

## **Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary**

### **Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)**

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

1. Date of Submission: 9/6/2008
2. Agency: Small Business Administration
3. Bureau: Government Contracting and Business Development
4. Name of this Capital Asset: GCBD: Business Development Management Information System
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 028-00-01-03-01-3004-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) 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:

BDMIS is a Mixed-Lifecycle investment that facilitates SBA's management of the 8(a) program. The planned final modernized solution consists of three integrated components: 1) 8(a) Certification E-Application, 2) 8(a) Electronic Annual Review, and 3) Back Office functionality. The latter includes reporting and analytics, as well as support for other SBA programs, such as Surplus Property, Joint Ventures, Mentor Protege Agreements, etc. Currently, the system consist of two operational components; 1) the legacy SACS/Medcor application (migrated to an Oracle/Java environment in FY07) and 2) 8a Certification E-Application (on the Symplicity platform). Although operational, neither component fully meets statutory, regulatory, or SBA's requirements. In addition, the Administrator requested the creation of new management level reports, currently unavailable on either component. Finally, the components are not in compliance with the SBA's Enterprise Architecture.

As a result of these deficiencies, SBA is pursuing its goal of modernizing the 8(a) management information system via a new remediation effort. It is superior to previous remediation plans, as it delivers the benefit stream to the customer a year earlier than anticipated in the earlier plans, while at lower cost. These benefits include the ability for the public to apply for, obtain and maintain their 8a status using the new system, again a year earlier than anticipated.

A key element of this new effort is to incorporate the OCIO Segment Architecture into the design and implementation of the system, through close collaboration with the OCIO Enterprise Architect.

This effort incorporates five (5) other specific activities: 1) migrate the current production 8a Certification E-Application from the existing hosted Symplicity platform to a PHP platform on the OCIO premises, 2) develop the Reporting Components mandated by the Administrator and migrate them to the new OCIO production environment, 3) develop the Annual Review functionality and migrate it to the new OCIO production environment, 4) complete enhancements to address ongoing issues to both the existing 8a Certification E-Application and 8a Annual review application and migrate them to the OCIO production environment, and 5) convert the PHP environment on the OCIO premises to bring it into full compliance with the SBA Enterprise Architecture (i.e., convert the database to Oracle and re-write the entire application in Java).

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
- a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 7/18/2006
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient 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) 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? No

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

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?)

This system allows the public to enter all information electronically for the 8a/SDB Certification process and the subsequent Annual Review process, via a readily accessible and user friendly web-interface. The system is equipped with internal analytics to vastly speed up the processing time for new applications and annual eligibility reviews, reducing wait time for 8a SDB applicants/participants. The above features will result in a significant improvement in service quality to the public.

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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part).) Yes

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

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

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

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

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

For information technology investments only:

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

17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 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 FFIA compliance area? No

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

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

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

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	0.000000
Software	10.000000
Services	90.000000
Other	0.000000

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? Yes

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

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

Records Administration's approval?

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? No

**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 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.1	0	0	0.05					
Acquisition:	0.918	0.545	0.25	0.25					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	1.018	0.545	0.25	0.30					
Operations & Maintenance:	0.487	0.167	0.103158	0.106665					
TOTAL:	1.505	0.712	0.353158	0.406665					
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	0.564	0.204	0.204	0.204					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	5	2	2	2					

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? 1 Fulltime Project Manager beginning FY 2007

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: This project was originally funded for DME in 2003 through 2005. Steady state operations were supposed to commence in 2006, with no further DME, and a relatively stable and low maintenance/hosting cost. However, deficiencies in the system uncovered by t

**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:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA 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)
SBAHQ07FO193/GS35FO440M	FFP	Yes	4/27/2007	10/1/2006	11/30/2007	134.33854	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes				
SBAHQ07MO465	FFP	Yes	9/21/2007	10/1/2007	1/31/2008	100.00	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes				
SBAHQ07FO376	FFP	Yes	9/27/2007	10/1/2007	8/31/2008	689.8982	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes				
SBAHQ08FO245	FFP	Yes	8/21/2008	8/25/2008	10/31/2008	44.9419	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes				
SBAHQ8FO246	FFP	Yes	8/26/2008	9/1/2008	9/30/2008	20.062	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes				

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:

