

MS Word Exhibit 300 for O&M (BY2008) (Form) / KSC Shuttle Integrated Logistics (Item)

Form Report, printed by: System Administrator, **Jan 31, 2007**

OVERVIEW

General Information	
1. Date of Submission:	Jan 26, 2007
2. Agency:	026
3. Bureau:	00
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	KSC Shuttle Integrated Logistics
Investment Portfolio:	BY OMB 300 Items
5. Unique ID:	026-00-01-03-01-1422-00
(For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	

All investments
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?
<i>(Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)</i>
Operations and Maintenance
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?
FY2001 or earlier
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 Integrated Logistics (IL) investment supports Shuttle Program launch activity by providing necessary hardware, software, and labor associated with logistics activity in ground processing and flight operations. The investment supports logistics needs for flight hardware articles as well as the need for program related training and ground support equipment.</p> <p>The IL organization supports NASA's strategies for future IT initiatives while complying with consolidated IT standards. Support includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintaining current Logistics systems and spares and providing repair support for the Operations Center for Shuttle Avionics Integration Laboratory (SAIL), Training Operations Center (TOC) and Integration and Program Requirements Multi-facility. - Providing spares/repairs for IT hardware and software supporting NASA Shuttle Logistics Depot (NSLD) Special Test Equipment and CAD systems that support manufacturing and repair activities. - Supporting current and future process improvements, including IT requirements for the migration of Logistics systems to PeopleSoft Inventory. This migration should bring system improvements such as streamlined demand processing, inventory out-of-balance corrections, Shelf-Life Management, Contamination /Decontamination requests and ASRS Mini-loader interface. <p>The Space Flight Operations Contract covers all Information Technology (IT) related activities including the design, development, implementation and maintenance of computer-related hardware and software systems required to process the Space Shuttle at KSC, including IL. The IL investment reduces lifecycle cost of replacement equipment. The requirements for lifecycle cost for replacement of Ground Support Equipment (GSE) is the only supported funding in the lifecycle cost of this GSE.</p> <p>This investment has been reviewed and approved by the Shuttle Program Chief Information Officer (CIO) with concurrence from the Johnson Space Center, KSC, and Marshall Space Flight Center CIOs.</p> <p>This investment is closely coupled with Shuttle Processing. The loss of this investment would require us to revert to manual based systems. This would increase our headcount and impact our processing schedule.</p>
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?
Yes
9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?

Apr 7, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

Yes

If "yes," select the initiatives that apply:

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

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

NASA full cost budgeting & accounting process improves financial management, while linking budget and performance using the NASA Integrated Budget & Performance Document. The Shuttle support contract & follow-on are competitively sourced. This investment supports strategic human capital management & allocation as part of the continued effort to keep the Shuttle flying safely. It advances agency efforts to leverage new IT technologies & create electronic access for program performance.

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

Yes

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

Yes

14.b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?

Space Shuttle

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

Adequate

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

Yes

For information technology investments only:

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?

No

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

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

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

Integrated Logistics which provides for repairs, spare parts, and warehousing for the Space Shuttle program, and associated Ground Support Equipment (GSE).

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 A-11 section 52.

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

Area	Percentage	
Hardware	39.00	
Software	38.00	
Services	3.00	
Other	20.00	
Total	100.00	★

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

N/A

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions

Name	Mark Mason
-------------	------------

Phone Number	321 867-3014
Title	KSC Information Officer
Email	mark.mason@nasa.gov

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

Yes

SUMMARY OF FUNDING

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (In Millions)

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	CY	BY
	2006	2007	2008
Planning:	0.000	0.000	0.000
Acquisition:	0.000	0.000	0.000
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0.000	0.000	0.000
Operations & Maintenance:	11.098	11.755	11.202
TOTAL	11.098	11.755	11.202
Government FTE Costs	0.000	0.000	0.000
# of FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total, BR + FTE Cost	11.098	11.755	11.202

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

2.a. If "yes," how many and in what year?

