOTAL:	0	45000	0	1600000	50000	50000	50000	50000	1845000
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0	83616	0	421772.65	600000	421772.65	300000	300000	2127161.3
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	0	0	0	4	6	4	3	3	20

1.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? **yes**

   a. If "yes", How many and in what year? **2 in 2009**

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: [Not answered]

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Contract or Task Order Number	None
Type of Contract/Task Order	None
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Jan 1, 1900
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Jan 1, 1900
End date of Contract/Task Order	Jan 1, 1900
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M)	0
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	no
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	no
Name of CO	None
CO Contact information	None
Contracting Officer Certification Level	NA
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	no

1.

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 answered]**

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

    a. Explain why: **It is a technical requirement that all GUI interfaces to the system be 508a so that any employees with disablities can use the new system.**

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **no**

    a. If "yes," what is the date? **[Not answered]**

    b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? **[Not answered]**

        1. If "no," briefly explain why: **[Not answered]**

Section D: Performance Information

Performance Information Table 1:					
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2008	Goal 1: Ensure preparedness and the capacity to timely provide manpower to DoD during a national emergency.	Earned Value Management - performance will be mesured on a weekly basis - % of completed tasks vs. project tasks	0	100	0

Performance Information Table 2:					

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2008	Technology	System Development	This effort will be measured and evaluated interms of annual operation cost savings of registration information systems.	The current annual operating costs of the registration information systems (not including FTE) exceed $400,000 anually.	90% Reduction	[Not answered]

Section E: Security and Privacy

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: **0**

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 - Security Table:			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date
RCV Portal	Government Only	Dec 1, 2008	Nov 1, 2008

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
There are no Operational Systems.							

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? **yes**

   a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? **yes**

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. **[Not answered]**

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **[Not answered]**

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Is the PIA available to the public?	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?
RCV Portal	yes	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? **yes**
   a. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]

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. **RCV Portal**
   b. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]

3. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table :							
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	Service Component Reused		Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
				Component Name	UPI		
There are no Serivce Components.							

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
There are no mappings to Technical Reference Models.				

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? **no**
   a. If "yes," please describe. [Not answered]

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system? **no**
   a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)? [Not answered]
      1. If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services). [Not answered]

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? **yes**
   a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? **Aug 15, 2006**
   b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? [Not answered]
   c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: [Not answered]

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
Alternative Analyzed	**Description of Alternative**	**Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate**	**Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate**
Microsoft.net SQL Server Solution	This alternative employs a strategy of redesigning/rewriting CICS/COBOL online/batch code as object oriented .NET real-time applications and redesigning/rewriting the inefficient manual batch JCL/COBOL applications to automated native Microsoft applications that process data in real-time from an open and scalable SQL Server relational database. Projected to take 12 months to implement and cost $2,000,000. Provide a complete ROI on the investment within 6 years.	6267030	0
Java Oracle Solution	This alternative employs a strategy of redesigning/rewriting CICS/COBOL online/batch code as object oriented JSP real-time applications and redesigning/rewriting the inefficient manual batch JCL/COBOL applications to automated native Oracle/JAVA based applications that process data in real-time in an open and scalable Oracle relational database. Projected to take 24 months to implement and cost $3,127,000. Provide a complete ROI within 11 years.	7632000	0
Fujitsu Software Microsoft.net SQL Server Solution	This alternative employs a two phased strategy of first using Proprietary Fujitsu Software (NetCOBOL/NeoKicks) that would run the CICS/COBOL online/batch code and the inefficient manual batch JCL/COBOL applications "as is" on the Microsoft platform. The second phase would consist of the migration outlined in the first alternative above. Projected to take 18 months to implement and cost $2,415,600. Provide a complete ROI within 8 years.	6537820	0

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **Clearly the best suited alternative for the SSS environment was the Microsoft.net/SQL Server solution. In addition to the shortest return on investment, it provided the SSS with the proper technical solution. Given the type of processing applications SSS has (data processing vs. ecommerce intensive), given the technical staff set currently available at SSS (COBOL and dataflex developers) and given the limited IT capital spending available to SSS, this solution was ideally matched for our environment. The Microsoft development tools and platform are well suited for environment's that require building data intensive web applications in a rapid manner with limited costs and require a rapid learning curve for legacy developers. This standard has been set for the IT Directorate for all future software development efforts. The new development platform is also outlined in the agency's Standards Profile as required by OMB in the Agency's Enterprise Architecture Document. The selected alternative will provide a new system, with real-time processing capabilities, will virtually eliminate all of the manual staff interaction previously required to process data. The new system will be robust and able to scale up or down, as the Agency's needs dictate. The new solution will be designed and developed to meet all Federal Information Technology Requirements (Clinger Cohen Act, Paperwork Reduction Act, etc.) and allow for the seamless integration of all stringent security measures for protecting and tracking access to sensitive information that meet the current (OMB Memorandum M-06-16) as well as future federal mandates for the Agency. The migration from the mainframe to a Microsoft-based platform will dramatically reduce SSS's operating costs by 90% to less than $50K annually.**

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **o Provide a significant cost reduction of operating costs of production environment (from $400,000 to less than $50,000 annually) o Provide a highly scalable architecture where it is much less expensive to add resources should the need arise to significantly increase the processing capacity of the DMC. o Provide a system built on a Platform technology capable of meeting all current and future Federal Security Mandates (OMB, FISMA, NIST, etc) for Protecting and Tracking Access to Sensitive Data. o Provide a new system that ensures compliance with all federal information technology requirements (Clinger Cohen Act, Paperwork Reduction Act, etc.) o Provide significant performance enhancements over current mainframe system. o Provide superior production monitoring and ABEND handling environment. o Provide a superior and agile development environment allowing faster turnaround for changes in shorter elapsed time for new development. o Provide a modern system where all data and source code is baselined**

and changes/modifications can be tracked easily.

Section B: Risk Management

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **yes**
   a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **Aug 22, 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: [Not answered]

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? [Not answered]
   a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? [Not answered]
   b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? [Not answered]

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **Mitgation Plans that have been idnetified in the Risk Assessment have lead to specific task/action plabns and requirments being included in this project in order to bothe monitor and address all risk identified proactively.**

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? **yes**

2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):
   a. What is the Planned Value (PV)? **O**
   b. What is the Earned Value (EV)? **O**
   c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? **O**
   d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? **Contractor and Government**
   e. "As of" date: **Sep 6, 2006**

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

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

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

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

7. Is the CV% or SV% greater than ± 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) **no**
   a. If "yes," was it the? [Not answered]
   b. If "yes," explain the variance: [Not answered]
   c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken? [Not answered]
   d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"? **O**

8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year? **no**

a.   If "yes," when was it approved by OMB? [Not answered]

9. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:							
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline			Current Baseline Variance	
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned/Actual	Total Cost ($M) Planned/Actual		Schedule/Cost (# days/$M)	Percent Complete
Complete Project	Dec 1, 2008	2	Dec 1, 2008	Dec 1, 2008	2	0	0	0	0