Exhibit 300: Part I: Summary Information and Justification (All Capital Assets)

I.A. Overview

1. Date of Submission:	2/2/2007
2. Agency:	Department of State
3. Bureau:	Bureau of Political-Military Affairs
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	Defense Trade Application System
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	014-00-01-05-01-1398-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (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.)	Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2003

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

The purpose of this section is to present the summary and justification of the Defense Trade Application System (DTAS) Business Case for the Department of State (DoS) Fiscal Year FY) 2008 budget submission. DTAS is a working web-based export license application system critical to national security. DTAS is composed of three major subsystems. D-Trade, the most visible DTAS sub-system was formally rolled out by then Secretary of State Collin Powell, February 18, 2004. After a year and a half of operation D-Trade has shown itself to be a paperless, user-friendly and security-sensitive defense technology export licensing system. D-Trade is important because it's one of many integrated parts within the U.S. national security system that controls the export of defense items and technologies. D-Trade is also part of the president's management agenda, which aims to advance effective government through e-government. The second component of DTAS is T-RECS, the Trade Registration, Enforcement and Compliance System (T-RECS). T-RECS provides for e-Gov services with electronic referral of applications for DHS, DOJ, etc. T-RECS is designed around Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) application of MS.Net technology. The T-RECS version 2 is being deployed as a Proof of Concept for user review, testing and component database interface evaluations in September 2005. The third component of DTAS is DTAR, the Defense Trade Archive Repository. DTAR is a working subsystem that implements electronic storage of applications for the DTAS data management requirements. It leverages existing expertise in the PM and VC Bureaus to operate high speed scanners, R/Ware and KM systems for identifiable cost savings. It is NARA approved and delivers long-term unit cost reductions to DDTC that will restrain the growth rate for operating costs. In total, these component of DTAS support our critical efforts to control international traffic in arms as required by the International Traffic in Arms control Regulations (ITAR) 22 CFR 120-130. The new DTAS subsystems and processes do not simply speed up old processes. They represent changes the ways in which we document, review, managed, and approved defense trade and technology distributions that improve the overall security of the United States and its allies.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	8/4/2006
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.	No
a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	No
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
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," check all that apply:	Human Capital, Expanded E-Government
13a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	Expanded Electronic Government: - DTAS: Shares information more quickly and conveniently among the federal agencies and by collaborating more readily with our allies - foreign governments by providing a web based electronic interface between government agencies participating in the defense trade application analysis area. DTAS uses electronic submissions, on-line license officer reviews, electronic referral and returned positions to service the massive license application increases.
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?	No
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?	
c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes
If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-section.	
For information technology investments only:	
16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 2
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance):	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?	No
19. Is this a financial management system?	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	No
1. If "yes," which compliance area:	
2. If "no," what does it address?	
b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52	

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)	
Hardware	8
Software	7
Services	85
Other	0
21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?	No
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	Yes

I.D. 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.

Performance Information Table 1:

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2004	Performance Goal #3 under Strategic Goal 4 - Weapons of Mass Destruction - Verification, . . . implementation . . . , and rigorous enforcement of compliance . . .	Increase percentage of DSP-5 license requests handled electronically to 10%	1% of DSP-5 license requests processed electronically	Make a comparison of DSP-5 licenses processed in FY-2002 and FY-2003 and licenses processed in FY-2004	This represented 100% increase in D-Trade usage over the pilot processing that occurred in 2003 (First partial year of operation).
2004	Performance Goal #2 under Strategic Goal 12 - Management and Organizational Excellence - Modernized, secure, high quality	Reduce median processing time for electronic licenses by 8 days to 43 days	51 day median processing time for a referred license	Review records to compare processing times from FY-2002 and FY-2003 to FY-2004	This represents a 46% improvement in the license process time

