

DIRECTIVE

3130.1

6/24/02

CAPITAL PLANNING AND INVESTMENT CONTROL PROCESS

I. PURPOSE

This Directive provides policy and procedures for ensuring that AMS' Information Technology (IT) investments are cost effective, well planned and effectively implemented.

II. REPLACEMENT HIGHLIGHTS

This Directive replaces AMS Directive 3130.1, Capital Planning Investment Control Process, issued on May 9, 2001.

III. AUTHORITY AND BACKGROUND

Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) is a systematic approach to selecting, managing, and evaluating information technology investments. CPIC is mandated by the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, and requires Federal agencies to focus more on the results achieved through IT investments. The CPIC process, prescribed by OMB Circular A-130, emphasizes careful analysis and selection of information technology investments and seeks to ensure that senior management obtains and reviews timely information regarding the progress of an investment in terms of its milestones, cost, and its capability to meet specified mission objectives.

IV. DEFINITIONS

- A. Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board (EITIRB) is a board consisting of senior-level managers. They ensure that information technology investments are managed as strategic business resources.
1. The *USDA/EITIRB* consists of Under Secretaries from each of the mission areas, the Office of Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and the Chief Financial Officer. Major investments are submitted to the *USDA/EITIRB* after review and approval by the *AMS/EITIRB*.
 2. The *AMS/EITIRB* consists of the AMS Administrator, Associate Administrator, all Deputy Administrators, the Chief Information Officer (CIO), and the Budget Officer. The current charter for the *AMS/EITIRB* Board is available from the CIO.

- B. Information technology (IT) investments are the allocations of Government resources (e.g., staffing, funds) for electronic automated systems that support the business needs of the Agency.
- C. Life cycle costs are the purchase price, time value of money (e.g., inflation, discount factors), operating costs (e.g., staff resources) and maintenance costs expended on an IT investment during its planning, implementation, operation and retirement.

V. POLICY

It is the policy of AMS to use the AMS CPIC process to provide a line-of-business strategic review of the Agency's significant IT investments. The AMS CPIC process shall be managed by the Science and Technology Program, Information Technology Group (ITG).

VI. CPIC PHASES

The AMS CPIC process consists of the following three sequential phases:

Select phase is the capital planning phase to assess whether new information technology projects support the AMS mission needs, comply with the AMS and USDA architecture, and are likely to succeed.

Control phase is the capital planning phase that requires ongoing monitoring of information technology investments against schedules, budgets, and performance measures during development.

Evaluation phase is the capital planning phase that requires a monitoring and review of information technology operational investments to ensure the cost, delivered value, and technology of the investment continue to meet mission needs.

VII. TYPES OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS

There are three types of information technology investments: 1) major investments, 2) non-major, significant investments and, 3) non-major investments.

A. Major Investments

In accordance with the OMB and the OCIO's guidance, investments are considered major if any one of the following conditions exists:

1. Total life cycle costs are greater than \$50 million;
2. There is significant multiple agency impact;
3. The system is mandated by legislation, Executive order, or identified by the Secretary as critical;
4. The system requires a common infrastructure investment;

5. The system is designated as a Department strategic or mandatory use system; or
6. The system differs significantly from or impacts the Department infrastructure, architecture, or standards guidelines.

It is rare that AMS programs will have a major investment. When they do, the ITG will work directly with the program to acquire this type of investment. ITG will provide level three support services as stated in the Support Level Service Agreement Table (Attachment D).

B. Non-major, Significant Investments

For AMS, non-major, significant investments are those investments with estimated life cycle costs of \$100,000 or more. Non-major, significant investments account for the majority of AMS' investments. ITG will provide support services as stated in the Support Level Service Agreement Table (Attachment D).

C. Non-major Investments

For AMS, non-major investments are those investments with estimated life cycle costs below \$100,000. Non-major investments are *not* required to be managed by the CPIC process, unless otherwise specified by the CIO because of the scope and complexity of the requirement.

VIII. APPROVAL AUTHORITY

A. Major Investments

Major investments are approved by both the Department and AMS Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board.

