Exhibit 300 (BY2009)

PART ONE

OVERVIEW

1. Date of Submission:	2006-09-07
2. Agency:	429
3. Bureau:	00
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	National Source Tracking System (NSTS)
5. Unique Project Identifier:	429-00-01-04-01-1010-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009?

Full-Acquisition

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?

FY2006

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.

Purpose: The purpose of this investment is to provide Web-based, full life cycle tracking of individual sealed sources containing nuclear materials. This investment directly supports the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) mission areas of nuclear materials safety and security of radioactive material with emphasis on accountability for radioactive sources. Establishment of the National Source Tracking System (NSTS) is required under the Energy Policy Act of 2005. These Sources, used in varied industrial and medical settings could potentially be stolen and used to produce a "dirty bomb", involving the use of conventional explosives in combination with Sources. Through detailed tracking in the NSTS, the NRC and other concerned government agencies will be able to readily determine when Sources of concern are in transit, overdue, or amassed in a given geographic area. Gaps Addressed: Based on the alternatives analysis and risk assessment, this investment will address mission gaps regarding timely tracking of Sources and will make data readily accessible to concerned agencies. Without this investment, these critical activities could not be achieved. In particular, current monitoring of Source data is limited to a periodic inventory submitted by NRC and Agreement State licensees who possess these materials. This interim database does not provide detailed tracking of Source shipments nor does it provide timely information regarding Source locations and is not readily accessible to all concerned agencies. Accomplishments: This investment is under development with approximately half of the software completed. An interim independent review has confirmed that the software is compliant with NRC requirements and structural standards.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?

yes

9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?

2007-08-29

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?

yes

11. Project Manager Name:

Bristor (NSTS), Joel

Project Manager Phone:

301-415-8037

Project Manager Email:

JSB1@nrc.gov

11.a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?

Mid/Journeyman-level

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.

yes

12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?

yes

12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)

no

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

yes

If yes, select the initiatives that apply:

Expanded E-Government

13.a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)

When implemented, the NSTS will support the initiative for expanded E-Government by Web portal access to all system stakeholders. Licensees will be able to report transfers of nuclear materials, and licensing agencies such as the NRC, Agreement States, and DOE will be able to view and query summary data for their licensing domain.

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

yes

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

no

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

Nuclear Materials Users Licensing and Inspection

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

Effective

15. Is this investment for information technology?

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 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB memorandum M-05-23)?

yes

19. Is this a financial management system?

no

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

Hardware	5
Software	1
Services	90
Other	3

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

Sandra Northern

Phone Number

301-415-6879

Title

Privacy Officer

Email

SSN@nrc.gov
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?
no
24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?
no

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	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4 & Beyond
	-2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013+
Planning Budgetary Resources	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Acquisition Budgetary Resources	4.609	3.775	4.518	3.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Maintenance Budgetary Resources	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.573	2.566	2.694	2.829	6.089
Government FTE Cost	0.265	0.138	0.168	0.178	0.183	0.189	0.195	0.408
# of FTEs	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies).

Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?

no

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

In late FY 2006, a mid-process NRC internal review identified concerns that emergent technologies could provide significantly improved security architecture for the NSTS. While allowing the development contractor to proceed with work not related to security controls, the NRC and development contractor conducted market research and examined security architecture alternatives. As a result of this effort, the NRC identified a security architecture that will provide appropriate Level 4 authentication that was not available at the time of NSTS contract award. As part of the security categorization assessment, per FIPS Publication 199/200, the NRC determined that the NSTS potential loss impact is high with regard to the objectives of confidentiality, integrity and availability. The NRC and NSTS development contractor have revised the integrated project schedule and are conducting cost negotiations prior to establishing a new baseline. Investigation and implementation of this revised security architecture will delay system deployment by about one year and increase contract costs.

