

# PBGC - Risk Management Early Warning / Legal Matter Management

[redacted]

Agency: 012

## Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

### Part I: Summary Information And Justification

#### Section A: Overview

1. Date of submission: **Dec 28, 2007**
2. Agency: **012**
3. Bureau: **12**
4. Name of this Capital Asset: **PBGC - Risk Management Early Warning / Legal Matter Management**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **012-12-01-05-01-2195-00**
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? **Mixed Life Cycle**
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: **Two departments within PBGC support the strategic corporate goal of safeguarding the pension insurance system through 1) early identification of pension plan risks and 2) proper mitigation of those risks through legal action, settlement, or plan termination. The Department of Insurance Supervision and Compliance (DISC) and the Office of Chief Counsel (OCC). The departments suffered from a performance gap due to years of uncoordinated management and the use of separate management information systems containing redundant and inconsistent information. DISC uses a Lotus Notes application named CHAMPS and OCC uses a matter management system named LEGAL EDGE (LEW). Neither system complies with enterprise architecture guidelines or is properly maintained. In 2004 a steering committee was established to address the performance gap. The committee identified the need for an integrated system to manage case information, documents, and work flow that complies with PBGC's enterprise architecture and uses a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) product. The system will comply with all information security and privacy act requirements and will facilitate information flow between PBGC, the Department of Labor (DOL), the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and the Employee Benefits Service Administration (EBSA), as DISC needs to coordinate frequently with those agencies on open, active cases. The system, once implemented, will be used as a pilot program for use in other departments within PBGC such as the Multi-employer Program Division and the Standard Termination and Compliance Division. Funds for this effort (\$4.9 million) were allocated in 2006. Planning efforts were completed in 2006 to support the executive steering committee decision to pursue a single solution. In 2007, efforts to finalize the process reengineering effort as well as the functional and technical system requirements will be completed. Because of the time required to engage in a fully competitive acquisition process, the request for proposal for the COTS software and integrator will be issued in 2007 but may not be successfully awarded until**

**2008. At that time, DISC and OCC will spend the remainder of the budgeted funds to employ the COTS integrator to configure, test, document, and deploy the system in 2008. By budget year 2009, the project will be in operations and maintenance. The system is fully on track and within budget as of the end of 2007.**

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Jun 29, 2007**
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**
11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name **Jennifer Messina**  
 Phone Number **202-326-4000** [redacted]  
 E-mail **messina.jennifer@pbgc.gov**

- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? **TBD**
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energyefficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. **no**
  - a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? **yes**
  - b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) **no**
    1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?  
[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? **yes**  
**Budget Performance Integration**
  - a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **This asset supports Budget Performance Integration by solving a performance gap in strategic goal #1. By more quickly identifying pension plan sponsor corporate transactions that increase PBGC's exposure to financial loss, PBGC improves its ability to negotiate for plan protection and reduces the risk of loss. Streamlining communication and modernizing case files eliminates the need for manual processes and frees up more resources to monitor companies that sponsor large pension plans.**
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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part).) **yes**
  - a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? **no**
  - b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? **Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation**
  - c. 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 2**

- 17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment**
- 18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4-FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)? **no**
- 19. Is this a financial management system? **no**
  - a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? **[Not answered]**
    - 1. If "yes," which compliance area: **[Not answered]**
    - 2. If "no," what does it address? **[Not answered]**
  - b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52 **[Not answered]**
- 20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following?
  - Hardware **5**
  - Software **25**
  - Services **70**
  - Other **[Not answered]**

- 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** [redacted]  
 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? **no**
- 24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? **no**

**Section B: Summary of Spending**

1.

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>									
<i>(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)</i>									
	<b>PY-1 and earlier</b>	<b>PY 2007</b>	<b>CY 2008</b>	<b>BY 2009</b>	<b>BY+1 2010</b>	<b>BY+2 2011</b>	<b>BY+3 2012</b>	<b>BY+4 and beyond</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning:	0	0.6	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	1.4
Acquisition:	0	0	4.2	0	0	0	0	0	3.5
Subtotal Planning	0	0.6	4.4	0	0	0	0	0	4.9

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	<b>PY-1 and earlier</b>	<b>PY 2007</b>	<b>CY 2008</b>	<b>BY 2009</b>	<b>BY+1 2010</b>	<b>BY+2 2011</b>	<b>BY+3 2012</b>	<b>BY+4 and beyond</b>	<b>Total</b>
& Acquisition:									
Operations & Maintenance:	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.1	1	1	1	1	6.2
TOTAL:	0.4	1.0	4.8	1.1	1	1	1	1	11.1
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	2
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	11