B. Non-Major, Significant Investments

1. *Investments with Life Cycle Costs from \$100,000-\$250,000*: Non-major, significant investments with life cycle costs up to \$250,000 are approved by the AMS CIO. At the option of the CIO, investment approval may be referred to the AMS/EITIRB when the investment includes unusual or precedent-setting elements from an Agency perspective.
2. *Investments with Life Cycle Costs of \$250,000 or More*: Non-major, significant investments with life cycle costs of \$250,000 or more are approved by the AMS/EITIRB.

C. Non-Major Investments

Non-major investments estimated at or above \$2,500 and telecommunication and processor investments of any dollar amount are approved by the AMS CIO in the technical approval process.

IX. TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT PLAN (TIP)

A Technology Investment Plan (TIP) is used by AMS to identify, describe, and provide justification for information technology investments with life cycle costs at and above \$100,000.

A. Submission of TIPs.

ITG will request that AMS programs identify all planned investments and update the status of existing investments using the TIP format (see Attachment A) *annually*. This usually occurs June-July; however, it can occur sooner if necessary. On a case-by-case basis, new investments will be reviewed and evaluated by the AMS CIO and AMS/EITIRB at other times during the year, based on urgent or compelling needs.

B. Follow-on Investments

If a significant investment is planned for an existing system, two TIPs can be prepared. One *Evaluation Phase* TIP can present the cost of maintaining that system and a second *Select Phase* TIP can present the cost of the planned revisions. TIPs for retired systems shall be updated to show the final system cost and reflect the closed status of the system.

C. Technology Refreshment Investments

At a minimum, programs shall include planned investments to maintain their desktop and program-specific computing environment under a plan identified as "Technology Refreshment." The Technology Refreshment TIP is used for those investments that are not part of a specific system.

D. Approval Process

ITG shall review and evaluate TIPS for all IT investments. ITG may provide programs with comments and allow them to make modifications to the TIP. The AMS CIO shall render a decision for investments under \$250,000. Properly documented feasible investments, at or above \$250,000, shall be forwarded to the AMS/EITIRB by the CIO for review and evaluation.

After the AMS/EITIRB members review and evaluate each investment, the AMS/EITIRB shall meet to discuss the investments, provide an opportunity for programs to explain investments, and either approve, disapprove, or return the investment to the program for revision.

E. Evaluation Criteria

Investments shall be scored according to the appropriate evaluation criteria listed in Attachment B. Scores for each investment are recorded on the Score Sheet found in Attachment C.

F. Decision Timeframe

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>
ITG reviews and evaluates IT investments	10 business days
AMS/EITIRB reviews and evaluates IT investments over \$250,000	30 business days

G. Investments Received Outside of the Annual Review Cycle

Investment plans shall be accepted outside of the annual review period by the AMS CIO on a case-by-case basis. The acceptance shall be based on urgent and compelling needs. Complete feasible plans will be forwarded to the AMS/EITIRB members for review and evaluation.

H. Implementation of Decisions from Approving Official

The program shall follow the recommendation of AMS/EITIRB or CIO and either proceed with the investment or adhere to the prescribed alternative solution.

I. Information Technology Investment Portfolio System (I-TIPS)

Once approved by the EITIRB, the ITG shall enter financial data about the investment into the Information Technology Investment Portfolio System (I-TIPS) before any equipment is purchased or any contracts for IT services are awarded. Information entered into I-TIPS is reviewed and evaluated by USDA and the Office of Management and Budget.

X. USDA REVIEW AND EVALUATION

A. Waiver

A USDA IT acquisition waiver is necessary for investments with life cycle costs, excluding AMS staff resources, estimated at or above \$250,000. Waivers are granted by USDA's Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO). Waivers are based on the technical feasibility of the investment, its measurable return on investment, an impact analysis, and its telecommunications, security and accessibility requirements. Once the investment is approved by AMS EITIRB, the ITG staff will work with programs to

prepare the waiver request for the OCIO. Typically, waivers require 5-7 weeks from the date of submission to approval.