ACQ STRATEGY

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

	Number	Type	Awarded?	Award date (planned or actual)	Start Date	End Date	Total Value ($M)
1	GS-35F-4524G, DR-02-06-005	T&M: Time & Materials	yes	2005-12-22	2005-12-23	2010-12-31	15.311
2	GS-35F-0125S, DR-41-07-402	T&M: Time & Materials	yes	2007-06-26	2007-06-26	2008-06-25	0.924

	Number	Interagency Acquisition?	Performance based?	Competitively awarded?	Alternative Financing Option?	EVM in contract?	Include sec & priv clauses?
1	GS-35F-4524G, DR-02-06-005	no	yes	yes	NA	yes	yes
2	GS-35F-0125S, DR-41-07-402	no	yes	yes	NA	no	yes

	Number	CO Name	CO Contact	CO Certification Level	If N/A, CO Competent?
1	GS-35F-4524G, DR-02-06-005	Eleni Jernell	301-415-6201 EXJ1@nrc.gov	3	
2	GS-35F-0125S, DR-41-07-402	Valerie Whipple	301-415-6514 VMW@nrc.gov	3	

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

Contract line number 2 (above) is for our project independent verification and validation activities. There are no development, modernization, or enhancement (DME) activities in this contract. Therefore, EVM is not a requirement. However, in lieu of EVM the contractor provides weekly and monthly status reporting and the NRC reviews this information for cost and schedule realism. Any variances are addressed with the contractor and remediated.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

yes

3.a. Explain why.

To ensure compliance, Section 508 contractual requirements, an NRC independent (IV&V) contractor reviews interim software releases. Any deficiencies are documented in the IV&V reports and are addressed by the development contractor prior to the next NRC review. Any Section 508 deficiencies discovered during the final NRC review could delay software delivery and invoke contract performance disincentives for late delivery of an acceptable product.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?

yes

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

2007-07-31

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

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding Measurement Area and Measurement Grouping identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

	Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
1	2006	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites able to report possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS - indicates potential for NSTS to improve timely reporting	No data available on reporting rate of possession of radiological sources	Conduct a pilot to demonstrate that U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites can report possession of radiological sources to support the initial NSTS data load	Completed pilot and demonstrated ability of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites can report possession of radiological sources
2	2006	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - indicates level of stakeholder acceptance and any need for interface/process improvement	No data available on reporting rate of possession of radiological sources	Conduct a pilot to demonstrate that U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites can report possession of radiological sources to support the initial NSTS data load	Completed pilot and demonstrated ability of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites can report possession of radiological sources
3	2006	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Time required to reflect updated regulations through an on-line system such as the NSTS - provides baseline for future improvements to prompt implemention of regulations, such as those needed in response to terrorist acts	No data available on reporting rate of possession of radiological sources	Conduct a pilot to demonstrate that U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites can report possession of radiological sources to support the initial NSTS data load	Completed pilot and demonstrated ability of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites can report possession of radiological sources
4	2006	Management	Technology	Availability	NSTS system up	No data	Conduct a pilot	Completed

					time - provides baseline for monitoring system availability in support of timely reporting of source tracking information	available on reporting rate of possession of radiological sources	to demonstrate that U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites can report possession of radiological sources to support the initial NSTS data load	pilot and demonstrated ability of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites can report possession of radiological sources
5	2007	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites able to report through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of degree to which NSTS can affect timely data collection and reporting	Conduct a follow-up pilot to determine completeness of reporting during initial pilot	0% increase in reporting possession of radiological sources	Pending
6	2007	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - provides ongoing monitoring of need for process improvements	Conduct a follow-up pilot to determine completeness of reporting during initial pilot	0% increase in reporting possession of radiological sources	Pending
7	2007	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Improvement in time required to reflect updated regulations through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of improvement in timely implementation of changes to regulations, such as thoses needed in response to terrorist acts	Conduct a follow-up pilot to determine completeness of reporting during initial pilot	0% increase in reporting possession of radiological sources	Pending
8	2007	Management	Technology	Availability	Improvement in NSTS system up time - provides ongoing monitoring of system availability in	Conduct a follow-up pilot to determine completeness of reporting during initial	0% increase in reporting possession of radiological sources	Pending

