

Exhibit 300 (BY2008)

PART ONE	
OVERVIEW	
1. Date of Submission:	2007-02-05
2. Agency:	009
3. Bureau:	00
4. Investment Name:	Grants.gov - Find and Apply
5. UPI:	009-00-01-99-01-0160-24
6. <i>What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?</i>	
E-Gov LoB Oversight	
7. <i>What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?</i>	
FY2002	
8. <i>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.</i>	
<p>The Grants.gov system (www.grants.gov) is the Federal government's single site for the public to Find and Apply for Federal discretionary grants. Prior to Grants.gov, grant processes varied from agency to agency, program to program, and information about grants - and how to apply for them - was scattered in printed materials and across the Internet. As a result, the process of finding and applying for Federal grant opportunities was complicated, burdensome and costly. The 2002 President's Management Agenda (PMA) and Public Law 106-107 stipulated that agencies "allow applicants for Federal grants to apply for, and ultimately manage, grant funds online through a common web site, simplifying grants management and eliminating redundancies." Furthermore, PL 106-107 called for the establishment of "a common system, including electronic processes, wherein a non-Federal entity can apply for, manage, and report on the use of funding from multiple financial assistance programs..." The Grants.gov system addresses the PMA and PL 106-107 mandates by embodying the intent of standardization, simplification, and streamlined processes and data. Grants.gov is currently limited to two functions: Find and Apply. The Find mechanism allows Federal agencies to post discretionary opportunities on Grants.gov and potential applicants to search for these opportunities and receive opportunity posting notices via e-mail (30 million in FY06). The Apply mechanism allows Federal agencies to post application packages on Grants.gov, and allows applicants to download the packages and submit them electronically. The number of application packages posted has quadrupled from 994 through FY05 to over 4,200 to date (8/14/06). Additionally, the number of electronic applications submitted has grown from 16,160 through FY05 to over 93,000 to date (8/14/06); nearly a 500% increase. Since FY05, the number of registered users has doubled with more than 48,900 current Authorized Organization Representatives.</p>	
9. <i>Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?</i>	
yes	
9.a. <i>If "yes," what was the date of this approval?</i>	
2006-07-07	
10. <i>Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?</i>	
yes	
12. <i>Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.</i>	
yes	
12.a. <i>Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?</i>	
yes	
12.b. <i>Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)</i>	
no	
13. <i>Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?</i>	
yes	
<i>If yes, select the initiatives that apply:</i>	

Expanded E-Government

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

Grants.gov directly supports the objectives of PMA Goal #4 Expanded Electronic Government: - Simplify and Unify Around Citizen Needs: Discretionary grant opportunities can be found at a single site - Maximize Interoperability and Minimize Redundancy: Unified electronic mechanism for grants, using simplified processes and standard data - Support Projects that Perform Across Agency Boundaries - Provides the Find and Apply services across the Federal Government for all grant-making agencies.

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

no

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

no

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

yes

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

Level 3

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)?

yes

19. Is this a financial management system?

no

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

Not Applicable

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

Hardware	3
Software	2
Services	95

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.

Name

Byrne Huntley

Phone Number

(202) 690-8002

Title

Director, ITSC

Email

Byrne.Huntley@hhs.gov

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

yes

SUMMARY OF SPEND

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated Government FTE

Cost, and should be excluded from the amounts shown for Planning, Full Acquisition, and Operation/Maintenance. The total estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for Planning, Full Acquisition, and Operation/Maintenance. For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

All amounts represent Budget Authority

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

	PY-1 & Earlier	PY	CY	BY
	-2005	2006	2007	2008
Planning Budgetary Resources	5.076	0.419	0.250	0.200
Acquisition Budgetary Resources	13.731	3.128	2.450	1.790
Maintenance Budgetary Resources	19.394	6.617	9.256	10.058
Government FTE Cost	2.100	0.700	1.100	1.400
# of FTEs	21	8	9	11

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?

yes

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

The addition of 2 FTEs in FY08 supports Grants.gov's growth and addresses the challenges that prevail in utilizing detailees, which currently supplement the Grants.gov PMO staff. The lack of staff continuity results in the loss of institutional knowledge and makes it difficult for the PMO to leverage the necessary staff skills. The addition of FTEs will provide a stronger operational framework for the organization and provide for improved project execution across a broader timeline.