B. Investment Proposal for Major Investments Only

Once the AMS/EITIRB has reviewed and given approval, ITG shall assist the program in preparing an *investment proposal* for the USDA/EITIRB review and approval. AMS is required to update investment profiles throughout the life cycle of major systems and submit these profiles to the USDA/EITIRB once each year. Details regarding the description of new major investments are provided by the “USDA Information Technology Capital Planning and Investment Control Guide” available from the OCIO’s web site.

XI. TECHNICAL APPROVAL

Requests for technical approval (TA) of IT investments estimated at or above \$100,000 must be supported by an approved TIP that accurately represents the investment at the time of the TA request. Details regarding the TA process are provided in AMS Directive 3130.3, Technical Approval of Information Technology Investments.

XII. INVESTMENT CONTROL

Following contract award, AMS shall engage in contract administration and project management to implement the system. Careful attention must be given to the timely accomplishment of business objectives. AMS shall continue to monitor the investment while in production to ensure that the functionality continues to meet the needs of AMS.

XIII. SUPPORT LEVEL SERVICE AGREEMENTS

A. Designation of Support Level

In order to facilitate the successful selection and deployment of AMS information technology investments, the ITG will provide programs with the support services stated in the Support Level Service Agreement Table (Attachment D). The default support level is determined by the estimated system life cost. For high-risk or complex investments, a program may request or the AMS/EITIRB may require a higher support level than that indicated in the Table. Similarly, a program may request that the AMS/EITIRB waive a requirement for a default support level when they can show reason why the support level is not appropriate for the investment.

B. Reimbursement of Support Costs

The salary and benefit costs of Level One services shall be provided through overhead funds provided by AMS to ITG. The cost of Level Two services shall be budgeted by the program as part of the cost of system implementation, except when ITG advises the program that part or all of the resource can be provided through overhead funding provided by the Agency. The cost of Level Three services, because of the high resource commitment that is dedicated to a single program, shall be budgeted by the program as part of the cost of system implementation.

XIV. QUESTIONS

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the ITG, Policy, Planning and Analysis Branch Chief, or visit the ITG website, <http://insideams/itintranet>.

/s/

A. J. Yates
Administrator

Attachment A: Agricultural Marketing Service Technology Investment Plan (Format Guide)

Attachment B: Evaluation Criteria for Performance, Schedule, Cost, Security, and Enterprise Architecture

Attachment C: Score Sheets for Proposed Investments, Pre-Implementation Investments, Post Implementation Investments

Attachment D: IT Investment Support Level Service Agreement Table

**AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE
TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT PLAN
Date Created MM/DD/YYYY**

1. Investment Title: [AMS-PP-FY-NN]: [Description Title of Investment]

Assign a unique number that will identify a specific investment. The first three letters identify the agency (AMS); the next two alphabetic identifiers are used for program identity (see list below); the next two digits identify the fiscal year that the investment became a part of the IT plan; and the last two digits are sequential number uniquely identifying the investment except for the TIP specifically for Technology Refreshment which should have TR in lieu of a number. Example: The first investment identified by the Livestock and Seed Program in FY 2002 would be AMS-LS-02-01. The investment for Technology Refreshment would be AMS-LS-02-TR.

Use the following alphabetic codes to identify each program:

CA – Compliance and Analysis
CN – Cotton
DA – Dairy
FV – Fruit and Vegetable
LS – Livestock and Seed
PY – Poultry
ST – Science and Technology
TB – Tobacco
TM – Transportation and Marketing
XX - Agency Infrastructure

2. Modification of existing TIP if applicable.

2.1 The date of the last modification to the TIP.

2.2 Summary reason for the last modification such as: Changes were made as requested by the EITIRB; or, Technology Refreshment to upgrade software and hardware.

3. Status: Indicate “Select” for new investments, “Control” for systems being implemented; “Evaluation” for operational systems, including operational systems that are undergoing enhancement and “Retired” for systems that are no longer needed.