Earned value is not in place for the current contracts, but will be performed when SBA completes implementation of Primavera.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? The current 8a Certification and Annual Review interface to the public and SBA Staff is being redesigned in the course of this project. This interface will be designed to be fully 508 compliant.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? No

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

1. Is it Current?

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? Yes

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](http://www.egov.gov). The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of electronic applications	End FY 08 Total of electronic applications	End FY 08 Total of electronic applications	Baseline
2008	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Evaluation	Number of Annual Reviews (i.e., electronic) done on time (i.e., that meet timeframe compliance for processing)	End FY08 Total of Annual Reviews	End FY08 Total of Annual Reviews	Baseline
2008	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Efficiency	Number of 8a applications processed	End FY08 Total 8a applications	End FY08 Total 8a applications	Baseline
2008	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them	Technology	Efficiency	System Response Time	Time to load a web-page	Average time to load a page (using a web metrics tool) at end FY08	Average time to load a web page (using a web metrics tool) at end FY 2008	Baseline

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	with high quality executive leadership and support services							
2009	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of electronic applications	End FY 08 Total of electronic applications	25% Annual increase in electronic applications from baseline	Measurement 11/09
2009	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Evaluation	Number of Annual Reviews (ie, electronic) done on time (ie, that meet timeframe compliance for processing)	End FY08 total of Annual Reviews	75% of Annual Reviews from baseline performed on time	Measurement 11/09
2009	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Processes and Activities	Quality	Access	Number of 8a applications processed	End FY 08 total 8a applications	Increase 8a applications processed annually by 25%	Measurement 11/09
2009	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Time to load a web-page	Average time to load a page (using a web metrics tool) at end FY 2008	5 seconds or less per page	Measurement 11/09
2010	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of electronic applications	End FY 08 Total of electronic applications	25% Annual increase in electronic applications from baseline	Measurement 11/10
2010	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Evaluation	Number of Annual Reviews (ie, electronic) done on time (ie, that meet timeframe compliance for processing)	End FY08 total of Annual Reviews	100% of Annual Reviews from baseline performed on time	Measurement 11/10
2010	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Number of 8a applications processed	End FY 08 total 8a applications	Increase 8a applications processed by 25% annually	Measurement 11/10
2010	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Time to load a web-page	Average time to load a page (using a web metrics tool) at end FY 2009	3 seconds or less per page	Measurement 11/10

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services							
2011	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of electronic applications	End FY 08 Total of electronic applications	25% Annual increase in electronic applications from baseline	Measurement 11/11
2011	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Evaluation	Number of Annual Reviews (ie, electronic) done on time (ie, that meet timeframe compliance for processing)	End FY08 total of Annual Reviews	Maintain 100% Annual Review performed on time	Measurement 11/11
2011	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Number of 8a applications processed	End FY08 total of 8a applications	Increase number of 8a applications processed annually by 25%	Measurement 11/11
2011	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Time to load a web-page	Average time to load a page (using a web metrics tool) at end FY 2010	3 seconds or less per page	Measurement 11/11
2012	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of electronic applications	End FY08 Total of electronic applications	25% Annual increase in electronic applications from baseline	Measurement 11/12
2012	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Evaluation	Number of Annual Reviews (ie, electronic) done on time (ie, that meet timeframe compliance for processing)	End FY08 total of Annual Reviews	Maintain 100% Annual Review performed on time	Measurement 11/12
2012	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Number of 8a applications processed	End FY 11 total of 8a applications	Increase number of 8a applications processed annually by 25%	Measurement 11/12
2012	Ensure that all SBA programs operate at	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Time to load a web-page	Average time to load a page (using a web	3 seconds or less per page	Measurement 11/12

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	maximum efficiency and effectiveness by providing them with high quality executive leadership and support services					metrics tool) at end FY 2011		

**Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)**

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment? Yes  
 a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 5.00
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), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
Business Development Management Information System (Enhanced)	Contractor and Government	9/8/2008	9/5/2008

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
Business Development Management Information System (BDMIS)	Contractor and Government	Moderate	no	9/5/2008	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/5/2008	9/5/2008

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.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? Monitoring, verifying, and validating contractor security procedures are incorporated into SBA's overall Continuous Monitoring Process. The Office of Government Contracting and Business Development and OCIO IT Security are primarily responsible for the security and continuous monitoring for the BDMIS investment. The following SBA's Continuous Monitoring Process schedule of activities describes how the program offices provide relevant continuous monitoring: Annually SBA coordinates/facilitates reviews and updates of the business impact analysis with the System Owner. Conducts a FISMA Self Assessment review, and verifies that the organization monitors the security controls in the system on an ongoing basis.