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

The summary of spending table has been adjusted to reflect two main changes. First, at OMB's direction, the Department of Defense did not provide their FY06 funding contribution [REDACTED] for Grants.gov, thereby reducing the Grants.gov FY06 budget from \$ [REDACTED] to \$ [REDACTED]. The second change reflects the approved FY08 budget which mirrors the FY07 budget with a three percent increase for inflation which will also support the additional FTE's. The FY08 budget, approved by the Grants Executive Board, supports a more robust and fully functional website, which will enable agencies to post 100% of their discretionary grant packages and will support continued growth of grantee organizations utilizing the Grants.gov system including the use of Applicant and Agency System-to-System (S2S) functionality. The budget includes key services to support this growth including system hosting and maintenance, Contact Center operations, and outreach and support activities. The budget also supports improvements to the system performance and usability based on measured growth, agency and grantee feedback received through user satisfaction surveys, the Grants.gov Contact Center, the Grants.gov User Group and the Grants Executive Board. Two key enhancements were deployed in FY06: the Find and Apply features of Grants.gov were merged and the web-site content was redesigned. These enhancements provided a single look and feel, standardized terminology, improved searching efficiency and enhanced features. Additionally, a major hardware upgrade, which included the installation of additional servers, was deployed in anticipation of the FY06 peak grant season. The upgrade handled record breaking numbers of applications with ease allowing Grants.gov to surpass its FY06 submissions goal of 45,000 by May 29, 2006, four months before the end of the fiscal year. To date (8/14/06) Grants.gov has received over 93,000 submissions, compared to 16,160 submissions received through FY05. The FY07 and FY08 budget will support the following work: - Ramp-up to 100% - E-Authentication for Grantees - System Conversion, Development, & Deployment - Functionality Upgrades Through User Feedback - Form Standardization, Conversion, Development & Clearance - Agency Test Bed - O&M Note: The cost of the Government FTE staffing plan for FY07 and beyond includes GS-7 through GS-15 Step 10 with average salaries ranging from \$ [REDACTED] to \$ [REDACTED] per year.

PERFORMANCE

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the

annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

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

Table 1

	Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
1	2003	Unified "Find Grant Opportunity" mechanism	Grant opportunities from all 26 federal grant-making agencies can be found via the common mechanism	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	Percent of 26 grant-making agencies whose grant opportunities can be found via the common mechanism	100% (26 out of 26) since 10/03
2	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	Grant applications for all 26 federal grant-making agencies can be submitted via the common mechanism	No government-wide electronic grant application mechanism currently exists	Percent of 26 grant-making agencies whose grant opportunities can be found via the common mechanism	65% of grant-making agencies posting application packages on Grants.gov
3	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of agencies publishing grant opportunity synopses in grants.gov	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	26 (100%)	100% (26 out of 26) since 10/03
4	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of grant programs available for electronic application	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	50 (8% of programs)	178 (28% of programs)
5	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	% of reusable information per grant application	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	60%	89%
6	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of applications received electronically	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	15,000 (3-5%)	1,012 (0.27%)
7	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of grants announcements posted on Grants.gov (Active Postings)	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	1,400 Active Postings	1,386
8	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of grants announcements posted on Grants.gov (Archived Postings)	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	20% increase in Archived Postings each FY	2,747

9	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of grants announcements posted on Grants.gov (Total Postings)	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	15% increase in Total Postings each FY	4,133
10	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of visitors to Grants.gov	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	200,000 per quarter	Over 20,000,000 visitors to Grants.gov last quarter
11	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	Average # of hits per day	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	100,000	178,692
12	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of notification Email messages sent per week	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	350,000	538,161
13	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	# of Grants.gov registered users (AOR)	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	1,000	1,320
14	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	% of Grant Community Members that feel Grants.gov makes the grant application process better	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	80%	57%
15	2004	Unified electronic grant application mechanism	% of Grantors that feel Grants.gov makes the grant application process better	No government-wide mechanism currently exists	80%	31%

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

Table 2

	Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
1	2005	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	# of grants announcements posted in Grants.gov (Active Postings)	1,481 (6/30/04)	Maintain within 5% (1,407 - 1,555 Active Postings)	2,026 (8/28/05)
2	2005	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	# of grant applications received electronically	796 (6/30/04)	15,000	15,296 (8/30/05)