4. Program(s) Supported: Name the AMS program(s) and branch(es) and how these AMS mission areas will benefit from this investment.

5. Background:

Describe the program's history and relevant issues that facilitate an understanding of this investment.

6. Objective/Benefit Statement: Provide a short statement (1 to 5 sentences) of the objective to be achieved and the benefits of this investment. Describe the source and quantify the amount of tangible savings, and describe source and value of intangible benefits.

7. Measurable Outcome:

Describe how you will measure the degree to which system implementation accomplishes the program's business objectives, i.e., how you will know that the system is successfully improving program operations (number of assessments performed to increase by 10%; service delivery costs reduced by 15%; elapsed time from service request to delivery reduced by 20%). For each attribute, describe the program's intended numeric objective. For functional systems, provide current metrics for the performance indicators, and describe any plans to attain or improve these performance metrics.

8. Acquisition and Implementation Strategy:

Describe the plan for procuring equipment and IT services and for implementing the system. Describe how principles of rapid application development and prototypes will be used to confirm the feasibility of key system concepts. Explain the role of contractor, program, and ST Information Technology Group (ITG) staff.

9. Major Milestones:

Use the table below to describe the key milestones and show the planned start date, planned end date, and actual end date, if known, for each. The delivery of each "deliverable" defined in the SOW should typically be included as a milestone event.

Milestone	Planned Start	Actual Start	Planned End	Actual End
a. Determine and accept system requirements	5/15/01	5/20/01	6/15/01	6/22/01
b. Determine and accept system design	6/15/01		6/30/01	
c. Develop and accept client prototype	7/1/01		7/21/01	
....	
n. Perform testing and accept functional system	11/1/01		6/15/01	

Copies of project management Gant charts can be attached to provide additional details. For systems being implemented, indicate the degree to which the project is on, ahead of, or behind schedule.

10. Resources:

For each of the resource categories, fill in the fiscal year, show the cost of the resource used to date and the cost projected for each fiscal year using the table below.

	All Prior FYs	FY__ (Current)	FY__ (Current +1)	FY__ (Current +2)	FY__ (Current +3)	FY__ (Current +4)	FY__ (Current +5)	Total
Equipment								
Software								
Contractor Service								
Security								
Telecommunica- tions								
Total Purchase (\$000)								
AMS Staff FTEs								
AMS Salary (\$000)								
Total Cost (\$000)								

For functional systems or systems that are being implemented, describe how actual costs have varied from original cost estimates and projections, and any management actions taken or planned to control costs.

11. Security:

Provide a description of the types of information handled by the system and an analysis of the criticality of the information. Identify the confidential or sensitive nature of the data and the risks of inappropriate disclosure. Describe management controls in the application software, network infrastructure, and operational procedures designed to protect the system and its data from unauthorized access. Identify when and who will prepare a Security Plan that conforms to the requirements of CS-002, "Annual Cyber Security Plan Call, Attachment A, Security Plan Guidance." If a security plan has been developed, attach a copy to this TIP. Indicate the last date your security plan has been review by AMS Information Systems Security Program Manager (ISSPM) and when. Indicate the program plans to follow-up on any recommendations made by the ISSPM.

12. e-Government Determination:

Indicate whether the system is considered an e-Government solution and explain why. E-Government systems are reflective of the Department's goal to make government more citizen-centered and to respond more directly and effectively to the people USDA serves. These systems should focus on improving USDA's working relationship with public and

private sector organizations or empower employees to work more collaboratively with one another.

13. Accessibility Determination:

Indicate whether the system will conform to published accessibility standards required by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998, and as described in 39 CFR Part 1194. Indicate whether the set of potential system users is limited to AMS and its service partners or if potential users may be from the public (e.g., industry, universities, or citizens). Also indicate if the identity of system users can be determined in advance and if accommodations can be effectively made on a case-by-case basis. If the system will not conform to published accessibility requirements, describe why conformance would present an undue burden to the program and what alternative methods the program can use to deliver the same information.