					support of timely reporting of source tracking information	pilot		
9	2008	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites able to report through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of degree to which NSTS can affect timely data collection and reporting	0% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	10% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	Pending
10	2008	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - provides ongoing monitoring of need for process improvements	0% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	6% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	Pending
11	2008	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Improvement in time required to reflect updated regulations through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of improvement in timely implementation of changes to regulations, such as thoses needed in response to terrorist acts	0% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	The NSTS is updated within 7 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	Pending
12	2008	Management	Technology	Availability	Improvement in NSTS system up time - provides ongoing monitoring of system availability in support of timely reporting of source tracking	0% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession	NSTS available 90% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	Pending

					information	and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.		
13	2009	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites able to report through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of degree to which NSTS can affect timely data collection and reporting	10% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	50% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	Pending
14	2009	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - provides ongoing monitoring of need for process improvements	6% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	35% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	Pending
15	2009	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Improvement in time required to reflect updated regulations through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of improvement in timely implementation of changes to regulations, such as thoses needed in response to terrorist acts	The NSTS is updated within 7 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	The NSTS is updated within 5 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	Pending
16	2009	Management	Technology	Availability	Improvement in NSTS system up time - provides ongoing monitoring of system availability in	NSTS available 90% of the time during scheduled and published	NSTS available 95% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	Pending

					support of timely reporting of source tracking information	hours of operation		
17	2010	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites able to report through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of degree to which NSTS can affect timely data collection and reporting	50% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	80% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	Pending
18	2010	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - provides ongoing monitoring of need for process improvements	35% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	55% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	Pending
19	2010	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Improvement in time required to reflect updated regulations through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of improvement in timely implementation of changes to regulations, such as thoses needed in response to terrorist acts	The NSTS is updated within 5 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	The NSTS is updated within 3 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	Pending
20	2010	Management	Technology	Availability	Improvement in NSTS system up time - provides ongoing monitoring of system availability in support of timely reporting of source tracking information	NSTS available 95% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	Pending

21	2011	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites able to report through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of degree to which NSTS can affect timely data collection and reporting	80% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	85% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	Pending
22	2011	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - provides ongoing monitoring of need for process improvements	55% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	60% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	Pending
23	2011	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Improvement in time required to reflect updated regulations through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of improvement in timely implementation of changes to regulations, such as thoses needed in response to terrorist acts	The NSTS is updated within 3 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	The NSTS is updated within 2 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	Pending
24	2011	Management	Technology	Availability	Improvement in NSTS system up time - provides ongoing monitoring of system availability in support of timely reporting of source tracking information	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	Pending
25	2012	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites	85% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting	87% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting	Pending

					able to report through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of degree to which NSTS can affect timely data collection and reporting	possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	
26	2012	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - provides ongoing monitoring of need for process improvements	60% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	65% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	Pending
27	2012	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Improvement in time required to reflect updated regulations through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of improvement in timely implementation of changes to regulations, such as thoses needed in response to terrorist acts	The NSTS is updated within 2 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	The NSTS is updated within 2 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	Pending
28	2012	Management	Technology	Availability	Improvement in NSTS system up time - provides ongoing monitoring of system availability in support of timely reporting of source tracking information	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	Pending
29	2013	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites able to report through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of	87% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via	88% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based	Pending

					degree to which NSTS can affect timely data collection and reporting	the Web-based NSTS	NSTS	
30	2013	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - provides ongoing monitoring of need for process improvements	65% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	70% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	Pending
31	2013	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Improvement in time required to reflect updated regulations through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of improvement in timely implementation of changes to regulations, such as thoses needed in response to terrorist acts	The NSTS is updated within 2 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	The NSTS is updated within 2 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	Pending
32	2013	Management	Technology	Availability	Improvement in NSTS system up time - provides ongoing monitoring of system availability in support of timely reporting of source tracking information	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	Pending
33	2014	Security	Mission and Business Results	Catastrophic Defense	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites able to report through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of degree to which NSTS can affect timely data collection and reporting	88% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	89% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites are reporting possession and transfer of radiological sources via the Web-based NSTS	Pending