3	2005	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	# of grant-making agencies publishing grant opportunities on Grants.gov	26 (6/30/04)	Maintain 100% (26 agencies)	26
4	2005	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	# of agencies posting Apply packages	12 (6/30/04)	26	24 (8/30/05)
5	2005	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	# of grant programs available for electronic application through Grants.gov	143 (6/30/04)	300 grant programs available	1,456 (8/30/05)
6	2005	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	# of visitors to Grants.gov	1,388,209/mo (6/30/04)	2,000,000/mo	11,034,627/mo (7/30/05)
7	2005	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	Average # of hits per day	174,329 (6/30/04)	250,000 per day	342,669 /day (7/30/05)
8	2005	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	# of Email messages sent per week	430,158 (6/30/04)	630,000 per week	1,187,323 /week (7/30/05)
9	2005	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	# of Grants.gov registered users (AOR)	1,018 (6/30/04)	2,000	14,005 (7/30/05)
10	2005	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of Grant Community Members that feel Grants.gov makes the grant application process better	57% (6/30/04)	70%	59% (7/30/05)
11	2005	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of Grantors that feel Grants.gov makes the grant application process better	31% (6/30/04)	50%	44% (7/30/05)
12	2005	Technology	External Data Sharing	% of reusable information per grant application	83% (6/30/04)	Maintain within 10% (73% - 93%) reusable information	88% (7/30/05)
13	2006	Technology	External Data Sharing	# of grants announcements published in Grants.gov per fiscal year (Active and Archived Postings)	3,300 (EOY FY05 Estimate)	Maintain 100% (3,300)	2,417 (8/6/06)
14	2006	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	# of applications received electronically	15,296 (8/30/05)	45,000	75,566 (8/7/06)
15	2006	Customer	Frequency and	# of agencies	24 (8/30/05)	26	26 (8/7/06)

		Results	Depth	posting Apply packages			
16	2006	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	# of discretionary grant programs available for electronic application through Grants.gov	1,456 (8/30/05)	2,400	1,895 (8/7/06)
17	2006	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of Grant community who are satisfied with Grants.gov	59% (7/30/05)	80%	57% (7/24/06)
18	2006	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of Grantors who are satisfied with Grants.gov	44% (7/30/05)	65%	57% (7/24/06)
19	2007	Technology	External Data Sharing	# of applications received electronically in the Fiscal Year	75,566 (8/7/06)	130,000	Actual Results will be reported at the end of FY07
20	2007	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	# of agencies posting Apply packages	26 (8/7/096) Maintain	26	Actual Results will be reported at the end of FY07
21	2007	Processes and Activities	Compliance	# of discretionary grant programs available for electronic application through Grants.gov for the Fiscal Year	1,895 (8/7/06)	3,200	Actual Results will be reported at the end of FY07
22	2007	Mission and Business Results	Customer Services	Overall customer satisfaction with the Grants.gov site. (Foresee Tool)	57% (7/24/06)	60%	Actual Results will be reported at the end of FY07
23	2007	Processes and Activities	Participation	Likelihood of the Grants Community to use Grants.gov as their primary resource (Foresee Tool)	63% (7/27/06)	70%	Actual Results will be reported at the end of FY07
24	2007	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Likelihood of the Grants Community to return to the Grants.gov site (Foresee Tool)	75% (7/27/06)	85%	Actual Results will be reported at the end of FY07
25	2007	Customer Results	Customer Retention	Users ability to accomplish what they wanted on the	60% (7/27/06)	70%	Actual Results will be reported at the end of FY07

				Grants.gov site (Foresee Tool)		
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--

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?

The Grants.gov architecture has been successfully implemented within the context of the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Reference Models: Business Reference Model (BRM), Service Component Reference Model (SRM), Technical Reference Model (TRM), Performance Reference Model (PRM), and the draft Data and Information Reference Model (DRM). The investment has been mapped to, and supports, the business, data, application and technology layers of the FEA and the additional layers of strategy, stakeholders, workforce, and facilities. Although HHS serves as one of the managing partners for the Grants Management Line of Business and provides much of the infrastructure supporting the Grants.gov initiative, the Grants.gov architecture is not directly aligned with the overall HHS enterprise architecture. Grants.gov serves all twenty-six Federal grant-making agencies, and the Grants.gov architecture is structured to reflect linkages and interfaces with all of the grant-making agencies. The Grants.gov architecture demonstrates its interoperability with other Federal and non-Federal systems. Through its Agency System-to-System and Applicant System-to-System interfaces, both Agencies and applicant organizations have been able to integrate their backend systems with Grants.gov. Grants.gov has successfully implemented architecture with open standards utilizing XML allowing different standards to seamlessly integrate with Grants.gov without requiring infrastructure changes. The Department of Justice has been extremely successful integrating their backend system with Grants.gov; their application packages are transmitted within 90 seconds from the Grants.gov system to their backend system, dramatically reducing transmission time. The use of System-to-System is gaining momentum: - Applicant System-to-System: 39 private sector providers are registered with Grants.gov to submit applications using XML and Web Services. 9 others are currently testing. - Agency System-to-System: 30 Federal agency systems are integrated with Grants.gov for pulling applications to their systems. Grants.gov is also working with the E-Authentication E-Gov initiative to implement multiple credential service providers utilizing SAML technology thereby fulfilling agency authentication requirements. Grants.gov is on schedule to deploy multiple credential service providers beginning with the Federal grantor agencies in August 2006 and extending it to the applicant community in FY07.