Note: Contractor Contingency Plan, while untested to-date, will be mooted by 10/31/2008 when the entire system is migrated to the OCIO premises, which is covered by a fully tested and accredited Disaster/Recovery/Contingency Plan.

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
Business Development Management Information System (BDMIS)	Yes	Yes	<a href="http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/bd_mis.pdf">http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/bd_mis.pdf</a>	Yes	<a href="http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/bd_mis.pdf">http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/bd_mis.pdf</a>
Business Development Management Information System (Enhanced)	No	Yes	<a href="http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/bd_mis.pdf">http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/bd_mis.pdf</a>	Yes	<a href="http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/bd_mis.pdf">http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/bd_mis.pdf</a>

**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: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

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

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes

a. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. In the SBA EA Transition Plan, Table 9: Business Development and Certification Initiative.

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. 113-000

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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Meta Data Management	Support the maintenance and administration of data that describes data	Back Office Services	Data Management	Meta Data Management			No Reuse	10
Ad Hoc	Support the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	5
Standardized / Canned	Generate pre-conceived / pre-written reports	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	5
Self-Service	Integrated management information system that will allow firms owned and controlled by economically and socially disadvantaged persons to submit applications electronically, update annual review information electronically for continuing eligibility and migrate all outdated systems off the mainframe to a web based Internet system.	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service			No Reuse	30
Inbound Correspondence Management	System will analyze the information provided by applicant and flag areas that need further evaluation.	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	10
Case Management	System will provide paperless workflow and tracking of 8a/SDB application from electronic submission by applicant, thru various approval levels to final certification, then will pass data to &apos;Annual Review&apos; component, also characterized by workflow and approval hierarchy, with applicant providing updated data	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	30
Access Control	The system will contain mechanisms and policies that restrict access to the system via user id and authentication, role management and other criteria, such as &apos;Office Code&apos; .	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	10

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

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

**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)
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent Technologies	Oracle
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	Java
Meta Data Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	ADO
Meta Data Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	JDBC
Meta Data Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	ODBC
Meta Data Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	OLE/DB
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Custom-Built Report Writer, to be replaced by COTS, such as Crystal, Hyperion, Microstrategy, COGNOS, etc.
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	JOLAP
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	OLAP
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	XBRL
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	XML
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Internet Explorer
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	Broadband Providers
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	OCIO Security Policies
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Various SQL components for data management

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., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No

a. If "yes," please describe.

**Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information**

**Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)**

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.

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 project?      Yes
  - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?      2/16/2007
  - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
  - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results:		* Costs in millions	
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
Build New System from Scratch	Develop completely new system that automates and incorporates 8a/SDB certification, Annual Review and Back Office processes, workflows and functionality, and meets all statutory, regulatory, technical and functional requirements. Back office functions include reporting and analytics, and support for other SBA programs, such as Surplus Property, Joint Ventures, Mentor Protege Agreements, and marketing and outreach.		
Enhance Existing System to meet all Known Requirements	Conduct internal IV&V to evaluate and fix known/identified bugs in the e-application and e-Annual Review modules; develop and integrate new functionality to meet functional requirements in existing e-application and e-Annual Review modules; implement Back Office functionality, and perform integration across all modules.		
Maintain Existing System As-Is	In this scenario, only minor incremental updates to the system are performed. As this system did not fully automate paper-based processes, the latter continue. In addition, the system does not fully satisfy statutory, regulatory and user requirements, so various work-arounds are in place to address this gap. For example, the unfriendliness of the user interface dissuades users from entering their applications electronically, prompting them to send them to the SBA for entry by our staff.		
Modified COTS/GOTS Packages	Survey federal market to identify COTS/GOTS software that can be customized to meet 75%-85% of SBA requirements. This survey was not performed during the Alternatives Analysis, hence, no cost/benefit information was collected or developed for this alternative.		