34	2014	Effectiveness	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Improvement in percentage of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that burden for reporting is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods - provides ongoing monitoring of need for process improvements	70% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	75% of U.S. nuclear materials licensee sites reporting that the regulatory burden for reporting the possession and transfer of radiological sources is less with NSTS versus alternative paper methods.	Pending
35	2014	Openness	Processes and Activities	Policies	Improvement in time required to reflect updated regulations through the NSTS - provides ongoing monitoring of improvement in timely implementation of changes to regulations, such as thoses needed in response to terrorist acts	The NSTS is updated within 2 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	The NSTS is updated within 2 days of approval of new regulations or policies affecting the possession and transfer of radiological sources.	Pending
36	2014	Management	Technology	Availability	Improvement in NSTS system up time - provides ongoing monitoring of system availability in support of timely reporting of source tracking information	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	NSTS available 99% of the time during scheduled and published hours of operation	Pending

SECURITY & PRIVACY

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

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

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

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

For all investments, please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Identified the IT security costs for the system(s) and have integrated those costs into the overall costs of the investment:

yes

1.a. If yes, provide the Percentage IT Security for the budget year.

4.98

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.

yes

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Moderization

System Name	Agency or Contractor?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
National Source Tracking System (NSTS) - System	Contractor Only	2009-01-31	2008-11-30

5. Have any weaknesses related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

no

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

no

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

NRC procedures for ensuring contractor compliance with required security procedures are monitored and verified with regard to both the hosting environments and the software architecture. The NSTS development contractor performs weekly vulnerability scans of the development environment, reporting any issues and the plan of action to address these. Independent NRC contractors perform periodic audits of the NSTS development environment. These audits entail a review of the contractor vulnerability scan logs or a thorough on-site review often including independent vulnerability scans. All of these procedures will be implemented in the production environment as it is brought on-line. In addition to environmental vulnerability scans, the NSTS development contractor is required to have all key security documentation reviewed by a Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP). Following these reviews, NRC security experts routinely review all contractor security documentation, including related system design documentation. Furthermore, all contractors must pass an NRC security background investigation prior to accessing any NRC computer system. If a breach is identified, the NRC immediately conducts an impact assessment and implements approved remediation procedures. Follow-up activities include a lessons learned study and corrective action plan to resolve or mitigate the risk of recurrence.

8. System Privacy Data

System Name	New System?	Is there a PIA?	PIA Internet Link or Explanation	Is SORN required?	SORN Internet Link or Explanation

National Source Tracking System (NSTS) - System	yes	no	An NRC initial review determined that the NSTS will not store or process information covered by the Privacy Act.	no	The NSTS is under development. As this system will not store official agency records, the preliminary determination has been made that a SORN is not appropriate for this investment.

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

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

yes

2.a. If yes, provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

National Source Tracking System

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture?

no

4. 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	Process Tracking	Tracks the full life-cycle of radiological sources	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	35
2	Online Help	Provides the ability for Licensees to request help on how to use the system	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Help			No Reuse	2
3	Reservations/Registration	Provides the ability to indicate that radiological sources have been transferred or received	Customer Initiated Assistance	Reservations / Registration			No Reuse	10
4	Alerts and Notifications	Upon login, the Licensee may see alerts that the system generates that apply to that licensee	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications			No Reuse	5
5	Case Management	Generates alerts of various events and tracks them within the system	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	5

6	Information Retrieval	Enables users to retrieve applicable information based on security roles	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	8
7	Information Sharing	NSTS supports multi-user environments to share NRC information	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	2
8	Ad Hoc	NSTS provides ad-hoc reporting	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	2
9	Standardized / Canned	NSTS provides standardized reports	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	4
10	Data Exchange	NSTS supports the exchange of data between multiple systems	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	2
11	Data Integration	NSTS supports the integration of data from multiple systems	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	2
12	Identification and Authentication	NSTS requires a user to identify themselves in order to gain access to the system	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	5
13	Access Control	NSTS controls access to the system	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	4
14	Cyptography	NSTS supports the encoding of data for security purposes	Security Management	Cryptography			No Reuse	4
15	Query	NSTS provides complete search and retrieval services	Search	Query			No Reuse	10