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

no

2.b. If no, please explain why?

The Grants.gov initiative has been identified in the HHS IT Strategic Plan (2003-2008) as one of the 20 strategic IT initiatives. Deemed consistent with the HHS target enterprise architecture, Grants.gov has been noted as a service that can be found in the application layer of the HHS enterprise architecture, and in the Service and Component Reference model of the Federal Enterprise Architecture. The HHS Enterprise IT Strategic Plan outlines strategic goals to be accomplished within the next fiscal year. Goal #2, identified in the Annual Plan, "Enhance the quality, availability, and delivery of HHS information and services to citizens, employees, businesses, and governments", is directly supported by the Grants.gov initiative. More specifically, Grants.gov is in direct support of Objective 2.2, "Leverage web services to conduct business securely with customers and stakeholders." Grants.gov provides a secure, fast, and efficient place for grantees and potential applicants to conduct grants-related business with HHS in a central location on the web.

3. Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

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

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

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

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

	Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Type	Component	Reused Component Name	Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	Funding %
1	Contact Center; Assistance Request	On-line Guidance, Contact Center	Customer Initiated Assistance	Assistance Request	Call Center Management		External	10
2	Online Help	Links available on Website	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Help			Internal	0
3	Online Tutorials	Links available on Website	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Tutorials			Internal	0
4	Reservations / Registration	Ability to Register Preferences	Customer Initiated Assistance	Reservations / Registration	Certification and Accreditation		External	6
5	Self-Service	On-line Help, can register to receive emails of grants posting	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service			Internal	0
6	Alerts and Notifications	Users establish profiles to receive updates via email (Find and Apply)	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications			Internal	0
7	Personalization	Profile is maintained with stored preferences	Customer Preferences	Personalization			Internal	0
8	Subscriptions	Users can sign up to receive email notifications of funding opportunities	Customer Preferences	Subscriptions			Internal	0
9	Call Center Management	Contact center is available weekdays from 7am - 9pm EST	Customer Relationship Management	Call Center Management			Internal	10
10	Customer / Account Management	Database profiles are maintained to manage accounts	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management			Internal	0
11	Customer Feedback	Focus groups and phone calls and email through contact center are used to elicit stakeholder and customer feedback	Customer Relationship Management	Customer Feedback			Internal	5
12	Partner Relationship	Executive Board, Stakeholder	Customer Relationship	Partner Relationship			Internal	0

	Management	Meetings	Management	Management				
13	Product Management	Manage rollout of Storefront to end users	Customer Relationship Management	Product Management			Internal	0
14	Surveys	Implemented real-time, on-line user surveys to collect user opinions using American Customer Satisfaction Index	Customer Relationship Management	Surveys	Customer Analytics		External	0
15	Content Publishing and Delivery	Strict configuration management processes in place to manage content	Content Management	Content Publishing and Delivery			Internal	22
16	Inbound Correspondence Management	Agencies can post application packages and potential applicants can download, fill out, and submit the packages back to agencies	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management			Internal	5
17	Outbound Correspondence Management	Agencies can post application packages and potential applicants can download, fill out, and submit the packages back to agencies	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management			Internal	5
18	Business Rule Management	E-Forms provide business rule enforcement of data	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management			Internal	5
19	Content Authoring	Agencies can create customized application packages using a variety of existing forms and also create customized opportunity postings	Content Management	Content Authoring			Internal	5
20	Content Review and Approval	E-Forms (IMB Workplace Forms) provide real-time edits on the data that is entered	Content Management	Content Review and Approval			Internal	0
21	Content	Agencies can	Content	Content			Internal	0