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 FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **In the FY 2008 request, two projects/systems were proposed to address the same performance gap, a Risk Management and Early Warning System as well as a separate Legal Matter Management System. As a result of the executive steering committee decision regarding the best way to address the performance gap, the projects/systems were combined into one project/system, as indicated in the project background and justification. The only way the project was affected was through schedule, not cost. The efficiencies gained by consolidated projects enabled the teams to conduct an assessment and rework the baseline schedule without adding cost. The project is still on target for completion by 2009 and within budget.**

### Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

- 1.

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	PBGC-01-CT-05-0744
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Time & Materials
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	yes
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Oct 15, 2005
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Oct 15, 2005
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Jun 30, 2009
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	1.4
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	no
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	no

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	no
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Michele Gray
<b>CO Contact information</b>	202-326-4160 gray.michele@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	[Not answered]
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	PBGC-01-DO-0006
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Time & Materials
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	yes
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Jul 23, 2006
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Jul 23, 2006
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Sep 30, 2008
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	1.2
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	yes
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	no
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Michele Gray
<b>CO Contact information</b>	202-326-4160 gray.michele@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	[Not answered]
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	PBGC
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	Fixed Price
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	no
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Oct 30, 2008
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Oct 30, 2008
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Sep 30, 2009
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	[redacted]
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	yes
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing</b>	NA

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
option is being used?	
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Kay Rison
CO Contact information	202-326-4160 Rison.kay@pbgc.gov
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]
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	<b>PBGC</b>
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order</b>	<b>Fixed Price</b>
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	<b>Oct 1, 2009</b>
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	<b>Oct 1, 2009</b>
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	<b>Sep 30, 2013</b>
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	<b>[redacted]</b>
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	<b>no</b>
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	<b>NA</b>
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Kay Rison
CO Contact information	202-326-4160 Rison.kay@pbgc.gov
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: **EVM was not required for Contract #1 or 2 but the contractors were required to create project plans and weekly status reports to communicate cost, schedule, and performance outcomes to the project manager. The project manager then reviewed the actual cost, schedule and performance against the project plan and issued guidance to the contractors as needed to keep the efforts and deliverables on schedule.**
3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
  - a. Explain why: **Section 508 compliance is a mandatory requirement for the procurement of this COTS-based system. The technical requirements require the software vendor to provide evidence that the software complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, as detailed in 36 CFR 1194, Subpart B as well as a requirement that the**

**contractor test plans include testing and assurance for Section 508 compliance. Failure to meet this requirement will be grounds for invalidating the proposal.**

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," what is the date? **Oct 15, 2006**
  - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? [Not answered]
    1. If "no," briefly explain why: [Not answered]

**Section D: Performance Information**

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached to mitigate risk of increased pension plan under funding	30 settlement agreements	+2 settlement agreements (as a result of the business process reengineering effort completed in 2007)	32 (as of 8/01/07)
2007	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Days between lien arising and perfection - shortening indicates plan is secured and ultimate recovery is maximized	60 days	-5 days (as a result of the business process reengineering effort completed in 2007)	55 (as of 8/01/07)
2007	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Customer Results	Timeliness	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	120 days	-10 days (as a result of the business process reengineering effort completed in 2007)	110 (as of 8/01/07)
2007	Safeguard	Processes and	Cycle Time	Days to	90 days	-30 days (as	60 (as of

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Activities		engage sponsor after a transaction – reduction improves negotiating power to secure additional funding for the plan		a result of the business process reengineering effort completed in 2007)	8/01/07)
2007	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit	1 error	-1 errors (as a result of the business process reengineering effort completed in 2007)	0 (as of 8/01/07)
2008	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached to mitigate risk of increased pension plan under funding	TBD at the end of FY2007	+5 settlement agreements (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/08
2008	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Days between lien arising and perfection – shortening indicates plan is secured and ultimate recovery is maximized	TBD at the end of FY2007	-5 days (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/08
2008	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit	Customer Results	Timeliness	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	TBD at the end of FY2007	-20 days (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the	Results will be available 9/30/08



