

PBGC - Risk Management and Early Warning / Legal Management

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary
Part I: Summary Information And Justification

Section A: Overview

1. Date of submission: **Sep 9, 2006**
2. Agency: **012**
3. Bureau: **12**
4. Name of this Capital Asset: **PBGC - Risk Management and Early Warning / Legal Management**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **012-12-01-05-01-2195-00**
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? **Mixed Life Cycle**
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: **One of the PBGC's strategic corporate goals is to better safeguard the pension insurance system. In 2004 two new departments were created to focus resources on achieving this goal: the Department of Insurance Supervision and Compliance (DISC) and the Office of Chief Counsel (OCC). PBGC planned two coordinated systems to support these new departments: a Risk Management and Early Warning System (RMEWS) focused on assessing the risk posed to the insurance program by large under-funded plans and determining which plans to focus analytical and litigation resources on, and a Legal Matter Management System (LMMS) focused on managing the full range of legal efforts needed to support the negotiation and settlement process. As initially conceived, RMEWS would combine electronic sources of business information (e.g., Moody's, S&P, SEC) with automated business rules to greatly enhance PBGC's ability to identify and quickly react to significant risks to the insurance program. A subset of RMEWS -- the e-4010 system -- already supports electronic filing of financial data from companies with pension plan under-funding in excess of \$50 million. This addresses a PART finding (in section 3.1): that the Corporation needs better information sooner from sponsors who cannot fund their pension plans. The LMMS was to replace in OCC an existing Office of General Counsel system designed for general practice rather than OCC's more specialized bankruptcy litigation. LMMS will be a COTS package modified to OCC's unique requirements so that the limited number of in-house legal staff to effectively deal with the increasingly large volume of documents, issues, and legal actions relating to "mega-cases" such as major airline bankruptcies. Preliminary analyses have made it clear that the most important performance gap to be closed in the short-term is**

integration between DISC and OCC. Closing this gap requires re-engineering processes in both departments, and defining common data models that will enable information to be shared quickly and completely. There are several options, ranging from a single integrated COTS package for both departments to enhancing legacy systems now serving these departments. Even modified, this investment is essential to addressing the PART deficiency by improving early identification of increased exposure and significant risks involved in pending legal matters, quicker analysis of electronic plan filings and court documents, and more routine matters.

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

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Apr 22, 2005**

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**

11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name **Michael Schaffner**

Phone Number **202-326-4000**

E-mail schaffner.michael@pbgc.gov

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

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

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) **[Not answered]**

1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? **[Not answered]**

2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? **[Not answered]**

3. 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? **no**

Expanded E-Government

Financial Performance

a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?
Supports Financial Performance by acting on a root cause of the PBGC deficit: under-funding in insured pension plans. By safeguarding the system, PBGC protects the defined-benefit pensions of American workers by ensuring that the sponsoring companies keep them adequately funded. Supports expanded E-Government through Risk Management's E-4010 feature, enabling practitioners to file regulatory information electronically (i.e., to e-file 4010, 4043, and distress termination requests.

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? **yes**
 - If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? **Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation**
 - If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? **Moderately Effective**
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 1**
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **(4) Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started**
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 FFMI 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**25**
- Services**70**
- 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? **n/a**
22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name	Philip Hertz
Phone Number	202-326-4000

Title

Deputy General Counsel / Chief Privacy Officer

E-mail

hertz.philip@pbgc.gov

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? **yes**

Section B: Summary of Spending

1.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY+1 2009	BY+2 2010	BY+3 2011	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0.4	0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.8
Acquisition:	0	0	4.5	0	1.5	0	1	0	7
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0	0	4.9	0	1.6	0.1	1.1	0.1	7.8
Operations & Maintenance:	0.3	0.077	0.4	1.2	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.7	4.577
TOTAL:	0.3	0.077	5.3	1.2	2.1	0.8	1.8	0.8	12.377
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.2	2.6
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	1	2	3	1	3	1	3	1	15

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: **The Risk Management / Early Warning and Legal Matter Management systems were envisioned to be comprehensive information systems based on COTS products, but requiring substantial customization, that**

would integrate the activities of the two PBGC organizations in the fore-front of negotiating settlements with companies sponsoring troubled pension plans. To that end, the FY 2007 summary of spending included substantial funds for software acquisition, software development and systems integration. Planning activities conducted in FY 2006 with the assistance of a consultant familiar with the business activities of the two organizations indicated that such a large-scale approach to solving the problem and closing the performance gap was not prudent at this time. The consultant was engaged to identify and explore options that were available, including both the integrated COTS approach as well as a more limited approach focused on improve the usability of the systems already supporting the individual organizations.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

1. @import url(/itweb/resources/app.css);