	IT management and infrastructure . . .				
2004	Performance Goal #2 under Strategic Goal 12 - Management and Organizational Excellence - Modernized, secure, high quality IT management and infrastructure . . .	Obtain median processing time of 5 days for electronic licenses	8 day median processing time for a non-referred license	Review processing records for FY-2004 to confirm processing time has been reduced in comparison to FY-2002 and FY-2003.	This represents a 37% improvement in the license processing time.
2005	Performance Goal #3 under Strategic Goal 4 - Weapons of Mass Destruction - Verification, . . . implementation . . . , and rigorous enforcement of compliance . . .	Increase percentage of license requests handled electronically to 24%	As of September 2004 we are processing 6% of the licenses applications electronically	Percentage of licenses handled electronically	700 + DSP-5s processed for each month - June and July of 2005.
2005	Performance Goal #2 under Strategic Goal 12 - Management and Organizational Excellence - Modernized, secure, high quality IT management and infrastructure . . .	Improve processing response time to 24 days	As of September 2004, processing time for an electronically referred license was reduced to 28 days	Median processing time for a referred electronic licenses	This represents a 21% improvement in processing time.
2005	Performance Goal #2 under Strategic Goal 12 - Management and Organizational Excellence - Modernized, secure, high quality IT management and infrastructure . . .	Obtain median processing time of 4 days for electronic licenses	As of September 2004 the median processing time for electronic non-referred license has been reduced to 5 days.	Median processing time for electronic licenses	The monthly median days processing times show great variances when the days are measured on small numbers.
2005	Performance Goal #3 under Strategic Goal 4 - Weapons of Mass Destruction - Verification, . . . implementation . . . , and rigorous enforcement of compliance . . .	Handle 25 % of DSP-5 special handling cases via D-Trade	DSP-5 special handling cases are not currently processed electronically via D-Trade	Percentage of case categorized/requiring special handling	
2005	Performance Goal #2 under Strategic Goal 12 - Management and Organizational Excellence - Modernized, secure, high quality IT management and infrastructure . . .	License officers will sign 10% of DSP-5 cases electronically	No DSP-5 cases are currently signed electronically by license officers	Cases signed to cases signed electronically - percentage	Data show as many as 400 DSP-5 licenses per month are now signed electronically. This is approximately 10% of total DSP-5 cases.
2005	Performance Goal #2 under Strategic Goal 12 - Management and Organizational Excellence - Modernized, secure, high quality IT management and infrastructure . . .	Increase to 20% - . 5% of DSP-5 Cases are referred to bureaus and agencies electronically	.5% of DSP-5 Cases are referred to bureaus and agencies electronically	Cases referred to bureaus and agencies electronically - percentage	Complete data are not yet available for the 2005 fiscal year.

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (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.

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2005	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Median number of days required to process staffed D-Trade license applications for referred cases using D-Trade.	30 days median processing time for D-Trade cases for 2004	Decrease processing time for by 1 day per quarter for FY 2005	End of 3rd qtr 2005 - shows median D-Trade referred cases are now taking 25 days to process.
2005	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	Percent (%) of all referred and non-referred license applications Processed using D-Trade	1.2 % - FY 2004	Increase by 1% per quarter for FY 2005	Number of cases processed has increased steadily in each quarter in FY 2005. Seven (7 %) of cases were being processed using D-Trade by the end of the 3rd quarter 2005.
2005	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	% of Approved referred and non-referred cases signed electronically	0 cases signed in FY 2004 - no e-signature D-Trade system module was in operation	1% of DSP-5 cases to be signed electronically by 4th QTR 2005	3rd QTR 2005 data - shows 400 cases signed electronically. This is approximately .3 % of cases.
2005	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Increasing % of new DDTC Registrants Using D-Trade to submit DSP5s electronically	1% of new registrants used D-Trade to submit DSP-5s in FY 2004	1% increase per quarter for FY 2005	5% of New registrants are using D-Trade to submit DSP-5s at the end of 3rd QTR 2005
2006	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Median number of days required to process staffed D-Trade license applications for referred cases using D-Trade.	End of FY 05 median result [Note: Medians times are used per GAO report, GAO-01-528 that discusses how licenses times can be significantly improved by a few emergency case or lengthened by a small number of difficult policy cases.	Continue to decrease the number of days required to process a case at a steady rate until this reaches a median of 20 days per case/per month.	http://www.pmddtc.state.gov/processtime.htm For FY 06 - an unstable measure, the high range variations (48-24) for staffed cases staffed cases has a median processing time = 36 days; far lower times for non-staffed cases - median - 13.4 days.
2006	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percent (%) of all DSP-5 referred and non-referred license applications submitted to DDTC using D-Trade.	FY 05 calculated 10% of DSP-5 cases processed using D-Trade	Increase the percent of the total of DSP-5 and all cases submitted for processing using D-Trade by 1 % per quarter	D-Trade received approximately 60% of DSP-5 D-Trade cases for the 4th quarter of FY 2006. D-Trade submission increased relative to the legacy and paper submission with FY. All DSP 5 submissions are beiing received via D-Trade for 2007.
2006	Mission and	Information and	Information	Percent of all	End of FY 2005	2 % per FY quarter.	Results for 4th quarter were up over 3rd quarter of