5. 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	Alerts and Notifications	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Application Server, Real Application Cluster, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950; NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
2	Online Help	Service Platform and	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4; Oracle HTTP Server, Real Application Cluster, and Data

		Infrastructure			Guard 10g; NetApp SnapManager for Oracle; Dell PowerEdge 1950; NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System; Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
3	Reservations / Registration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Real Application Cluster, Internet Directory, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
4	Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Real Application Cluster, Internet Directory, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
5	Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Real Application Cluster, Internet Directory, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
6	Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Real Application Cluster, Internet Directory, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
7	Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	SQL scripts;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Real Application Cluster, Internet Directory, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
8	Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Crystal Reports;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Real Application Cluster, Internet Directory, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
9	Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Application Server, Real Application Cluster, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
10	Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Appl Server, Real Application Cluster (RAC) 10g, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
11	Data Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Real Application Cluster, Internet Directory, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch
12	Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	PKI (Verisign), RedHat Linux Enterprise v4.0 Operating System, Oracle Internet Directory (OID) 10g R3. F5 BIG-IP Local Traffic Management v9 6400
13	Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	RedHat Linux Enterprise v4.0 Operating System, Oracle Internet Directory (OID) 10g R3. Dell PowerEdge 1950
14	Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle HTTP Server, Real Applic Cluster, and Data Guard 10g;NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch;F5 BIG-IP Local Traffic Management v9 6400

15	Query	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	Server side J2EE application;RedHat Linux Enterprise v4;Oracle Appl Server, Real Application Cluster, and Data Guard 10g; NetApp SnapManager for Oracle;Dell PowerEdge 1950;NetApp FAS270C Enterprise Storage System;Cisco MDS 9020 Fabric Switch

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

no

PART TWO

ALT ANALYSIS

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.

An Alternatives Analysis for E-Gov and LOB initiatives should also be obtained. At least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline (i.e., the status quo), should be included in the joint exhibit 300. 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.

4. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?

yes

4.a. If yes, what is the date of the analysis?

2007-07-31

Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternative Name	Description	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
1 Modular design/phased implementation	Object-oriented modular design to best support implementation of eny emergent policy or tracking requirements. In particular, this approach allows non-disruptive adoption of improved security architecture technologies. To provide basic functionality soonest, a phased implementation is used, with two major releases.	33.895	27.117
2 Enhance NRC Web-based Licensing System (WBL)	Enhancement of the LTS Replacement system, which will be based on COTS licensing software	34.876	21.160
3 Enhance RSRT	Modify the Department of Energy Radiological Source Registry Tracking (RSRT) system	38.041	23.146
4 Status Quo	Solution based on use of the NRC Interim Source Database	54.065	-11.912

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

Alternative 1 This approach best meets the business needs of NRC and provides the greatest benefits and lowest risks of any alternative considered. In addition, the investment costs, parallel operations costs, and recurring costs for this approach are lower than those of the other alternatives. Finally, this alternative is recommended because of its strong independence, flexibility, and infrastructure efficiencies.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Using the selected alternative, the NSTS will provide the following qualitative benefits: (1.) Improved source tracking including: complete source life-cycle tracking, more timely source tracking information collection, automated alerts and resolutions for unusual activities, and secure and convenient access by authorized users; (2.) Ability to improve productivity, minimizing NRC staff time in processing source data, minimizing licensee time in submitting source tracking data; (3.) Minimized licensee burden; (4.) Allowing the NRC to obtain the optimal technical solution; (5.) Providing the ability to utilize components of the NRC Technical Reference Model; (6.) Ability to employ secure web hosting facilities in alignment with OMB Circular A-11; (7.) Improved operational efficiency through use of technologies and facilities used on other NRC projects; (8.) Simplified modification to core software through use of object-oriented Java development platform; (9.) Readily expandable system architecture could support future replacement of NRC legacy systems; and (10.) Ready support for expanded user base through flexible web-based architecture.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or inwhole?