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

The alternatives investigated in the Alternatives Analysis included: 1) replace the existing system with an entirely new system, custom designed and built; 2) remediate/enhance the existing system to meet all known requirements; 3) leave the existing system as-is, that is, unchanged; and 4) replace the existing system with a suitable COTS or GOTS package. The first alternative in the above list was chosen: 'Replace the existing system with an entirely new system, built 'from scratch'. This alternative was deemed to provide the optimal benefits versus cost, discounted for present value and adjusted for risk, compared with the other alternatives. Retention of the existing system as-is involved the lowest cost, but carried in its wake no new benefits. However, the deficiencies of the present system are considered too serious to be left unaddressed. They largely stem from incomplete compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements, which recently prompted the SBA Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to issue a highly critical report. As a result, this alternative was ruled out. The COTS and GOTS alternative was not explored in the alternatives analysis, for unknown reasons. With regard to the remaining alternatives, the remediated or completely new system, they exhibited comparable life-cycle costs, before risk adjustment. However, the risk for

remediating an existing system was judged lower than for creation of an entirely new system. This assessment was based mainly on the premise that the existing system is already operating in production and is familiar to all stakeholders, while a new system represents an unknown quantity for them, i.e., users in the public, SBA processing staff, system developers and the existing system support staff. As a result, when adjusted for this risk, the cost of the new system was deemed higher than for the remediated system. Conversely, the benefit stream for the remediated system was assessed much higher than for the new system, because the remediated system is in production, and thus begins to produce benefits, a year earlier, when compared with the new system. These benefits accrue directly to the public and SBA staff and are significant. As a result of all of these effects on relative costs and benefits, the risk adjusted NPV for the remediated system was much larger than for the new system alternative. This result explains the choice of the remediated system as the preferred alternative.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, 2010 when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

1. SBA Staff effectiveness: the ability of SBA staff to perform their job will improve with the changes prescribed by this project in the 8a/SDB certification and annual review processes. SBA staff morale will improve correspondingly for the same reasons.
2. Customer ease of use will improve, leading to higher customer satisfaction.
3. Market penetration will also increase due to easier to use application and interface.
4. Faster response, processing time, will result in less wait time for applicants, also raising customer satisfaction.
5. Better tracking and reporting will improve management decisionmaking capabilities; i.e., to make decisions that better target and resolve problem areas.

<b>5. Federal Quantitative Benefits</b>				
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2007 & Prior	0	0		
PY 2008	0	0		
CY 2009	0	0.0007		Cost avoidance equates to productivity gains in Labor for 8(a) and SDB Certification and 8(a) Annual Review processing by SBA Staff. Detailed Business Case available on request. Other cost avoidance/productivity gains are in the following categories: Increase in market penetration, higher customer satisfaction, better tracking and reporting for SBA, savings stemming from less fraud, lower litigation fees, preservation of SBA good will. Risk adjusted savings shown (Risk adj factor is - 10%).
BY 2010	0	0.001408		Same as above.
BY + 1 2011	0	0.001408		Same as above.
BY + 2 2012	0	0.001408		Same as above.
BY + 3 2013	0	0.001408		Same as above.
BY + 4 2014 & Beyond	0	0.00704		Same as above.
Total LCC Benefit	0	0.013372	LCC = Life-cycle Cost	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? Yes

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? This Investment

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

<b>5b. List of Legacy Investment or Systems</b>		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
SACS/MEDCOR		1/2/2006

**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? 9/28/2007
  - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
- c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:  
The prior submission to OMB lacked a Risk Management Plan.
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
  - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? 9/10/2007
  - 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:

A cost/benefit analysis for this alternative was performed, and adjusted for present value and risk. First, the cost associated with this alternative was allocated monthly for a project life-cycle period of approximately five calendar years from inception of the investment, i.e., from September 2007 through December 2013. Monetized savings and benefits associated with this alternative were also allocated on a monthly basis over the same period. Savings were in terms of labor saved as a result of productivity gains stemming from the implementation of the alternative. Labor rates and hours for the actual staff who process 8a and SDB applications were used, with a corresponding estimate for the labor savings associated with productivity gains in Annual Review processing. Benefits associated with this alternative were estimated for the following categories: (1) increase in market penetration, (2) customer ease of use and corresponding increased customer satisfaction, (3) faster response time to customer applications and inquiries, also leading to higher customer satisfaction, and (4) better tracking and reporting, leading to improved management efficiency and decision-making. These costs and benefits were discounted back to the present, using a conservative representative Federal cost of capital of 5%. Next, risks were derived and applied to arrive at a risk-adjusted, present value figure for each cash-flow. Each risk was given a weight of either: Low (10%), Medium (25%) or High (50%). The risks categories applied to the present value of cost were: (1) Accuracy of Resource/cost Estimates, (2) Schedule Integrity, (3) Risk of Investment Failure, (4) Capacity of Agency to Manage Investment, (5) Dependencies and Interoperability, (6) Organizational Change Management, (7) Post-Production Technical Support, (8) Data Integrity, and (9) Security. The risk categories applied to the present value of the benefits were: (1) Staff Resistance to change (mirrored in the cost of Organizational Change Management), (2) inadequate staff training (same comment), (3) diminishing marginal returns of market penetration, and (4) lower gains from customer satisfaction if the re-designed interface proves less user-friendly than anticipated.