	Publishing and Delivery	control the publication of opportunities and grant applications on Grants.gov	Management	Publishing and Delivery				
22	Library / Storage	Agencies can select from a file of various e-forms to be used to create customized application packages	Document Management	Library / Storage			Internal	0
23	Information Retrieval	System allows access to grant opportunities across 26 grant making agencies	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			Internal	0
24	Information Mapping / Taxonomy	Allows agencies to create application packages utilizing standard form definition and saving them as templates	Knowledge Management	Information Mapping / Taxonomy			Internal	0
25	Information Sharing	Agencies can provide access to the e-form applications by simply providing the file, which can be shared with multiple users at one time	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			Internal	0
26	Smart Documents	E-Forms (IMB Workplace Forms) provide real-time edits on the data that is entered	Knowledge Management	Smart Documents			Internal	0
27	Query	Find mechanism allows potential applicants to search for funding opportunities based on specific query selection criteria	Search	Query			Internal	0
28	Identification and Authentication	Implemented E-Authentication	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			Internal	6
29	Access Control	Security controls in place to control access to the system	Security Management	Access Control			Internal	5

30	Access Control	Grants.gov supports user role assignments to control access	Security Management	Access Control			Internal	0
31	Cryptography	Security information is encrypted via SSL/TLS	Security Management	Cryptography			Internal	0
32	Identification and authentication	User credentials are verified prior to allowing access to the system; DUNS Number, Grants.gov login/password, and a user credential verified by an external credential provider	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			Internal	6
33	Access control	System supports the creation of users, assignment of roles, and management of user accounts	Security Management	Access Control			Internal	0
34	Access control	System supports restricted access to users based on assignment of roles	Security Management	Access Control			Internal	0
35	Forms Creation	System provides agencies with the ability to create standard templates incorporating various forms which can be reused within the agency	Forms Management	Forms Creation			Internal	2
36	Forms Modification	System provides agencies to modify the forms used in a template or modify a template for a single use when publishing a grant application package	Forms Management	Forms Modification			Internal	2
37	Data Exchange	Grants.gov exchanges data with agency and grantee backend systems	Data Management	Data Exchange			Internal	6

38	Meta Data Management	System contains data that defines data collected through the system	Data Management	Meta Data Management			Internal	6
39	Data Integration	System-to-system integration allows data to be transmitted from separate sources into a single source	Development and Integration	Data Integration			Internal	6

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

FEA SRM Component: Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications.

Service Specification: In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

	SRM Component	Service Area	Service Category	Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name)
1	Assistance Request	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer
2	Assistance Request	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	HTTP
3	Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer
4	Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	HTTP
5	Online Tutorials	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer
6	Online Tutorials	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	HTTP
7	Reservations / Registration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Oblix (SAML), Verisign
8	Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Unix (Send Mail)
9	Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Unix (Send Mail)
10	Personalization	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Unix (Send Mail)
11	Subscriptions	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Unix (Send Mail)
12	Call Center Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Seibel
13	Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Seibel
14	Customer Feedback	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	American Satisfaction Survey (ForeSee)

15	Partner Relationship Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	American Satisfaction Survey (ForeSee)
16	Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Serena (PVCS Tracker)
17	Surveys	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	American Satisfaction Survey (ForeSee)
18	Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	Serena (PVCS Tracker); Lyris (Listserv)
19	Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	W3C(Online Link Validator), IBM Workplace Forms (formerly PureEdge), JAVA(JSP), N-Stalker(N-Stealth), and freeware: Apache ab, JMeter, Nessus, Nmap,
20	Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Oracle (SQL), SUN MicroSystems (Sun 280R), EMC, Apache
21	Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	W3C(Online Link Validator), IBM Workplace Forms (formerly PureEdge), N-Stalker(N-Stealth), and freeware: Apache ab, JMeter, Nessus, Nmap
22	Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Oracle (SQL), SUN MicroSystems (Sun 280R), EMC, Apache
23	Business Rule Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms)
24	Content Authoring	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms)
25	Content Review and Approval	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms)
26	Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Apache
27	Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle (SQL), EMC
28	Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	SUN MicroSystems (Sun 280R), EMC
29	Information Mapping / Taxonomy	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms), Oracle(SQL), EMC
30	Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	Microsoft Internet Explorer
31	Smart Documents	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms)
32	Query	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Oracle (SQL), EMC
33	Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Oblix (SAML), Verisign

34	Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	SSL
35	Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	SSL
36	Forms Creation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms)
37	Forms Modification	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms)
38	Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Sysco(Sysco 3550-12), Nokia (Nokia350), F5(BigIP)
39	Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms), Oracle
40	Data Integration	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	IBM (IBM Workplace Forms), Oracle(SQL), EMC, XML

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

yes

5.a. If yes, please describe.