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

No changes

Budget Comments * Internal Use Only*

PERFORMANCE

Performance Information

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	2003	Goal 8. Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and Affordability. Objective 8.3. Improve the accessibility of space to better meet research, Space Station assembly, and operations requirements.	Maintain baseline goal of 98%	Provide parts, hardware and materials – 98% of requirements satisfied on or before the negotiated need date.	Percent of requirements satisfied on or before the negotiated need date.	99.6% of requirements satisfied on or before the negotiated need date.
2	2004	Goal 8. Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and Affordability. Objective 8.3. Improve the accessibility of space to better meet research, Space Station assembly, and operations requirements.	Maintain baseline goal of 98%	Provide parts, hardware and materials – 98% of requirements satisfied on or before the negotiated need date.	Percent of requirements satisfied on or before the negotiated need date.	99.8% of requirements satisfied on or before the negotiated need date thru June
3	2003	Goal 8. Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and Affordability. Objective 8.3. Improve the accessibility of space to better meet research, Space Station assembly, and operations requirements.	Maintain 99% or better availability	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Expectation = 97% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access.	99.2%
4	2004	Goal 8. Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and Affordability. Objective 8.3. Improve the accessibility of space to better meet research, Space Station assembly, and operations requirements.	Maintain 99% or better availability	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Expectation = 97% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Monthly percentage of unplanned or unscheduled outage supports the agency's goal of maintaining high LPS system reliability and helps ensures space access.	99.3%
5	2003	Goal 8. Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and Affordability. Objective 8.3. Improve the accessibility of space to better meet research, Space Station assembly, and operations requirements.	Maintain SOE of 95% on-time delivery	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems.	93.4%

6	2004	Goal 8. Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and Affordability. Objective 8.3. Improve the accessibility of space to better meet research, Space Station assembly, and operations requirements.	Maintain SOE of 95% on-time delivery	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of LPS IT products support both the Programs overall reliability and ensure affordability of the systems.	91.94%
7	2003	Goal 8. Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and Affordability. Objective 8.3. Improve the accessibility of space to better meet research, Space Station assembly, and operations requirements.	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems.	3.55 DRs per month
8	2004	Goal 8. Ensure the provision of space access, and improve it by increasing safety, reliability, and Affordability. Objective 8.3. Improve the accessibility of space to better meet research, Space Station assembly, and operations requirements.	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications supports both the Programs overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems.	5.14 DRs per month

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 Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvements to the Baseline	Actual Results
1	2005	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned/unscheduled outage supports NASA goal of maintaining high system reliability and ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2011	99.9 % Availability. This was arrived at by allowing 4 hours downtime for the Circuit Breaker, and 4 Hours for YERO Problems. (8760-8)/8760= 99.9%
2	2006	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned/unscheduled outage supports NASA goal of maintaining high system reliability and ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
3	2007	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned/unscheduled outage supports NASA goal of maintaining high system reliability and ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD

4	2005	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of IT products supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2011	96.2% This was arrived at by estimating the total number of "Deliveries" , both H/W modifications and S/W releases, at 80. 3 deliveries that were late and impacted operational use: FR-4, SAIL Installation, and PCG2 Phase 1. (80-3)/80= 96.2%
5	2006	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of IT products supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
6	2007	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of IT products supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
7	2005	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across applications supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2011	The Year to Date IPRs per month on all Released LPS Applications is 4.9. This number was arrived at by dividing the number of IPRs seen by Set Support in FY05 by 10 months.
8	2006	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across applications supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
9	2007	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across applications supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD

10	2005	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor for contract performance fee determination.	100%	100%	100% LPS Did not impact On-Orbit Mission Success in FY05. Did not understand how to map it to the GPRA/FY05 Budget Request.
11	2006	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor for contract performance fee determination.	100%	100%	TBD
12	2007	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor for contract performance fee determination.	100%	100%	TBD
13	2008	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor for contract performance fee determination.	100%	100%	TBD
14	2009	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor for contract performance fee determination.	100%	100%	TBD
15	2010	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Space Operations	Achieve 100% on-orbit mission success for all Shuttle missions. Mission success criteria are those provided to the prime contractor for contract performance fee determination.	100%	100%	TBD
16	2008	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned/unscheduled outage supports NASA goal of maintaining high system reliability and ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD

17	2009	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned/unscheduled outage supports NASA goal of maintaining high system reliability and ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
18	2010	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Monthly percentage of unplanned/unscheduled outage supports NASA goal of maintaining high system reliability and ensures space access	Availability of systems: Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 99% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >97%	Maintain 99% or better availability each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
19	2008	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of IT products supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
20	2009	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of IT products supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
21	2010	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Annual percentage On-Time Delivery of IT products supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	On-time Delivery of LPS IT Products - Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 95% Expectation = 80% Maximum Error Rate (MER) = >80%	Re-establish SOE of 95% on-time delivery each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
22	2008	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across applications supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
23	2009	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across applications supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD

24	2010	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across applications supports Program's overall reliability and ensures affordability of the systems	Monthly average of 4 or less DRs across released LPS applications Standards of Excellence (SOE) = 4 or less Discrepancy Reports (DRs) Expectation = 5 to 7 DRs Maximum Error Rate (MER) = 8 DRs	Maintain SOE of 4 or less discrepancies (DRs) against LPS released applications each year from 2005 to 2011	TBD
----	------	--------------------------	---------	------------	--	---	---	-----

EA

Enterprise Architecture (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

1.a. If "no," please explain why?