<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders					system deployment)	
2008	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to engage sponsor after a transaction – reduction improves negotiating power to secure additional funding for the plan	TBD at the end of FY2007	-5 days (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/08
2008	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit – maintaining a zero is the optimal goal	TBD at the end of FY2007	0 errors (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/08
2009	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached to mitigate risk of increased pension plan under funding	TBD a the end of FY2008	+15 settlement agreements (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/09
2009	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Days between lien arising and perfection – shortening indicates plan is secured and ultimate recovery is maximized	TBD a the end of FY2008	-15 days (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/09

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	stakeholders						
2009	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Customer Results	Timeliness	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	TBD at the end of FY2008	-15 days (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/09
2009	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to engage sponsor after a transaction – reduction improves negotiating power to secure additional funding for the plan	TBD at the end of FY2008	-15 days (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/09
2009	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit – maintaining a zero is the optimal goal	TBD at the end of FY2008	0 errors (as a result of the business process reengineering effort and the system deployment)	Results will be available 9/30/09
2010	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached to mitigate risk of increased pension plan under funding	TBD at the end of FY2009	+5 settlement agreements	Results will be available 9/30/10
2010	Safeguard the federal pension	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Days between lien arising and perfection	TBD at the end of FY2009	-5 days	Results will be available

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders			- shortening indicates plan is secured and ultimate recovery is maximized			9/30/10
2010	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Customer Results	Timeliness	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	TBD at the end of FY2009	-15 days	Results will be available 9/30/10
2010	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to engage sponsor after a transaction - reduction improves negotiating power to secure additional funding for the plan	TBD at the end of FY2009	-5 days	Results will be available 9/30/10
2010	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit - maintaining a zero is the optimal goal	TBD at the end of FY2009	0 errors	Results will be available 9/30/10
2011	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants,	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached to mitigate risk of increased pension plan under funding	TBD at the end of FY2010	+5 settlement agreements	Results will be available 9/30/11

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	plan sponsors, and other stakeholders						
2011	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Days between lien arising and perfection	TBD at the end of FY2010	-5 days	Results will be available 9/30/11
2011	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Customer Results	Timeliness	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	TBD at the end of FY2010	0 days	Results will be available 9/30/11
2011	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to engage sponsor after a transaction – reduction improves negotiating power to secure additional funding for the plan	TBD at the end of FY2010	-5 days	Results will be available 9/30/11
2011	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit – maintaining a zero is the optimal goal	TBD at the end of FY2010	0 errors	Results will be available 9/30/11

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
2012	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached to mitigate risk of increased pension plan under funding	TBD a the end of FY2011	+5 settlement agreements	Results will be available 9/30/12
2012	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Days between lien arising and perfection - shortening indicates plan is secured and ultimate recovery is maximized	TBD a the end of FY2011	-5 days	Results will be available 9/30/12
2012	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Customer Results	Timeliness	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	TBD a the end of FY2011	0 days	Results will be available 9/30/12
2012	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to engage sponsor after a transaction - reduction improves negotiating power to secure additional funding for the plan	TBD a the end of FY2011	0 days	Results will be available 9/30/12
2012	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit -	TBD a the end of FY2011	0 errors	Results will be available 9/30/12

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders			maintaining a zero is the optimal goal			
2013	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Number of settlements reached to mitigate risk of increased pension plan under funding	TBD at the end of FY2012	0 settlement agreements	Results will be available 9/30/13
2013	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Productivity	Days between lien arising and perfection – shortening indicates plan is secured and ultimate recovery is maximized	TBD at the end of FY2012	-5 days	Results will be available 9/30/13
2013	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Customer Results	Timeliness	Days to respond to minimum funding waiver applications for IRS	TBD at the end of FY2012	0 days	Results will be available 9/30/13
2013	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Days to engage sponsor after a transaction – reduction improves negotiating power to secure additional	TBD at the end of FY2012	0 days	Results will be available 9/30/13

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	and other stakeholders			funding for the plan			
2013	Safeguard the federal pension insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders	Technology	Reliability	Number of errors found in financial statement audit – maintaining a zero is the optimal goal	TBD at the end of FY2012	0 errors	Results will be available 9/30/13

**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: **7**
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 Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
Risk Management Early Warning / Legal Matter Management System	Government Only	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008

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 Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Legal Edge for Windows	Government Only	Moderate	yes	Dec 15, 2003	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	Jul 5, 2007	Aug 11, 2007
Champs	Government Only	Moderate	no	Nov 30, 2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	Jul 5, 2007	Aug 11, 2007