**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? No
2. 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 CV or SV or both?
  - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
  - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? Yes
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? 7/19/2007

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.

Milestone Number	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)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
5	Business Process Update	3/11/2004	\$0.029000	3/11/2004	3/11/2004	\$0.029000	\$0.029000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
7	System Development, Test & Deploy	10/5/2004	\$0.294000	10/5/2004	10/5/2004	\$0.294000	\$0.294000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
8	Hosting, Maintenance & Support	12/1/2004	\$0.010000	12/1/2004	12/1/2004	\$0.010000	\$0.010000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
10	Annual Review Module Development & Test	11/29/2005	\$0.095000	11/29/2005	11/29/2005	\$0.095000	\$0.095000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
11	Hosting, Maintenance & Support	11/29/2005	\$0.154000	11/29/2005	11/29/2005	\$0.154000	\$0.154000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
12	Hosting, Maintenance & Support	9/30/2006	\$0.139000	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$0.139000	\$0.139000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
13	Standard Hosting	11/30/2007	\$0.134000	11/30/2007	11/30/2007	\$0.134000	\$0.134000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
14	Symplicity O&M (Maintenance, Testing Environment and Help Desk)	9/30/2007	\$0.070000	3/31/2008	3/31/2008	\$0.070000	\$0.070000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
15	Validate Requirements of 8a SDB Processes (BPR)	11/30/2007	\$0.100000	12/31/2007	12/31/2007	\$0.100000	\$0.100000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
16	Complete Management Report Module	11/30/2007	\$0.081000	1/31/2008	1/31/2008	\$0.081000	\$0.081000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
17	System Deployment at SBA (Migration)	11/30/2007	\$0.032000	2/15/2008	2/15/2008	\$0.032000	\$0.032000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
18	Complete enhancement of 8a/SDB Certification Application to meet usability, statutory and regulatory requirements	2/29/2008	\$0.186000	6/15/2008	7/28/2008	\$0.186000	\$0.186000	-43	\$0.000000	100.00%
19	Build-Out and Deploy e-Annual Review	2/29/2008	\$0.097000	6/15/2008	7/28/2008	\$0.097000	\$0.097000	-43	\$0.000000	100.00%
20	Complete Training & Documentation	3/31/2008	\$0.079000	7/31/2008	8/31/2008	\$0.079000	\$0.079000	-31	\$0.000000	100.00%
20	Convert 8a/SDB (Symplicity) Database to Oracle	4/30/2008	\$0.100000	12/31/2008		\$0.100000				0.00%
21	Complete Conversion/Re-write of 8a/SDB Application	9/30/2008	\$0.400000	9/30/2009		\$0.400000				0.00%

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.

Milestone Number	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)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	(Symplicity) code to Java									
22	Design, Develop and Deploy Further 8a/SDB Enhancements (to system on OCIO premises)	8/31/2009	\$0.500000	12/31/2009		\$0.250000				0.00%
23	System O&M	9/30/2008	\$0.060000	9/30/2008	9/30/2008	\$0.167000	\$0.167000	0	\$0.000000	100.00%
24	System O&M	9/30/2009	\$0.060000	9/30/2009		\$0.103158				0.00%
25	System O&M	9/30/2010	\$0.060000	9/30/2010		\$0.106665				0.00%
26	System O&M	9/30/2011		9/30/2011						0.00%
27	System O&M	9/30/2012		9/30/2012						0.00%
28	System O&M	9/30/2013		9/30/2013						0.00%
<b>Project Totals</b>		<b>9/30/2013</b>		<b>9/30/2013</b>	<b>9/30/2008</b>					