Grants.gov is leveraging existing components and applications across the government where feasible. Below are components/applications across the government that Grants.gov currently leverages: E-Authentication E-Gov - Grants.gov is working with the E-Authentication E-Gov initiative to implement SAML technology to fulfill organization/agency authentication requirements. Grants.gov is the first E-Gov client for another E-Gov initiative. Central Contractor Registration (CCR) - Grants.gov is utilizing CCR for credentialing services - the primary vendor database for the U.S. Federal Government. Contact Center Services - Grants.gov is also utilizing FirstGov.gov's USA Services for Tier 1 support by leveraging an existing HHS contract. American Customer Satisfaction Survey - Grants.gov is utilizing Department of Treasury's American Customer Satisfaction Index tool (ForeSee) which is also being used by other initiatives such as FirstGov.gov, GovBenefits.gov and USAJobs.gov. The ForeSee tool allows Grants.gov to survey the Grants.gov users to better understand needs of the grantee community. COTS Product Utilization - Grants.gov has leveraged existing COTS technology to the greatest extent possible. For example, Grants.gov is utilizing IBM Workplace Forms (formerly PureEdge forms), a COTS product, for the Apply mechanism. Grants.gov continues to evaluate and utilize COTS products to meet the changing functionality needs of the grantor and grantee communities.

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

yes

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

yes

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).

The IBM Workplace Viewer 6.0 (formerly PureEdge Viewer) is used for viewing/completing application forms. Windows users system requirements are: - Windows 98, ME, NT 4.0, 2000, XP - 500 Mhz processor - 128 MB of RAM - 40 MB disk space - Web browser: Internet Explorer 5.01 or higher, - Netscape Communicator 4.5 - 4.8, Netscape 6.1, 6.2, or 7
Macintosh user system requirements are: - OS X Version 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 or 10.4 - 128 MB of RAM - 10 NB Disk Space - PowerPC Processor

PART FOUR

EGOV & LOB OVERSIGHT

RISK

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

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.
1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?
yes
1.a. If yes, what is the date of the plan?
2006-06-21
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:
No significant changes have been incorporated into the Grants.gov Risk Management Plan, which was updated in June 2006. The Grants.gov PMO continually assesses program risk and mitigation strategies. Risk reviews are incorporated into the bi-weekly Internal Control Board meetings, monthly program status meetings, and the quarterly report to the HHS Information Technology Review Board - all to ensure regular review and broader awareness of program risks. The list of identified risks and their mitigation plans is regularly updated, and includes issues pertaining to the system integration contract re-compete, program funding reductions, security re-certification, system security for delegated administrators, and incorporation of stakeholder feedback. In large part, updates pertain to progress in implementing mitigation plans and in closing fully mitigated risks.
COST & SCHEDULE
<i>You should also periodically be measuring the performance of operational assets against the baseline established during the planning or full acquisition phase (i.e., operational analysis), and be properly operating and maintaining the asset to maximize its useful life. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements.</i>
<i>Answer the following questions about the status of this investment. Include information on all appropriate capital assets supporting this investment except for assets in which the performance information is reported in a separate exhibit 300.</i>
1. Are you using EVM to manage this investment?
yes
Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard 748?
yes
1.c. If N/A, please provide date operational analysis was conducted and a brief summary of the results?
10/31/2006 Note: DOT is concerned about the continuing increases in the Grants.gov costs in a time of flat or declining agency budgets.
Questions #2 - 7 are NOT applicable for capital assets with ONLY O&M
2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. Indicate whether the information provided is contractor-only, or whether it includes both government and contractor costs. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs)
2.a. What is the Planned Value (PV)?
36.171
2.b. What is the Earned Value (EV)?
36.015
2.c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?
33.602
What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information?
Contractor and Government
2.e. As of date:
2006-10-31
3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)?

1
4. What is the schedule variance ($SV = EV - PV$)?
-0.156
5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index ($CPI = EV/AC$)?
1.07
6. What is the cost variance ($CV = EV - AC$)?
2.412
7. Is the CV or SV greater than 10%?
no
7.b. If yes, explain the variance.
Not applicable, as the variances are not greater than negative 10 percent.
7.c. If yes, what corrective actions are being taken?
Not applicable.
7.d. What is most current Estimate at Completion?
59.563
8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?
no