14. Compatibility with Recommended Standards:

Indicate whether the investment conforms to the Agency's current recommended standards for desktop computer hardware, network infrastructure, and application software. Describe the investment's use of non-standard hardware or software and the business reasons that require the variation. Describe the use of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) products, the extent to which custom code is required, and what language (e.g., Visual Basic, Visual Basic.net) is used to create the code. Explain what steps were taken to share code, data, and technology infrastructure to reduce duplication of effort among AMS programs, which operate systems with similar functionality.

15. Contact Name, Organization, E-mail, and Phone Number: Enter the first and last name of the contact person, the organization name, e-mail address, and phone number.

16. Program Approval (mandatory):

Deputy Administrator
Signature

Date

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE

Factors	Select Phase (New)	Control Phase (Pre-Implementation)	Evaluation Phase (Post-Implementation)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well has the program done in identifying original baseline goals? • How well has the program done in identifying performance measures and indicators? • How well has the program done in reporting progress in attaining their baseline goals or attaining their targets for performance measures and indicators? • How meaningful are the identified baseline performance goals and the performance measures and indicators in measuring the “value” of the investment to the support program? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this rating if the program has done a superior job of identifying original baseline performance goals, performance measures and indicators. 2. Award this rating if the program has clearly identified original baseline performance goals, performance measures and indicators. 3. Award this rating if the program has clearly identified baseline performance goals but not performance measures or indicators. 4. Award this rating if the program has done a poor job of identifying baseline performance goals, performance measures and indicators. 5. Award this rating if the program has not identified baseline performance goals, performance measures, or indicators. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this rating if the program is exceeded the original baseline performance goals and performance measures using planned indicators. 2. Award this rating if the program is meeting all baseline performance goals and performance measures using planned indicators. 3. Award this rating if the program is meeting the critical-path baseline performance goals and performance measures using planned indicators. 4. Award this rating if the program is not meeting its critical-path baseline performance goals and performance measures using planned indicators. 5. Award this rating if the program’s original baseline performance goals were not provided. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this rating if the program has exceeded the original baseline performance goals and performance measures using planned indicators. 2. Award this rating if the program has met all baseline performance goals and performance measures using planned indicators. 3. Award this rating if the program has met critical-path baseline performance goals and performance measures using planned indicators. 4. Award this rating if the program has not met critical-path baseline performance goals and performance measures using planned indicators. 5. Award this rating if the program’s original baseline performance goals or performance measures were not provided.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCHEDULE

<p>□ Factors</p>	<p>Select Phase (New)</p>	<p>Control Phase (Pre-Implementation)</p>	<p>Evaluation Phase (Post-Implementation Modifications and Enhancements)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How realistic is the schedule for deployment, implementation, and operations? • How realistic is the plan for managing slippages on a percent, time and cost basis? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award the rating if a detailed, realistic schedule is provided. 2. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 3. Award this rating if a complete, realistic schedule is provided. 4. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 5. Award this rating if the schedule is unrealistic or not reasonably complete. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this rating if the project is proceeding ahead of schedule. 2. Award this rating if the critical path is being met according to the original schedule slippages are within 20% of original baseline. 3. Award this rating if the critical path is being met according to the original schedule slippages are within 30% of original baseline. 4. Award this rating if the critical path is being met according to the original schedule slippages are within 40% of original baseline. 5. Award this rating if the project is delayed beyond 50% of the original schedule or if schedule slippages have not been properly managed or the plan is not reasonably complete. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this rating if the project was completed ahead of schedule. 2. Award this rating if the critical path was met according to the original schedule with slippages limited to 20% of the original baseline. 3. Award this rating if the critical path was met according to the original schedule slippages limited to 30% of the original baseline. 4. Award this rating if the critical path was met according to the original schedule slippages limited to 40% of the original baseline. 5. Award this rating if the project was completed 50% beyond the original schedule or if schedule slippages were not properly managed or the plan is not reasonably complete.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR COST