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Contract or Task Order Number	PBGC-01-CT-05-0744
Type of Contract/Task Order	Labor Hr
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 15, 2006
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 15, 2005
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 14, 2010
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	1.6
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	Michele Gray
CO Contact information	202-326-4160
Contracting Officer Certification Level	3
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	PBGC-CT-
Type of Contract/Task Order	UNKNOWN
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 28, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 28, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2011
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	6.5
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	yes
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	yes

clauses?	
Name of CO	UNKNOWN
CO Contact information	UNKNOWN
Contracting Officer Certification Level	3
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	[Not answered]
Contract or Task Order Number	GS35F4594G
Type of Contract/Task Order	Labor Hour
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Oct 1, 2004
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Oct 1, 2004
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2009
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	2
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	yes
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	no
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?	no

Name of CO	UNKNOWN
CO Contact information	UNKNOWN
Contracting Officer Certification Level	3
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	[Not answered]

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: **PBGC's application of EVM is limited to development projects budgeted for \$500,000 or more.**
3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
 - a. Explain why: **Section 508 compliance is a mandatory requirement of all PBGC contracts, and will be for these systems. Among the mandatory technical requirements will be: provide an application interface that complies with the software application standards required by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, as detailed in 36 CFR 1194, Subpart B. PBGC reviews contractor test plans for completeness, and for traceability back to requirements. During testing, Section 508 compliance will be tested and assured.**
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **no**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date? **Sep 17, 2006**
 - 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 Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2006	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached	30	18	TBD
2006	Customer Results	Timelines	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	90	-15	TBD
2006	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to process reportable events	120	-30	TBD
2006	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit	20	-5	TBD
2007	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached	48	+52	TBD
2007	Customer Results	Timelines	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	75	-15	TBD
2007	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to process reportable events	90	-30	TBD
2007	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit	15	-5	TBD
2008	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached	60	-15	TBD
2008	Customer Results	Timelines	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	60	-15	TBD
2008	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit	10	-2	TBD
2008	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to process reportable events	60	-15	TBD

2009	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached	200	0	TBD
2009	Customer Results	Timelines	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	45	-15	TBD
2009	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to process reportable events	45	0	TBD
2009	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit	5	3	TBD

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: **2**
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
Risk Management / Early Warning	Government Only	Oct 1, 2008	Sep 15, 2008
Legal Matter Management	Government Only	Oct 1, 2008	Sep 15, 2008

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST	Date C&A Com	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete(d) : Security Control	Date the contingency plan tested

		level	800-37?	plete		Testing	
Legal Management System	Government Only	Moderate	yes	Mar 5, 2004	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	Dec 23, 2003	Aug 12, 2006

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? **yes**
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. **Yes, a request of \$2.7 million was requested but not approved, pending further information. OMB's approval is pending further information. Of that \$2.7 million, \$1.5 million was requested to make various improvements to PBGC's enterprise-wide information security program and to complete eight additional C&As during FY2007. The remainder of the request related to smart cards, data encryption and two-factor authentication. Additionally, during January 2007, PBGC management will begin a strategic review of security requirements and funding, in order to decide the funding schedule and possible funding sources for the improvements and C&As needed. PBGC has made substantial progress by hiring a third party Information Security vendor to assist in developing an effective Risk Management Program and performing Independent Validation and Verification (IV&V) on new and in progress C&A efforts. While in this role, the Vendor also performed a gap analysis comparing PBGC's security program to all OMB, NIST Special Publications, and FISMA information security guidelines, and then mapped them back to PBGC's information security reportable condition. This analysis served as a baseline for planned Risk Management activities upgrading PBGC's security program to include Risk Management and Certification and Accreditation. The IV&V vendor is also assisting PBGC in developing system specific/ enterprise-level Security Plans of Action and Milestones. The systems listed in this investment have been certified and accredited as listed. PBGC will re-certify the systems listed, each one receiving a C&A as prioritized and aligned with the strategic planning process scheduled from January to April 2007.**
7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **Not applicable, PBGC believes: none of these systems will be operated outside of PBGC control**

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?
Risk Management / Early Warning	yes	3. No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	2. No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	no	5. No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Legal Matter Management	yes	3. No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	2. No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	no	5. No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Legal Management System	no	3. No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	2. No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	no	5. No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
E-4010	no	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	no	3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.

