

Record Center Program Operating System (RCPOS)

Budget year: FY2007

Agency: 393

This Exhibit was submitted on Sep 11, 2006 11:43:31 AM by LISA WEBER.

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information and Justification

Section A: Overview

1. Date of submission: **Sep 11, 2006**
2. Agency: **393**
3. Bureau: **00**
4. Name of this Capital Asset: **Record Center Program Operating System (RCPOS)**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **393-00-01-04-01-0031-00**
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? **Planning**
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? **FY2007**
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: **Under the direction of OMB, NARAs Records Centers Operation became a fee-for-service revolving fund in 1999. NARA organized a Records Center Program (RCP) to operate this business segment. The RCP needs to replace legacy systems developed in the 1980s and 1990s with modern systems that provide enhanced functionality at a reasonable cost. These applications include: a records holdings inventory management system, a space management system, Personnel Registry databases that support the Military and Civilian Personnel Center, and workload tracking systems. In developing a solution to meet our internal business needs, as well as our customer needs, NARA is proceeding incrementally in two phases. Phase I produced the following deliverables: concept of operations, high-level functional requirements, modular migration plan, estimated implementation schedule, preliminary cost estimate for each module, technical risks, and a product plan for Phase II to develop, acquire, and implement RCPOS. The cost analysis completed in Phase I estimated \$6 million for development and estimated \$3.4 million annually to operate and maintain RCPOS. The benefit analysis estimated the RCP program will save more than \$5 million annually in operations when fully implemented, and projects that Federal agency customers will also save \$5 million in operations annually. The RCP will also save \$600,000 in operations and maintenance costs for the seven legacy systems that will be shut down after testing, acceptance, and implementation of RCPOS is complete. Based solely on current annual cost versus projected new cost, the new system will achieve a full return on investment in three years. Based on this analysis, the Archivist approved RCPOS Phase II, Development and Acquisition of RCPOS, to begin in July 2007. Phase II will result in implementation and operation of RCPOS. NARAs System Development Life Cycle methodology will be used for the Phase II process, beginning with a detailed design and a prototype. Initial Operating Capability is scheduled for the second quarter of FY2008.**
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Aug 28, 2006**
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**
11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name **Larry Hines**
Phone Number **301-837-1815**
E-mail **Lawrence.Hines@nara.gov**

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. **yes**
- Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? **yes**
 - Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) **no**
 - If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? [**Not answered**]
 - If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? [**Not answered**]
 - If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? [**Not answered**]
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? **yes**
Expanded E-Government
- Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **RCPOS will automate processes for Federal agencies to retrieve records from FRCs. Federal agencies store large volumes of records in FRCs that are used to determine citizens benefits and to protect rights and interests of citizens and of the Federal government. These records include criminal and civil court records, IRS tax returns, and Immigration and Naturalization case files. RCPOS will reduce the time and the cost to retrieve these records, thus speeding services.**
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.) **yes**
- If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? **no**
 - If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? **Records Services Program**
 - If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? **Adequate**
15. Is this investment for information technology? **yes**

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) **(2) Project manager qualification is under review 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**
- If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? [**Not answered**]
 - If "yes," which compliance area: [**Not answered**]
 - If "no," what does it address? [**Not answered**]
 - 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 [**Not answered**]
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following?

Hardware **5**
Software **30**
Services **65**
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**
22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name **Gary M Stern**
 Phone Number **301.837.3026**
 Title **Senior Official for Privacy Policy**
 E-mail **garym.stern@nara.gov**

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? **no**

Section B: Summary of Spending

- 1.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)				
<small>(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)</small>				
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008
Planning:	0.308	0.319	0.204	0.216
Acquisition:	0	1.5	2.5	0.6
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0.308	1.819	2.704	0.816
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	1.8	3
TOTAL:	0.308	1.819	4.504	3.816
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.				
Government FTE Costs	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.145
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	1	1	1	1

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? **no**
 a. If "yes", How many and in what year? [**Not answered**]
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: [**Not answered**]

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Contract or Task Order Number	1. NAMA-05-F-0041
Type of Contract/Task Order	Fixed Price
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Mar 7, 2005
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Mar 7, 2005

End date of Contract/Task Order	Nov 6, 2008
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	1.049
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Laverne Fields
CO Contact information	301-837-3063, Laverne. Fields@nara.gov
Contracting Officer Certification Level	2
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes
Contract or Task Order Number	2. New contract for development and implementation
Type of Contract/Task Order	Time and Materials and Fixed Price
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Jun 1, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Jun 1, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	May 31, 2011
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	3.5
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Not assigned yet
CO Contact information	N/A
Contracting Officer Certification Level	NA
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes
Contract or Task Order Number	3. New contract to purchase Software licenses for RCPOS
Type of Contract/Task Order	Fixed Price
Has the contract been awarded	no