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. **Note: PBGC is not requesting additional funding. PBGC implemented new NIST compliant security policies and procedures June 1, 2007 that are based upon the Department of Labor's, modified slightly to meet PBGC's operating environment. The new policies and procedures include those for conducting a FIPS 199 inventory assessment and performing NIST 800-37 certification and accreditation (C&A). Following publication, PBGC developed a FIPS 199 inventory of systems, completed June 30, 2007. As a result, CHAMPS was elevated to moderate from low, and now requires an independent C&A. The previous C&A for Legal Edge for Windows was rejected by PBGC's independent auditors as non NIST 800-37 compliant. Legal Edge for Windows is scheduled to undergo a compliant C&A starting October 1, 2007 and to be completed January 31, 2008. CHAMPS is scheduled to undergo C&A starting September 1, 2007 and to be completed November 30, 2007. PBGC completed testing security controls July 7, 2007. Deficiencies identified have been incorporated into the comprehensive POA&M for addressing the security deficiencies. PBGC is funding improvement actions to correct the weaknesses through existing budgets. This business case requests seven percent for security. With the implementation of new functionality, additional security controls will be required. The funding request for security will be used to conduct annual risk assessments, update system security plans, perform C&As, establish continuous monitoring and perform the function of continuous monitoring associated with the new functionality.**
7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **All PBGC systems are jointly run and managed by federal employees and contractor teams reporting to PBGC federal employees. PBGC contracts include language to ensure the suitability of contractors' employees, and inspection of all new or renovated contractor hosting sites. PBGC federal employees and contractors are subject to suitability background investigations. New federal employees and contractors are issued roles of conduct, required to take computer security awareness orientation, and provided instruction on incident reporting procedures. Annually, federal employees and contractors are required to take refresher security awareness training. Role-based training is conducted during employee position training. For positions related to the Designated Approving Authority, Information System Owner, System Administrators and Project Managers, role-based training is conducted by PBGC's Enterprise Security Team following orientation, and annually thereafter. Electronic security compliance is monitored by the OIT security team through routine checking of user ID account activity for suspicious or high-risk behavior. If such behavior is identified, the contracting officer is**



**notified immediately to begin remediation procedures. PBGC also conducts user account recertification annually.**

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?	Internet Link or Explanation	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Internet Link or Explanation
Risk Management and Early Warning / Legal Matter Management System	yes	no	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information	no	The system is not a Privacy Act System of Records
Champs	no	no	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information	no	The system is not a Privacy Act System of Records
Legal Edge for Windows (LEW)	no	no	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information	no	The system is not a 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. **Risk Management and Early Warning / Legal Matter Management System**
  - b. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]
3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **Plan Management**

4. 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		
RISK AND LEGAL MATTER MANAGEMENT (CHAMPS/RMEWS-	Financial and actuarial management system for	Investment Management	Performance Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	10

4. 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		
LMMS)	risk identification and valuation						
RISK AND LEGAL MATTER MANAGEMENT (CHAMPS/RMEWS-LMMS)	Financial and actuarial management system for risk identification and valuation	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	40
RISK AND LEGAL MATTER MANAGEMENT (CHAMPS/RMEWS-LMMS)	Imaging Processing System for document storage and retrieval	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	40
PARTICIPANT SERVICES (FILENET/CMS)	Case Administration for plan terminations	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management	Data Exchange	012-12-01-05-01-2075-00	Internal	5
CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL SERVICES	Premium payer tracking and insured inventory management	Tracking and Workflow	Portfolio Management	Data Exchange	012-12-01-01-01-2065-00	Internal	5

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC browser standards (IE)
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	All PBGC privacy and security and web standards, in the case of this web based software this includes 508, Records Management and P3P
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	PBGC CSS/GSS standards
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint ex. J2EE, Linux and Oracle
Performance	Service Platform	Delivery	Application	COTS to be procured (RMEW-

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b>				
<b>FEA SRM Component</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification</b>
Management	and Infrastructure	Servers	Servers	LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint ex Oracle Application Server (OC4J)
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle RDMS (current PBGC supported versions)
Performance Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC browser standards (IE)
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint.
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	All PBGC privacy and security and web standards, in the case of this web based software this includes 508, Records Management and P3P
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	PBGC CSS/GSS standards
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint ex. J2EE, Linux and Oracle
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint ex Oracle Application Server (OC4J)
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle RDMS (current PBGC supported versions)
Case Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC browser standards (IE)
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint.
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	All PBGC privacy and security and web standards, in the case of this web based software this includes 508, Records Management and P3P
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	PBGC CSS/GSS standards