	Business Results	Technology Management	Management	Cases examined by DDTC, submitted to D-Trade.	results. (approximately 5%)		FY06. D-Trade submissions (all) were 3460 or 28% of the total of 12256 submissions for 4th quarter FY06.
2006	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	% of Approved referred and non-referred cases signed electronically	End of FY 05 result of 3%	FY 06 QTR 1 - 1% of cases to be signed electronically; QTR 2 - 2% of DSP-5 cases to be signed electronically; QTR 3 - 5% of cases to be signed electronically; QTR 4 - 8% of cases to be signed electronically	D-Trade has delivered excellent results. D-Trade submissions (all) are now signed electronically when completed and licenses are approved. [4th Qtr. 2006 - 3460 or 28% of the total of 12256 submissions for 4th quarter FY06.
2006	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Number of new DDTC Registrants Using D-Trade to submit DSP5s.	End of FY 05 result (Less than 1%)	5 % increase per quarter for FY 2006; reaching 25 % of all new registrants submit DSP5s using D-Trade by end of FY 2006	New registrant's - 180 new DDTC registrants for the 4th quarter. Only 16 applied for license, and of this number - 50% used D-Trade rather than Detra.
2007	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Median number of days required to process staffed D-Trade license applications for referred cases using D-Trade.	End of FY 06 median result [Note: Medians times are used per GAO report, GAO-01-528 that discusses how licenses times can be significantly improved by a few emergency case or lengthened by a small number of difficult policy cases.	Improve median reported and published results. Continue to decrease the number of days required to process a case at a steady rate until this reaches a median of 20 days per case/per month.	During the 1st quarter of FY 07 process improvements were made; D-Trade staffed case median processing time - 31 days; non-staffed cases median processing - 11 days. The average of staffed & non-staffed days reached 21 days. (very near target)
2007	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percent (%) of all referred and non-referred license applications Processed	D-Trade received approximately 17% of DSP-5 D-Trade cases. D-Trade submission increased relative to the legacy and paper submission with 23% (854 of 3734) DSP-5 submissions being received via D-Trade.	Increase by 2% per quarter for FY 2007	Excellent progress -exceeding targets. D-Trade received approximately 59% of license applications for December 2006. D-Trade submissions - 3870; Detra - 2596.
2007	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	% of Approved referred and non-referred cases signed electronically	End of FY 06 result	FY 07 QTR 1 - 10 % of cases to be signed electronically; QTR 2 - 12% of DSP-5 cases to be signed electronically; QTR 3 - 15% of cases to be signed electronically; QTR 4 - 18% of cases	Progress for FY 2006 greatly exceeded targets in the first quarter of 2007. As of Sept 30, 2006 27.8% of all DDTC cases were signed electronically; increasing to 33% - October, 48% November; 59% of all cases signed electronically for Dec. 2006..