no

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?
2007-08-23
1.b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?
no
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:
Investment risks are reflected through added costs in independent contractor reviews and compliance with an iterative development process. This iterative approach provides frequent product reviews to ensure early identification of any variance from NRC requirements. The added cost of packaging products for multiple reviews and the cost of independent verification and validation contractors and added NRC expert reviews is returned in ongoing assurance of true versus perceived progress. In performing reviews, particular emphasis is given to areas identified in the NRC agency plan of action & milestones (risk list).

COST & SCHEDULE

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard 748?

yes

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than Â± 10%?

yes

2.a. If yes, was it the?

Both

2.b. If yes, explain the variance.

Both the schedule and cost variance were caused by an NRC effort to ensure that the NSTS security architecture reflects the latest emergent technologies. This is in response to ongoing concerns over sensitivity of the NSTS data. In late FY 2006, a mid-process NRC internal review identified concerns that emergent technologies might be able to provide a significantly improved security architecture for the NSTS. While allowing the development contractor to proceed with work not related to security controls, the NRC and development contractor conducted market research and examined security architecture alternatives. As a result of this effort, the NRC identified a security architecture that will provide appropriate Level 4 authentication that was not available at the time of NSTS contract award.

2.c. If yes, what corrective actions are being taken?

The NRC and NSTS development contractor have revised the integrated project schedule to reflect implementation of the enhanced security architecture. Contract negotiations are underway to and will result in a new baseline. To ensure successful implementation of this enhanced architecture, the NRC has modified the contract to require more extensive involvement by key contractor security experts. The NRC has also added to the integrated schedule more frequent and detailed NRC security reviews.

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year?

no

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., 03/23/2003/ 04/28/2004) and the baseline and actual total costs (in $ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the Description of Milestone and Percent Complete fields are required. Indicate 0 for any milestone no longer active.

	Description of Milestone	Initial End Date	Initial Total Cost ($mil)	Planned End Date	Actual End Date	Planned Total Cost ($mil)	Actual Total Cost ($mil)	Schedule Variance (# of days)	Cost Variance ($mil)	Percent Complete
1	V1 Acquisition: Requirements Validation	2006-05-17	0.570	2006-04-27	2006-04-27	0.806	0.757	0	-0.049	100
2	V1 Acquisition: System Design	2006-08-03	0.615	2007-12-12		1.266	1.233		-0.033	98
3	V1 Acquisition: Security Planning	2006-11-28	0.686	2008-04-02		1.090	0.897		-0.193	19
4	V1 Acquisition: Final Build Inspection	2007-01-30	1.087	2008-02-08		1.089	0.581		-0.508	30
5	V1 Acquisition: System Testing	2007-02-22	0.716	2008-02-29		0.730	0.328		-0.402	7
6	V1 Acquisition: Security Testing and Evaluation	2007-04-10	0.307	2008-10-15		0.260	0.000		-0.260	0
7	Authority to Operate (ATO)	2007-06-12	0.521	2008-12-24		0.531	0.000		-0.531	0
8	V1Acquisition: Production Deployment	2007-08-02	0.267	2009-01-15		0.246	0.000		-0.246	0
9	V1 Acquisition: Project Closeout	2007-09-07	0.332	2009-03-06		0.310	0.000		-0.310	0