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b>				
<b>FEA SRM Component</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification</b>
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint ex. J2EE, Linux and Oracle
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	COTS to be procured (RMEW-LMMS) will support PBGC EA standards from the Blueprint ex Oracle Application Server (OC4J)
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle RDMS (current PBGC supported versions)
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Case Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	XML/SOAP
Case Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	JDBC/ADO.NET
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	XML/SOAP
Portfolio Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	JDBC/ADO.NET

6. 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]

**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]

<b>2. Alternatives Analysis Results:</b>			
<b>Alternative Analyzed</b>	<b>Description of Alternative</b>	<b>Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate</b>	<b>Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate</b>
Status Quo	Use of Champs for DISC and LEW for OCC. The use of current systems is fragmented and does not enable the participants in the case team to share the same	7	10

<b>2. Alternatives Analysis Results:</b>			
<b>Alternative Analyzed</b>	<b>Description of Alternative</b>	<b>Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate</b>	<b>Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate</b>
	information in an electronic matter or establish and track due dates and work flow tasks.		
Alternative #1 (COTS)	Use of COTS to create an integrated case management, document management and workflow management tool to integrate DISC and OCC operations and information. The primary benefit of this investment is a net improvement in the total dollars negotiated in settlements and risk mitigation which represents a real increase in the funds available to PBGC to pay benefits. The net present value of this alternative is \$38.5 million.	13.7	40
Alternative #2 (Custom Build)	Custom build an integrated case management, document management and workflow management tool to integrate DISC and OCC operations and information. Effort includes developing, testing, and deploying the new system. The primary benefit of this investment is a net improvement in the total dollars negotiated in settlements, which represents a real increase in the funds available to PBGC to pay benefits. The net present value of this alternative is \$24.0 million.	24.5	40
Alternative #3 (Modified Legacy)	Conversion of all OCC users to CHAMPS (from LEW). The primary benefit of this investment is a net improvement in the total dollars negotiated in settlements, which represents a real increase in the funds available to PBGC to pay benefits. The net present value of this alternative is \$5.2 million.	9.1	12

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 highest net present value. DISC and OCC also place great value on the use of COTS because it enables the agency to implement the necessary functions much sooner, thereby speeding up benefit realization. COTS can also be more easily reused by other departments within PBGC or similar functions at other agencies like DOL or EBSA. The COTS-based solution involves a business process reengineering effort to integrate and streamline the processes of both DISC and OCC. Rather than having to create detailed requirements as would be required for a custom-built system, functional requirements can be used because much of the functionality required is already available in the COTS product, it just needs to be configured to meet the specific needs of DISC and OCC. This investment is envisioned to be reused as the workflow management, tracking, and document management component in at least 3 other departments within PBGC, the Standard Termination and Compliance Division, the Multi-employer Program Division and the Office of General Counsel.**
4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **As now envisioned for the near-term, this investment will significantly improve communication and workflow between the business units that are engaged in safeguarding the pension insurance system. Because the system can be deployed faster by**

using COTS than a custom-built solution, it will enable the two departments to realize benefits sooner. This is critical because the economic environment has required over the last two years and continues to require rapid responses to corporate transactions in order to protect the pension assets from exposure to risk. This system will enable DISC and OCC to 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. By increasing organizational capacity through workflow streamlining and the reduction of manual processes, DISC and OCC will be able to more closely monitor a larger portion of the entire insured inventory. By improving communication across DISC and OCC analysts, attorneys and managers and by increasing the availability of case histories and analytical information, DISC and OCC will be able to respond more quickly to high-risk transactions thereby increasing the amount of protection that can be obtained for the plan, either through settlement agreement, 412(n) lien perfection, or letter of credit.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment? **This Investment**
  - b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment or Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
Champs	[Not answered]	Sep 30, 2008
Legal Edge for Windows (LEW)	[Not answered]	Sep 30, 2008

**Section B: Risk Management**

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **Apr 30, 2007**
  - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **yes**
  - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: **It's a new plan. The plan focuses on risks to cost, schedule, and resources. The main risks identified in 2007 are related to the unpredictability of the procurement schedule, the quality of the COTS integrator, and the ability to negotiate price with the integrator. While this is a low probability risk because it was mitigated in advance by conducting thorough market research and allocating budget appropriately, it is still a fundamental risk.** [redacted]
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? [Not answered]
  - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? [Not answered]
  - 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: **The largest risks to the investment typically impact either the schedule or executive approval (at many levels) and thereby impact the cost of the investment. The most apparent schedule risks are related to obtaining all of the appropriate and required sign offs (usually from outside department resources) on critical path deliverables, as**