If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Jan 1, 2008
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Jan 1, 2008
End date of Contract/Task Order	Dec 31, 2012
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	1.033
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Not assigned yet
CO Contact information	N/A
Contracting Officer Certification Level	NA
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes

1. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why: **Will be included in the next contract modification to occur in FY 2007**
2. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
 - a. Explain why: **NARA specifies Section 508 compliance in all contracts, including small acquisitions to ensure that assistive technology, devices, and services are available to all NARA employees and members of the public with disabilities who use NARA Information Technology equipment in NARA facilities. Contractors are required to design, develop, implement, maintain and upgrade all technologies to demonstrate full compliance with all existing accessibility legislation**
3. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **no**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date? [**Not answered**]
 - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? **yes**
 1. If "no," briefly explain why: [**Not answered**]

Section D: Performance Information

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)
<i>There are no performance goals.</i>					

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal	Measurement	Measurement	Measurement	Baseline	Planned	Actual Results

Year	Area	Grouping	Indicator		Improvement to the Baseline	
2005	Mission and Business Results	Central Records and Statistics Management	RCPOS development proceeds on schedule and within budget	Concept Exploration Phase	Develop concept of operations and functional requirements	Concept of operations complete, Use cases complete, Requirements complete.
2006	Mission and Business Results	Central Records and Statistics Management	RCPOS development proceeds on schedule and within budget	Concept Exploration Phase	Award contract for building a RCPOS	Detail design and prototype contract awarded, Analysis of alternatives complete, Development acquisition strategy complete
2007	Mission and Business Results	Central Records and Statistics Management	RCPOS development proceeds on schedule and within budget	Concept Exploration Phase	Complete detailed design and prototype. Award contract for building a RCPOS	[Not answered]
2008	Mission and Business Results	Central Records and Statistics Management	RCPOS development proceeds on schedule and within budget	Development	Implement RCPOS Initial Operating Capability	[Not answered]
2008	Customer Results	Customer Retention	Percent of revenue coming from new services	\$83.459M	\$.646M or 0.7%	[Not answered]
2008	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce RCP operational costs.	\$83.459M	\$.835M or 1%	[Not answered]
2008	Technology	Overall Costs	Overall Cost	\$4.0M	\$.8M	[Not answered]

Section E: Security and Privacy

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: **3**
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 - Security Table:			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date

RCPOS	Government Only	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007
ERA	Government Only	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007
ENOS	Government Only	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007
OFAS	Government Only	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007
RCPBS	Government Only	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007

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
----------------	--	---------------------------------	--	-------------------	---	--	----------------------------------

There are no Operational Systems.

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediate, 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 into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? [**Not answered**]
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. [**Not answered**]
7. How is contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? [**Not answered**]

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?
RCPOS	yes	4. No, because even though it has personal identifying information, the system contains information solely about federal employees and agency contractors.	2. No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	yes	3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.
CMRS	yes	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	1. Yes, because this is a newly established Privacy Act system of records.
ERA	yes	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	1. Yes, because this is a newly established Privacy Act system of

					records.
ENOS	yes	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	1. Yes, because this is a newly established Privacy Act system of records.
RCPBS	yes	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	1. Yes, because this is a newly established Privacy Act system of records.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? **yes**
 - a. If "no," please explain why? **[Not answered]**
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. **RCPOS**
 - b. If "no," please explain why? **[Not answered]**

3. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table :

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	Service Component Reused		Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
				Component Name	UPI		
RCPOS	Records Center Program Operations System (RCPOS) to support 1) inventory and space management, 2) automated records operations and activity measurement 3) interfaces to RCPBS and CMRS data and 4) real-time record center activities. RCPOS will replace NARS-5	Document Management	Library / Storage	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	100

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Library /	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	None selected

Storage				
Library / Storage	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	TCP/IP
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	None selected
Library / Storage	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	None selected
Library / Storage	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	None selected
Library / Storage	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	None selected

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? **no**
 - a. If "yes," please describe. **[Not answered]**
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)? **[Not answered]**
 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). **[Not answered]**

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information
Section A: Alternatives Analysis

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? **Oct 14, 2005**
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? **[Not answered]**
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: **[Not answered]**