						to be signed electronically	
2007	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Number of new DDTC Registrants Using D-Trade vs. Detra to submit license applications.	End of FY 06 result	10 % increase per quarter for FY 2007; reaching 65 % of all new registrants submit applications using D-Trade by end of FY 2007	Data new registrant's for the 1st quarter of FY 07 shows there are 19 new registrants submitting applications. Of those 19 submitted applicants for licenses, 14 or 73% used D-Trade. (55% improvement over 2006 data). This now exceeds the FY target.
2008	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Median number of days required to process staffed D-Trade license applications for referred cases using D-Trade.	End of FY07 results.	Continue to decrease the number of days required to process a case at a steady rate until this reaches an average of 18 days per case. [Currently estimated to be an optimum level given the required processing and review time w/i other agencies.]	
2008	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percent (%) of all referred and non-referred license applications Processed	FY 07 calculated 20% of DSP-5 cases processed using D-Trade	70 % per FY quarter.	
2008	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	% of Approved referred and non-referred cases signed electronically	End of FY 07 result	FY 06 QTR 1 - 31% of cases to be signed electronically; QTR 2 - 52% of DSP-5 cases to be signed electronically; QTR 3 - 65% of cases to be signed electronically; QTR 4 - 75% of cases to be signed electronically	
2008	Technology	Effectiveness	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	Number of new DDTC Registrants Using D-Trade to submit DSP5s	End of FY 07 result	20 % increase per quarter for FY 2007; reaching 85 % of all new registrants submit DSP5s using D-Trade by end of FY 2008	

I.E. Security and Privacy

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system / application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the

systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system/s to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system/s.

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:	15
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.	Yes

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Defense Trade Application System	Contractor and Government	High	Yes	10/31/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/30/2006	7/31/2006

5. Have any weaknesses related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?	No
a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated agency's plan of action and milestone process?	Yes
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?	No

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

System Audit Logs and database audit logs are turned on and reviewed periodically. System use metrics are maintained and reviewed at least weekly. Anomalies that are discovered in the audit tracking are investigated. Additionally we have had periodic reviews by the OIG and re mediated the system in accordance with their findings. As noted in previous paragraphs access to the system is scrutinized by a rigorous access request process that includes Additions, modifications, and Deletions with aggressive service level agreements to ensure employees do not have access to the system after leaving. The system was accredited in October of 03 and we are currently stepping through Certification renewal with the Office of Information assurance, with an expected accreditation date of Jan 30, 06

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Is the PIA available to the public?	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?
Defense Trade Application System	Yes	Yes.	Yes.	Yes	No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.

I.F. 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
a. If "no," please explain why?	
2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.	Defense Trade Application System
b. If "no," please explain why?	

3. Service Reference Model (SRM) Table:

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
Data Exchange	Defines the set of capabilities that support the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications; includes verification that transmitted data was received and unaltered.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	0
Extraction and Transformation	Defines the set of capabilities that support the manipulation and change of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation			No Reuse	0
Reporting	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	0
Change Management (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that control the process for updates or modifications to the existing documents, software or business processes of an organization.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Change Management			No Reuse	0
Configuration Management (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that control the hardware and software environments, as well as documents of an organization.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			No Reuse	0
Program / Project	Defines the set of capabilities that manage	Business	Management of	Program /			No Reuse	0

