

	#	Risk Description	Priority	Probability	Ability to Control	Mitigation Plan	Status	Upper Mgt?	Owner	Frequency
IPM	1	Gaps exist around defining target state requirements for FP and Title IV operations; current efforts do not include these areas. Replacing/ reengineering PEPS or designing IPM without this information could result in incomplete solution or more costly additions downstream. Additionally, a common solution or set of solutions may be able to meet the needs of both Schools and Financial Partners.	High	High	High	Add FY04 activity related to identifying business objectives, high level requirements, and conceptual design for IPM (address Schools and FP). FP analysis needed.	Open	No		
IPM	2	Lack of understanding/ integrated approach for alignment of eCMO and Integrated Partner Management efforts prior to any detailed design/ build may lead to rework, redundancies or incomplete solution.	High	High	High	Can be managed via phased approach. Include more joint discussions of eCMO and IPM in the BIG.	Open	No		
IPM	3	Inability to successfully deploy Integrated Partner Management will impact large number of operational systems/ business processes.	High	Medium	High	Need to develop detailed implementation plan which demonstrates dedicated resources, supportive stakeholders/ champions, a communication strategy, and a phased approach.	Open	No		
IPM	4	May not get full funding for core capabilities across Integrated Partner Management.	High	Medium	Low	Need to determine approach and whether phased-in is required/possible/etc.; prioritize components.	Open	No		
IPM	5	Undefined impact of deploying Integrated Partner Management components on external partners could lead to community resistance to full deployment and/ or not fully realizing benefits of solution.	High	Low	High	Add FY04 activity for an impact assessment of IPM, based upon the high level requirements and conceptual design.	Open	No		
AD	8	SAIG unable to handle increased file size/ volume due to XML ISIR (05-06).	High	High	High	Complete SAIG capacity analysis and implement required changes prior to 2005-06 processing. Have a plan via Data Strategy effort.	Open	No		
AD	9	Minimum hardware/ software requirements have not been updated to accommodate additional needs related to XML use; schools may not be prepared/ have adequate time to prepare for XML roll-out.	High	High	Medium	Plan in place.	Open	No		
AD	10	Unknown impacts on EDExpress users (schools) in 2004-05 due to Common Record processing (capacity and hardware issues due to increased file size).	High	High	Medium	Plan in place.	Open	No		
AD	11	Barriers to adoption/ proper implementation of XML by community (schools, vendors) will minimize benefits of XML and may lead to increased processing issues.	High	High	Medium	Address at Software Developer's Conference and EAC.	Open	No		
AD	12	Lack of integrated approach for alignment of ED PIN and Security Architecture may lead to incomplete recommendations/ solution.	Low	High	High	Already mitigating via integrated discussions and solutions.	Open	No		
AD	13	VDC may not have the capacity to support Application improvements.	Low	Low	High	Requested money in business case, plan and track, general operations.	Open	No		
AD	14	VDC hardware refresh complete without ED PIN Reengineering analysis and implementation may lead to rework.	Medium	High	High	Submitted FY03 business case.	Open	No		
AD	16	Issues associated with possible conversion of CPS to new contractor (may include PIC and editorial services under CPS).	High	High	Medium	Will be closed for now are re-addressed next year.	Closed; 7/29	No		
AD	17	No funding for EDPIN Re-engineering or Security Architecture.	High	Medium	Low	Funding allocated for both efforts.	Closed; 7/29	No		
AD	18	Issues associated with possible conversion of COD to new contractor.	High	High	Medium		Open	No		
AD	19	Issues associated with possible conversion of NSLD5 to new contractor.	High	High	Medium		Open	No		
AD	20	Estimated workload on the ED PIN infrastructure (to double every 3 years for next 10 years), as well as the effect this will have on the workload for other services such as CSB, CPS (FOTW).				The re-engineered ED PIN system should be an independent enterprise shared service with a scaleable architecture and design.	Closed; 7/29	No		
CSB	21	Data Strategy requirements were not complete in time for issuance of CSB RFP/SOO. Data Strategy components were addressed at a high level in the SOO to notify potential vendors of impending requirements.	High	High	High	Once requirements for the Data Strategy components are adequately defined, FSA can either incorporate into negotiation with CSB vendor or expand implementation of CSB to include (most likely through a contract modification).	Closed; 7/29	No		
CSB	23	The CSB transition strategy will require a routing solution during parallel processing, which is not yet defined. This impacts feeds from other systems (i.e. COD), mail processing and customer service.	High	High	High	EAI/ITA and Data Strategy to have an off-line discussion about options for routing solution. Include a discussion of alternatives at the BIG (with CSB representation).	Open	No		
CSB	25	The decision regarding the potential FMS/FMSS merge (11i upgrade) will come after CSB solution in progress.	High	Medium	Low	Once requirements for the FMS/FMSS merge (11i upgrade) are adequately defined, FSA can either incorporate into negotiation with CSB vendor or expand implementation of CSB to include (most likely through a contract modification).	Open	No		
Ent	27	Lack of enterprise understanding of current security standards (e.g.: items to be included during requirements and test phases of SLC) and inability to confirm that overall security requirements are being met across SLC, system accreditation.	Medium	High	High	Review current SLC. Bring SLC & Enterprise Release Mgt. discussion to BIG.	Open	No		
Ent	32	Numerous major systems going into re-compete at the same time.	High	High	Medium	Need to create an integrated timeline of planned procurements/competitions, which includes dependencies as well as tentative implementation dates. Develop integrated acquisition strategy.	Closed; 7/29	No		

	#	Risk Description	Priority	Probability	Ability to Control	Mitigation Plan	Status	Upper Mgt?	Owner	Frequency
Ent	33	Re-authorization changes are not known at this point (what and timeframe).	High	Medium	Low	Schedule Reauthorization discussion for BIG.	Open	No		
Ent	34	Hosting CSB at VDC may impact operations of other core systems, resources and hw/sw requirements.	High	Medium	High	Ensure CSC can support - get plans on how CSC will support (proper review of resources, etc.).	Open	No		
Ent	35	Lack of clarity regarding 'financial' system status and required sub-ledger functions of DLSS, COD & eCampus Based impacts, scope and <i>(impact of what a financial system means is unclear - no one understands what being part of a financial suite means-no clear direction from DoED as to where ledgers will be housed)</i> interface with FMS and CMDM.	Medium	High	Medium		Open	No		
Ent	37	Lack of clarity around how CSB fits into Integrated Partner Management, CMO, RID, Single Sign-on may lead to incomplete solution.	High	Medium	High	Engage CSB subject matter experts (FSA and Integration) in the BIG.	Open	No		
Ent	38	Lack of an integrated approach and clear direction for NSLDS may impact visioning/sequencing of Data Strategy.					Open	No		