<p>□ Factors</p>	<p>Select Phase (New)</p>	<p>Control Phase (Pre-Implementation)</p>	<p>Evaluation Phase (Post-Implementation)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How realistic are the cost estimates? • How well are budgeted and actual costs accounted for, controlled, and managed? • Are cost variances computed? Are they used to monitor how well the investment is proceeding relative to its cost estimates? Are they used as a management tool? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this rating if detailed cost estimates are provided and are realistic. 2. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 3. Award this score if general cost estimates are provided and appear realistic. 4. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 5. Award this rating if cost estimates are not provided or are not realistic. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this rating if costs are appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, and if the original cost estimate has been met. 2. Award this rating if costs are appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, and if the cost variance is within 20% over the original estimates. 3. Award this rating if costs are appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, and if the cost variance is within 30% over the original estimates. 4. Award this rating if costs are appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, and if the cost variance is within 40% over the original estimates. 5. Award this rating if cost is not appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, or if cost variance exceeds 50% of the original estimates. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this rating if costs were appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, and if the original cost estimate has been met. 2. Award this rating if costs were appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, and if the cost variance was within 20% over the original estimates. 3. Award this rating if costs were appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, and if the cost variance was within 30% over the original estimates. 4. Award this rating if costs were appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, and if the cost variance was within 40% over the original estimates. 5. Award this rating if cost were not appropriately accounted for, controlled, and managed, or if cost variance exceeded 50% of the original estimates.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SECURITY

Factors	Select Phase (New)	Control Phase (Pre-Implementation)	Evaluation Phase (Post-Implementation)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a comprehensive security analysis been conducted? • Are security risks identified and mitigation strategies proposed? • Have security goals and measures been established and met? • Is the system security functioning as anticipated? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A security analysis has been completed, identifying risks and comparable mitigation strategies and contingency planning. 2. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 3. A security analysis has been completed, however, the mitigation strategies and contingency planning are not commensurate with the risks. 4. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 5. A security analysis has not been completed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The security plan is being implemented according to the initial analysis, including additional factors identified during the requirements analysis and/or design of the system. Contingency plans and risk mitigating factors, including disaster recovery plans have been written and tested. 2. The security plan is being implemented according to the initial analysis, including additional factors identified during the requirements analysis and/or design of the system. Contingency plans and risk mitigating factors, including disaster recovery plans have been written. 3. The security plan is being implemented according to the initial analysis, including additional factors identified during the requirements analysis and/or design of the system. 4. Implementation of the security plan is behind schedule and the program is exposed to risks identified in the analysis. 5. The security plan is not being implemented. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The security plan was fully implemented according to the initial analysis, including additional factors identified during the requirements analysis and/or design of the system. Contingency plans and risk mitigating factors, including disaster recovery plans have been written and tested. 2. The security plan was implemented according to the initial analysis, including additional factors identified during the requirements analysis and/or design of the system. Contingency plans and risk mitigating factors, including disaster recovery plans have been written but never tested. 3. The security plan was implemented according to the initial analysis, including additional factors identified during the requirements analysis and/or design of the system. 4. Implementation of the security plan was never fully completed and the program is exposed to risks identified in the analysis. 5. The security plan was not implemented.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE (EA)

Factors	Select Phase (New)	Control Phase (Pre-Implementation)	Evaluation Phase (Post-Implementation)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this investment conform to the EA goals and objectives (e.g., interoperability, resource sharing, potential for reduced costs, sharing processes, information timeliness and comprehensiveness)? • Is a credible migration plan (for data, applications, and legacy system phase-out) from the existing to the proposed environment presented? • Are detailed management plans in place that describe how this investment will be supported, maintained, and refreshed to ensure its currency and continued effectiveness, including a training and awareness plan for users and technical staff? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this score if the EA objectives for standards compatibility, security, and accessibility are clearly identified. 2. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 3. Award this score if one or more of the EA objectives for standards compatibility, security, and accessibility are not clearly identified. 4. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 5. Award this score if none of the EA objectives for standards compatibility, security, and accessibility are identified. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this score if all of the EA objectives for standards compatibility, security, and accessibility are being implemented. 2. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 3. Award this score if one or more of the EA objectives for standards compatibility, security, and accessibility are not being addressed or satisfied by the implementation. 4. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 5. Award this score if none of the EA objectives are being implemented. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Award this score if all of the EA objectives for standards compatibility, security, and accessibility were successfully implemented. 2. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 3. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 4. <i>Do not assign this score.</i> 5. Award this score if one or more of the EA objectives was not successfully implemented.