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. **Risk Management Early Warning Systems & Legal Matter Management System**
 - 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		
SAS	Statistical modeling for DOL 5500 data	Data Management	Data Exchange	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	100
PIMS	Pension insurance modeling and simulation	Analysis and Statistics	Meta Data Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	100
CHAMPS	Financial and actuarial management system for risk identification and valuation	Investment Management	Strategic Planning and Mgmt	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	100
CHAMPS	Financial and actuarial management system for risk identification and valuation	Management of Processes	Sales and Marketing	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	100
IPS	Imaging Processing System for document storage and retrieval	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR	[Not answered]	012-12-01-05-01-2075-00	Internal	0
Legal Management Suite	Legal case processing and document management	Routing and Scheduling	Case Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	100
CAS	Case Administration for plan terminations	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management	[Not answered]	012-12-01-05-01-2075-00	Internal	0

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Network Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Software Configuration Management	.Net / Windows 2000
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java / Linux
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	XML/SOAP
Data Integration	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	JDBC/ADO.NET
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	ASP.NET
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	HTML
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	JSP/JSF
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	HTML
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	SSL
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	WS Security
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	IE 6.0

Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Extranet	TCP/IP
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	TCP/IP
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	TCP/IP
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Oracle Internet Directory / Active Directory
Procurement	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Section 508
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Internal
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	HTTP, HTTPS
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	DHCP
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	DNS
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	TCP/IP
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Oracle BPEL
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	PLSQL, Net8
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	WSDL, API
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	XML

Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	XML Schema
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	MS SQL Server
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	FileNet, Optical Image Storage
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10gAS, .NET
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Oracle 10gAS, IIS
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Enterprise server
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	Frame Relay
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Ethernet
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	Oracle JDeveloper
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	All Fusion, Oracle JDeveloper
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Mercury Interactive
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Peregrine, PVCS Version Manager

Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Windows 2000/2003, Windows .NET
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Linux

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? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)? **no**
 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). **No specific software required.**

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? **Apr 22, 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:			
Alter native Analy zed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Baseli ne	Status quo	5.8	0
Altern	Use of COTS for each system, with modest configuration	12.2	179.7

ative #1	and customization to meet the unusual business needs. Includes conducting a complete BPR in both major business units, a gap analysis, development of high-level specifications, performing market research, developing an RFP, and designing, developing and testing the new system. Also include would be the development of new interfaces to other PBGC systems. The new system would automate workflows - including approval and authorization routing		
Alternative #2	This alternative is a custom-built RMEW / LMM, delivering the same services and the same benefits	16.4	179.7

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **Alternative #1 was chosen, both for its lower estimated cost and its use of COTS. However, during the planning phase, an assessment of the current systems supporting these business activities was conducted, but as of 9/5/2006 has not been finalized. This assessment looked at the immediate business needs of the organizations for which RMEW and LMM were targeted, and will pose choices to management as to how to proceed. Those choices will be made in Q1 FY 2007**
4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **As now envisioned for the near-term, this investment will significantly improve communication between the business units that are engaged in safeguarding the pension insurance system. It will enable them to better share information, use a common data model to describe and track the work that they do, and give the managers in each business unit a much better organizational view of priorities, and allow more effective team assignments to be made by each.**

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? **Mar 31, 2007**
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? **[Not answered]**
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **A Risk Management Plan is currently under development with an anticipated completion date of 03/31/2007. The Risk Management Early Warning / Legal Matter Management project manager will work within the allocated budget to determine activities that can be supported for the year. The budget will be**

divided into areas of support, which will be aligned with the project schedule. The schedule will track activities relating to risk, specifically: MOUs and ISAs, OMB reporting, application and data releases, partner working groups and meetings, and overall project management. Each of Risk Management Early Warning / Legal Matter Management fiscal year goals will be tracked in the project schedule so as to ensure on-time and on-budget delivery. The investment's scope, schedule, and cost will be reviewed and baseline through the initiative's oversight and governance procedures. In addition, the milestones will be reported to OMB through the OMB Dashboard and Milestone reporting process. The tasks' scope and completion are validated, and the cost and schedule are tracked using earned value management. Section B of this Exhibit 300 will be included in the enterprise plans of actions of milestones (POA&M).

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)? **3.8**
 - b. What is the Earned Value (EV)? **0**
 - c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? **0**
 - d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? **Contractor Only**
 - e. "As of" date: **Sep 30, 2006**
3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)? **0**
4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)? **0**
5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)? **0**
6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)? **0**
7. Is the CV% or SV% greater than $\pm 10\%$? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) **no**
 - a. If "yes," was it the? [**Not answered**]
 - b. If "yes," explain the variance: [**Not answered**]
 - c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken? [**Not answered**]
 - d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"? **3.8**
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? **As far as is known, baseline changes have not been approved.**

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)			
LMMS Market Research / Alternatives Analysis	Nov 30, 2005	0.2	Nov 30, 2006	[Not answered]	0.2	0.2	220	0.3	30
RMEWS Market Research / Alternatives Analysis	Dec 30, 2005	0.3	Nov 30, 2006	[Not answered]	0.3	0.3	220	0	30
RMEWS Development	Mar 30, 2007	1.9	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	2.3	[Not answered]	330	0.4	0
LMMS Development	Jan 31, 2007	1.9	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	2.3	[Not answered]	390	0.4	0