10	Set-up hosting environment and obtain ATO	2008-09-30	4.982	2008-09-30		4.982	0.000		-4.982	0
11	Acquire and set-up maintenance environment	2008-09-30	1.133	2008-09-30		1.133	0.000		-1.133	0
12	V2 Acquisition: Requirements Validation	2009-09-14	0.554	2009-09-14		0.554	0.000		-0.554	0
13	V2 Acquisition: Update System Design	2009-10-29	0.621	2009-10-29		0.621	0.000		-0.621	0
14	V2 Acquisition: Update Security Plan	2010-02-14	0.677	2010-02-14		0.677	0.000		-0.677	0
15	V2 Acquisition: Final Build Inspection	2010-03-16	1.160	2010-03-16		1.160	0.000		-1.160	0
16	V2 Acquisition: System Testing	2010-05-16	0.751	2010-05-16		0.751	0.000		-0.751	0
17	V2 Acquisition: Security Testing and Evaluation	2010-06-16	0.334	2008-12-31		0.334	0.000		-0.334	0
18	Authority to Operate (ATO) Revised System	2010-08-01	0.604	2010-08-01		0.604	0.000		-0.604	0
19	V2Acquisition: Production Deployment	2010-08-15	0.289	2010-08-15		0.289	0.000		-0.289	0
20	V2 Acquisition: Project Closeout	2010-09-14	0.359	2010-09-14		0.359	0.000		-0.359	0
21	Operations (hosting and help desk) FY09	2009-09-30	3.788	2009-09-30		3.788	0.000		-3.788	0
22	Operations (hosting and help desk) FY10	2010-09-30	1.750	2010-09-30		1.750	0.000		-1.750	0
23	Operations (hosting and help desk) FY11	2011-09-30	1.832	2011-09-30		1.832	0.000		-1.832	0
24	Operations (hosting and help desk) FY12	2012-09-30	1.918	2012-09-30		1.918	0.000		-1.918	0
25	Operations (hosting and help desk) FY13	2013-09-30	2.008	2013-09-30		2.008	0.000		-2.008	0
26	Operations (hosting and help desk) FY14	2014-09-30	2.103	2014-09-30		2.103	0.000		-2.103	0
27	Maintenance NSTS V1.1	2009-01-31	0.259	2009-01-31		0.259	0.000		-0.259	0
28	Maintenance NSTS V1.2	2009-05-31	0.260	2009-05-31		0.260	0.000		-0.260	0
29	Maintenance NSTS V1.3	2009-09-30	0.266	2009-09-30		0.266	0.000		-0.266	0

30	Maintenance NSTS V1.4	2010-01-31	0.342	2010-01-31		0.342	0.000		-0.342	0
31	Maintenance NSTS V1.5	2010-05-31	0.342	2010-05-31		0.342	0.000		-0.342	0
32	Maintenance NSTS V2.1	2010-09-30	0.342	2010-09-30		0.342	0.000		-0.342	0
33	Maintenance NSTS V2.2	2011-01-31	0.357	2011-01-31		0.357	0.000		-0.357	0
34	Maintenance NSTS V2.3	2011-05-31	0.357	2011-05-31		0.357	0.000		-0.357	0
35	Maintenance NSTS V2.4	2011-09-30	0.357	2011-09-30		0.357	0.000		-0.357	0
36	Maintenance NSTS V2.5	2012-01-31	0.374	2012-01-31		0.374	0.000		-0.374	0
37	Maintenance NSTS V2.6	2012-05-31	0.374	2012-05-31		0.374	0.000		-0.374	0
38	Maintenance NSTS V2.7	2012-09-30	0.374	2012-09-30		0.374	0.000		-0.374	0
39	Maintenance NSTS V2.8	2013-01-31	0.393	2013-01-31		0.393	0.000		-0.393	0
40	Maintenance NSTS V2.9	2013-05-31	0.393	2013-05-31		0.393	0.000		-0.393	0
41	Maintenance NSTS V2.10	2013-09-30	0.393	2013-09-30		0.393	0.000		-0.393	0
42	Maintenance NSTS V2.11	2014-01-31	0.411	2014-01-31		0.411	0.000		-0.411	0
43	Maintenance NSTS V2.12	2014-05-31	0.411	2014-05-31		0.411	0.000		-0.411	0
44	Maintenance NSTS V2.13	2014-09-30	0.411	2014-09-30		0.411	0.000		-0.411	0