Management (New DoS Service)	and control a particular effort of an organization.	Management Services	Processes	Project Management				
Requirements Management (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that gather, analyze and fulfill the needs and prerequisites of an organization's efforts.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Requirements Management			No Reuse	0
Contact Management	Defines the set of capabilities that provide a comprehensive view of all customer interactions, including calls, email, correspondence and meetings; also provides for the maintenance of a customer's account, business and personal information.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Contact and Profile Management			No Reuse	0
Information Retrieval	Defines the set of capabilities that allow access to data and information for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	0
Case Management (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that manage the lifecycle of a particular claim or investigation within an organization to include creating, routing, tracing, assignment and closing of a case as well as collaboration among case handlers.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	0
Process Tracking (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that allow the monitoring of activities within the business cycle.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	0
Forms Creation (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that support the design and generation of electronic or physical forms and templates for use within the business cycle by an organization and its stakeholders.	Support Services	Forms Management	Forms Creation			No Reuse	0
Forms Modification (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that support the maintenance of electronic or physical forms, templates and their respective elements and fields.	Support Services	Forms Management	Forms Modification			No Reuse	0
Access Control (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that support the management of permissions for logging onto a computer, application, service, or network; includes user management and role/privilege management.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	0
Digital Signature Management (New DoS Service)	Use and management of electronic signatures to support authentication and data integrity; includes public key infrastructure (PKI).	Support Services	Security Management	Digital Signature Management			No Reuse	0
Identification and Authentication (New DoS Service)	Defines the set of capabilities that support obtaining information about those parties attempting to log on to a system or application for security purposes and the validation of those users.	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	0
Data Network Services	Executes, maintains, and supports the devices, facilities and standards that provide the computing and networking within and between enterprises.	Support Services	Security Management	NEW			No Reuse	0

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

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' 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.

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.

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

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

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java Servlet (JSR 53)
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	JavaScript
Case Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Electronic Business using XML (ebXML)
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Java Database Connectivity (JDBC)
Case Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Cascading Style Sheets (CSS)
Case Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Java Server Pages (JSP)
Case Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML)
Contact and Profile Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Digital Certificate Authentication
Contact and Profile Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Secure Sockets Layer (SSL)
Digital Signature Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Web Service
Forms Creation	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Internet Explorer
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Internal (within Agency)
Forms Creation	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Section 508
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Security
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Hyper Text Transfer Protocol Secure (HTTPS)
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Internet Protocol (IP)
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Transport Control Protocol (TCP)
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Domain Name System (DNS)
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP)

Information Retrieval	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Database Access: ISQL/w
Case Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	eXtensible Markup Language (XML)
Case Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	eXtensible Stylesheet Language Transform (XSLT)
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	XML Schema
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	SQL Server
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Network-Attached Storage (NAS)
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Internet Information Server
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	Hard Disk Drive
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	Random Access Memory (RAM)
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Ethernet
Contact and Profile Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Firewall
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Hub
Extraction and Transformation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	Printer
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Enterprise Server
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	Case Management
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	Unified Modeling Language (UML)
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Change Management
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Version Management
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Functional Testing
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Usability Testing (508 Testing)
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Windows 2000
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)

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

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.	
5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?	Yes
a. If "yes," please describe.	
DTAS is linked from FirstGov.gov thru Exports.gov. DTAS was one of the first agency PKI systems to board the Quicksilver initiative E-Authentication. DTAS also utilizes Pay.gov to support automated electronic registration functions.	
6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?	No
a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?	
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).	

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

II.A. Alternatives Analysis

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.	
In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A- 94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.	
1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?	3/1/2001
b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	
c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:	

II.B. Risk Management

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.	
1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?	1/31/2007
b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No

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

Risks included in the plan were examined to determine if any new risks needed to be added. The program is very mature and on schedule & on budget. No new risks have materialized. Peformance measures are exceeding estimates and plans.

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?	
a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?	
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:

Investment risks are carefully monitored throughout the investment development period. The DTAS system is being built in useful and complete segments (4) that each have demonstrable uses and value to minimize the risk of "non-completion" and loss of investment. Portions of all 4 of the segments are now in use and delivering value to the government and the numerous industry customers of DDTC. The performance statistics demonstrate the value of this risk management approach very clearly. Approximately 60% of license applications are now processed and approved using D-Trade. Compliance cases are now all stored and managed from T-RECS. 1/5/2007