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Baseline	Status quo. Continue to operate the RCP program with the legacy applications. The legacy applications operate at the VA-Austin Automation Center. These are COBOL programs developed in the 1970s and 1980s. They continue to function and provide IT support to the RCP.	69.585	0
1. Use the existing legacy application and web enable	This alternative would extend legacy applications by adding web services. The RCP has seven legacy applications that operate at the VA-ACC. These are COBOL programs developed in the 1970s and 1980s. They continue to function and provide IT support to the RCP. The RCP could task the VA-AAC to develop a web portal to these legacy applications. Customer agencies would be able to submit transactions electronically. However, many benefits do not accrue that would be achieved in operational savings.	71.085	35.209
2. Enterprise resource planning COTS product, such as SAP	This alternative would use COTS products that could be configured to meet the functional and technical requirements of the RCP. ERP products provide supply chain functionality that the RCP would use to meet all of the functional requirements. Customers would use a web portal to conduct all transactions with the RCP. In addition, the ERP would allow the RCP functionality to extend to customers who want to use its features for managing active records stored at the customers site.	54.836	94.873
3. Use a records management COTS product, such as ONeill or OmniRIM	This alternative would use a COTS product that has been developed specifically to manage a records center. Many COTS providers have developed products that are specific to the management and operation of a record center. These products provide a standard methodology for managing physical records object. The product architecture is thick client and uses SQL. The products have limited web functionality and are not properly architected to service an RCP operation that contains 25 million boxes.	38.058	42.981
4. Use a combination of CRM, such as Siebel with a RM product for assets and space management	This alternative would take advantage of the functionality of two COTS products. Customer Relationship Management (CRM) such as Siebel provides functionality that meets all RCP requirements for accepting transactions efficiently. ERP (see alternative 2) meets all RCP functionality to manage	45.286	94.873

	transactions within the RCP. This is the only solution that would meet 100% of the functional and technical requirements.		
5. Acquire RCPOS with an ASP acquisition process	This alternative is independent of a specific software solution. NARA would award a performance based contract that would require that all functional and performance requirements be met. The contractor would provide the hardware, the software, and the solution. The RCP program would not own the application, only the data. The RCP program would pay fees based on the number of transactions conducted.	53.543	94.873

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **4. Use a combination of ERP such as Siebel with a RM product for assets. This alternative provides the greatest return on investment. It will produce \$49.587M of savings (benefits minus costs) over the life of the application which is \$8.257M greater than the next best alternative (Alternative 5. Acquire RCPOS with an ASP).**
4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **RCPOS will automate processes for Federal agencies to retrieve records from FRCs. Federal agencies store large volumes of records in FRCs that are used to determine citizens benefits, and to protect rights and interests of citizens and of the Federal government. These records include Criminal and Civil Court records, IRS tax returns, and Immigration and Naturalization case files. RCPOS will reduce the time and cost to retrieve these records thus speeding services.**

Section B: Risk Management

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **no**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **[Not answered]**
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **[Not answered]**
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: **[Not answered]**
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? **Oct 27, 2006**
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? **Risks are identified and categorized by the project manager. The project manager reviews the risks quarterly and adjusts the probability and impact, which is reported to the program manager. A risk officer has just been assigned to the project and will assume these duties upon completion of the risk plan.**
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **Investment The current risk inventory includes three risks that are "high impact-high probability" with a combined cost exposure of \$8M. This amount is accounted for and included in the estimates provided in the alternatives analysis. Furthermore, the FRCP program is a revolving fund activity. The FRCP program maintains a capital expenditure plan that includes a \$5M reserve for managing RCPOS risks. .**

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? **no**

2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):
 - a. What is the Planned Value (PV)? **1.501**
 - b. What is the Earned Value (EV)? **0.842**
 - c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? **0.594**
 - d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? **Contractor Only**
 - e. "As of" date: **Aug 4, 2006**
3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)? **0.56**
4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)? **-0.659**
5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)? **1.42**
6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)? **0.248**
7. Is the CV% or SV% greater than ± 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) **yes**
 - a. If "yes," was it the? **CV**
 - b. If "yes," explain the variance: **CV% is positive. The analysis phase of the contract is 73% completed at lower cost than scheduled. SV% is negative. We anticipated beginning the Detailed Design and Prototype phase on March 29, 2006; however, due to delays in awarding the contract for the Detailed Design and Prototype, it was not awarded until July 28, 2006. No costs were incurred during the schedule delay.**
 - c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken? **The contract for Design and Development has been awarded at the budgeted price. The Contractor is working on several projects with NARA that have similar requirements. As a result, we believe that we can eliminate most of the Schedule Variance during this Detailed Design and Prototype phase.**
 - d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"? **5.724**
8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," when was it approved by OMB? **2006-09-06**

9. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned/Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned/Actual		Schedule/Cost (# days/\$M)		
Planning	Mar 10, 2005	0.02	Mar 10, 2005	Mar 10, 2005	0.02	0.022	[Not answered]	0.002	100
Analysis	May 19, 2006	1.051	May 19, 2006	[Not answered]	1.051	0.519	[Not answered]	0	73
Detailed Design and Prototype	Apr 25, 2007	1.498	Apr 25, 2007	[Not answered]	1.498	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Develop and Implement	Dec 28, 2007	2.5	Dec 28, 2007	[Not answered]	2.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0

Increment Initial Operating Capability									
Develop and Implement Increment 1	Jun 16, 2008	0.3	Jun 16, 2008	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Develop and Implement Increment 2	Dec 1, 2008	0.3	Dec 1, 2008	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Develop and Implement Increment 3	May 18, 2009	0.3	May 18, 2009	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Develop and Implement Increment 4	Nov 2, 2009	0.3	Nov 2, 2009	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0