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.

KSC Integrated Logistics

2.b. If "no," please explain why?

Service Reference Model

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 Domain	Service Type	Component	Reused Component Name	Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	Funding %
1	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistic provides the contracting method to manage multiple vendor contracts	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Contact and Profile Management			No Reuse	1.00

2	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistic provides the contracting method to manage multiple vendor contracts	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Product Management			No Reuse	6.00
3	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistic provides the contracting method to manage multiple vendor contracts	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Customer Feedback			No Reuse	1.00
4	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistic provides asset managing and tracking using the existing contract data systems	Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Asset Cataloging / Identification			No Reuse	9.00
5	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistic provides asset managing and Material using the Maximo and Peoplesoft systems	Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Asset Transfer, Allocation, and Maintenance			No Reuse	7.00
6	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics provides quality on-site in vendor plants	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Quality Management			No Reuse	7.00
7	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics supports Risk Management by maintaining the infrastructure including servers, storage and network services	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Risk Management			No Reuse	12.00
8	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics supports strategic planning by providing the tools required to budget, plan, execute, and status reporting of Shuttle assets	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Strategic Planning and Mgmt			No Reuse	13.00
9	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics supports performance management by providing the tools required to budget, plan, execute, and status reporting of Shuttle assets	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management			No Reuse	14.00
10	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics provides procurement of Shuttle assets using Peoplesoft	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Procurement			No Reuse	7.00
11	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics provides procurement of Shuttle assets using Peoplesoft	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Sourcing Management			No Reuse	4.00
12	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics provides procurement of Shuttle asset using Peoplesoft	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Ordering / Purchasing			No Reuse	8.00
13	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics provides procurement of Shuttle assets using Peoplesoft	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Invoice / Requisition Tracking and Approval			No Reuse	6.00
14	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics provides procurement of Shuttle assets using Peoplesoft	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Returns Management			No Reuse	2.00

15	Space and Ground Network IT Support	Integrated Logistics provides cataloging of Shuttle assets using Peoplesoft	Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Asset Cataloging / Identification			No Reuse	3.00
----	-------------------------------------	---	----------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--	----------	------

Technical Reference Model

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
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Virtual Private Network (VPN)
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services
Simulation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management
Knowledge Engineering	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering
Information Sharing	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration

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

No

5.a. If "yes," please describe.

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

No

6.a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?

6.a.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).

Character Limitation Check

EA General Questions:		★
SRM Table:		★
TRM Table:		★
Exhibit 300:		★

RISK

Risk Management

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?

Dec 20, 2002

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

No

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

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

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

2.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: (O&M investments do NOT need to answer.)

COST & SCHEDULE

Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Was operational analysis conducted?

Yes

1.a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed.

Jul 13, 2006

1.b. If "yes," what were the results?

Continuous operational assessments are performed on capital assets to determine their performance and effectiveness in meeting critical mission operations objectives, as opposed to performing an Operational Analysis at discrete milestones within the lifecycle of the Space Shuttle Program and its operations support contracts SFOC/SPOC. A Performance Measurement System is used to track and monitor monthly key metrics to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, availability, reliability, security, etc. of capital assets. Operations and maintenance costs associated with these capital assets are reviewed monthly in conjunction with the metrics to identify any early warning indicators that may impact lifecycle costs and performance goals. These data are used to reprioritize operations and maintenance costs to underperforming assets and/or the requests for new funding in annual Program Operating Plan inputs.

1.c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future.

Actual Performance against the Current Baseline

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

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

Contractor and Government

	Description of Milestone	Planned End Date	Actual End Date	Planned Total Cost (\$mil)	Actual Total Cost (\$mil)	Schedule Variance (# of days)	Cost Variance (\$mil)
1	FY06 Operational Cost	Sep 30, 2006		11.098			
2	FY07 Operational Cost	Sep 30, 2007		11.755			
3	FY08 Operational Cost	Sep 30, 2008		11.202			

			DME	Steady State	Total
Completion date: Current Baseline:	Sep 30, 2011	Total cost: Current Baseline:		86.156	86.156
Estimated completion date:	Sep 30, 2010	Estimate at completion:			