**required by the IT solution life cycle methodology. Because these departments do not have an incentive to sign off according to our investment schedule, these signoffs require significant advanced planning, communication and management in order to ensure that sign offs happen on time and with the proper review and consideration. To mitigate this risk, we have included in the project plan, a key milestone for each deliverable and the preparatory steps required to effectively communicate and manage the signoff of each critical path deliverable. This additional project management component adds FTE costs to the schedule of about 20% of the overall contractor services costs. The value it provides by effectively mitigating much larger risks to the investment cost makes the additional steps and cost a necessary element of the budget and schedule. Additionally, the investment's scope, schedule, and cost are reviewed 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. 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 causes of the variance: [Not answered]
  - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions [Not answered]
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? **no**
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? [Not answered]

4. 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)		
1.1 RMEW-LMMS Market Research	Dec 30, 2005	0.2	Nov 30, 2006	Nov 30, 2006	0.2	0.2	220	0	100
1.2 As Is Process Model Defined	Apr 30, 2007	0.2	Apr 30, 2007	Apr 30, 2007	0.2	0.2	0	0	100
1.3 To Be Process Model Defined	May 30, 2007	0.3	May 30, 2007	May 30, 2007	0.3	0.3	0	0	100

4. 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)		
1.4 Functional and Technical Design Requirements Complete	Jun 30, 2007	0.5	Jun 30, 2007	Jun 30, 2007	0.5	0.5	0	0	100
1.5 Integrated Project Team Planning	Dec 31, 2007	0.2	Dec 31, 2007	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
2.1 Purchase Software	Oct 30, 2007	0.3	Oct 30, 2007	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
2.2 Purchase Hardware	Oct 30, 2007	0.3	Oct 30, 2007	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
2.3 Design complete	Feb 29, 2008	0.7	Feb 29, 2008	[Not answered]	0.7	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
2.4 Configure COTS	Jun 30, 2008	1.5	Jun 30, 2008	[Not answered]	1.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
2.5 Testing Complete	Aug 30, 2008	0.5	Aug 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
2.6 Implement in Production	Sep 30, 2008	0.2	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
3.1 FY06 Steady State	Sep 30, 2006	0.3	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.3	0.3	0	0	100
3.2 FY07 Steady State	Sep 30, 2007	0.3	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
3.3 FY08 Steady State	Sep 30, 2008	0.4	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
3.4 FY09 Steady State	Sep 30, 2009	0.9	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
3.5 FY10 Steady State	Sep 30, 2010	0.9	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
3.6 FY11 Steady State	Sep 30, 2011	0.9	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
3.7 FY12 Steady State	Sep 30, 2012	0.9	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0



4. 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)				
3.8 FY13 Steady State	Sep 30, 2013	0.9	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
4.1 FY06 Project Management	Sep 30, 2006	0.3	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.3	0.3	0	0	100
4.2 FY07 Project Management	Sep 30, 2007	0.5	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
4.3 FY08 Project Management	Sep 30, 2008	0.2	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
4.4 FY09 Project Management	Sep 30, 2009	0.2	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
4.5 FY10 Project Management	Sep 30, 2010	0.2	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
4.6 FY11 Project Management	Sep 30, 2011	0.2	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
4.7 FY12 Project Management	Sep 30, 2012	0.2	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
4.8 FY13 Project Management	Sep 30, 2013	0.2	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
5.1 FY08 C&A for RMEWS/LMMS and LEW and address security findings (CHAMPS is decommissioned)	Sep 30, 2008	0.2	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
5.2 FY09 Address security findings	Sep 30, 2009	0.1	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
5.3 FY10 Address security findings	Sep 30, 2010	0.1	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
5.4 FY11 Address security findings	Sep 30, 2011	0.1	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
5.5 FY12 Address security findings	Sep 30, 2012	0.1	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
5.6 FY13 Address	Sep 30,	0.1	Sep	[Not	0.1	[Not	[Not	[Not	0

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:						
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline		Current Baseline Variance	
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual	Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual	Schedule:Cost (# days/\$M)	Percent Complete
security findings	2013		30, 2013	answered]	answered]	answered]