SCORE SHEET FOR PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Instructions: Record the name of each proposed investment. Then record the evaluation score for each element and a summary recommendation. Use as many pages as necessary to list and score all investments in the Select Phase

Name of Investment	Select Phase					SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION
	Performance	Schedule	Cost	Security	Enterprise Architecture	
1. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						1. Score: _____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____
2. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						2. Score: _____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____
3. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						3. Score: _____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____
4. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						4. Score: _____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____

SCORE SHEET FOR PRE-IMPLEMENTATION INVESTMENTS

Instructions: Record the name of each investment in the implementation process. Then record the evaluation score for each element and a summary recommendation. Use as many pages as necessary to list and score all investments in the Control Phase

Name of Investment	Control Phase					SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION
	Performance	Schedule	Cost	Security	Enterprise Architecture	
1. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						1. Score: _____ Continue _____ Continue w/ modification _____ Abort _____
2. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						2. Score: _____ Continue _____ Continue w/ modification _____ Abort _____
3. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						3. Score: _____ Continue _____ Continue w/ modification _____ Abort _____
4. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						4. Score: _____ Continue _____ Continue w/ modification _____ Abort _____

SCORE SHEET FOR POST-IMPLEMENTATION INVESTMENTS

Instructions: Record the name of each functional investment. Then record the evaluation score for each element and a summary recommendation. Use as many pages as necessary to list and score all investments in the Evaluation Phase

Name of Investment	Evaluation Phase					SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION
	Performance	Schedule	Cost	Security	Enterprise Architecture	
1. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						1. Score: _____ Continue _____ Continue w/ modification _____ Abort _____
2. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						2. Score: _____ Continue _____ Continue w/ modification _____ Abort _____
3. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						3. Score: _____ Continue _____ Continue w/ modification _____ Abort _____
4. <u>Insert Name of Investment</u>						4. Score: _____ Continue _____ Continue w/ modification _____ Abort _____

IT INVESTMENT SUPPORT LEVEL SERVICE AGREEMENT TABLE

SUPPORT LEVEL	Outsourcing Stage	Description of Services	System Life Cost
ONE	Pre-award	Program develops requirements and Statement Of Work (SOW) which ITG reviews. ITG works with program to arrive at a complete, unambiguous, and technically accurate SOW. Standards of acceptability are set in proportion to the amount of the investment and the impact of an implementation failure.	\$0 - \$249,999
	Post-award	Program tests deliverables and determines acceptance. ITG is available as a reference to supplement program knowledge of technical issues. Responsibility of meeting business goals is almost entirely that of the program.	
TWO	Pre-award	ITG assists the program in identifying requirements and developing a complete, unambiguous, and technically accurate SOW. Standards of acceptability set in proportion to the amount of the investment and the impact of an implementation failure. ITG partners with program in identifying and evaluating vendors.	\$250,000-\$999,999
	Post-award	ITG assists program in testing and reviewing deliverables to meet business needs. ITG assists program in managing performance, scheduling, and cost of the system as well as acceptance testing. Responsibility of meeting business goals is primarily that of program with assistance from the ITG staff.	
THREE	Pre-award	With program's active involvement, ITG assigns full-time Project Manager to develop SOW, propose acquisition strategy, establish evaluation criteria, and evaluate vendors.	\$1,000,000 or more
	Post-award	ITG assigns full-time Project Manager who, together with Program Project Leader, manages the performance, scheduling and cost of the system as well as acceptance testing. Responsibility of meeting business goals is shared equally by program and ITG. This provides the highest level of assurance of meeting business objectives.	