Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 9/08/06
2. Agency: 449, Securities & Exchange Commission
3. Bureau: 00
4. Name of this Capital Asset: Momentum Upgrade Project
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investments only, see section *53*. For all other, use agency ID system.) 449-00-01-01-01-0001-00-402-124; (MAX Account ID Code: 449-00-0100-0).
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)
   ☐ Planning ☐ Full Acquisition ☐ Operations and Maintenance ☒ Mixed Life Cycle☐ E-Gov/LoB Oversight
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?
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:

The primary goal of the Momentum Upgrade project is to migrate the Momentum Financials system from its current 2001-era version of the CGI-AMS Momentum Financials COTS software to a recent and officially vendor supported version of Momentum Financials. Primary performance gaps include substantial technical and security weaknesses. Technical issues include financial processing issues, poor execution performance, high unreliability, a highly-complex technical architecture due to the makeshift approach, and the simple fact that both the application and the operating system are so old that the vendors no longer support them. The GAO has also recorded several Material Weaknesses in the Financial Management area, most of which are attributable to the FMS, and the current FMS cannot meet A-127 standards. The agency's PART [10002344 Enforcement Q3.6] also recorded issues that require upgrading of the FMS to resolve.

In FY2004 and FY2005, pending emergence of a viable e-Finance solution, the SEC began the first phase of the Upgrade project by investing in a partial upgrade of the Momentum FMS to increase the capacity of the supporting hardware, convert the DBMS supporting the Momentum application from Sybase to Oracle, and convert the Operating System from an old version of Sun Solaris to Microsoft Windows 2000 Server. To minimize organizational disruption, the system front end and business functionality remained unchanged. This approach reduced a small portion of the security weaknesses and is expected to make some improvement in the system's technical performance.

In FY06 the SEC also invested in a number of interfaces with emergent related systems (Acquisitions, Budget, e-Travel). The cost for these interfaces is accounted for in the budget for those systems, most of which have their own Exhibit 300. We also invested in a strategic planning initiative to explore in more detail the e-Finance alternatives that appear to be stabilizing for FY07 and to perform systems engineering tasks necessary to position the SEC for a FY07 or FY08 acquisition of a current FMS that is fully compliant with all Federal standards. Once installed we expect that system to have a life-cycle of 4-7 years without major significant investment, although we would expect a continuation of initiatives to integrate the agency's financial and business information.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?   Yes.
    a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?
        Name Orin Hamilton
        Phone Number 202-551-8278
        E-mail hamiltono@sec.gov
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient, and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. (Answer applicable to non-IT assets only) N/A
    a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? N/A
    b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)) N/A
        1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? N/A
        2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? N/A
        3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? N/A
13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes
    If "yes," check all that apply:
        ☐ Human Capital
        ☒ Budget Performance Integration
        ☒ Financial Performance
        ☒ Expanded E-Government
        ☐ Competitive Sourcing
        ☐ Faith Based and Community
        ☐ Real Property Asset Management
        ☐ Eliminating Improper Payments
        ☐ Privatization of Military Housing
        ☐ Research & Development Investment Criteria
        ☐ Housing & Urban Development Management & Performance

☐ Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives

☐ "Right Sized" Overseas Presence

☐ Coordination of VA & DoD Programs and Systems

a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? Financial Performance: stabilize the FMS, comply with FISMA, A-127. Budget-Performance Integration: Web-services platform facilitates integration with other agency systems. E-Government: we will try to use Federal Centers of Excellence.

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

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

   b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? 10002344 Enforcement Q3.6

   c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Results not Demonstrated

15. Is this investment for information technology? (see section 53 for definition) Yes

   If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

   For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council PM Guidance)?

   ☐ Level 1
   ☒ Level 2
   ☐ Level 3

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance):

   ☐ Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment –

   ☒ Project manager qualification is under review for this investment

   ☐ Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements

   ☐ Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started

   ☐ No Project manager has yet been assigned to 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? Yes

   a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? Yes

1. 1. If "yes," which compliance area: As a full-scale enterprise Financial Management System, the SEC FMS must address all 14 core requirements set forth in the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act (FFMIA) of 1996, conform to OMB Circular A-127, OMB Circular A-134 and the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP), and OMB Circular A-130. At the outset of this investment the SEC FMS did not meet those standard requirements.

2.

     2. If "no," what does it address? N/A

  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: Momentum

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100% - enter as decimal, e.g., .25 = 25%)

    Hardware 7 %   Software 22 %   Services 54%   Other 16 %

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 Barbara Stance

    Phone Number 202-551-7209

    Title SEC Privacy Officer

    E-mail stanceb@sec.gov

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?   NO – not on SORN roster.

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be **excluded** from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

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 <2005	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY+1 2009	BY+2 2010	BY+3 2011	BY+4 and Beyond >2012	TOTAL
Planning:	0.200	0.500	0.000	0.000					0.700
Acquisition:	1.900	0.038	1.500	1.500					4.938
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	2.100	0.538	1.500	1.500					5.638
Operations & Maintenance:	2.725	1.161	1.400	1.400					9.229
TOTAL:	**4.825**	**1.699**	**2.900**	**2.900**					14.867
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.								
Government FTE Costs	0.322	0.736	0.652	0.538					2.587
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	1.8	4.0	6.0	7.0					21.2

OIT FTE:	1.25	2.0	2.5	2.5					10.65

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No
   a. If "yes," How many and in what year? N/A

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes. We increased the expected cost of the full FMS upgrade from $2 million to $3.5 million based on the initial proposals received late in FY05. Maintenance phase costs also increased, partly because we will not be able to implement the full upgrade by the end of FY07 and will need to incur maintenance cost of the legacy system through FY07, and partly because the substantial increase in the system acquisition costs will probably be accompanied by increases in the licensing and support costs..

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																	
Contractor Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the ward? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start & end date of Contact / Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order ($M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? N)	Does the contract include the Required security & privacy clauses?(Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level(Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? Y/N)
SEC-HQ1-05-F-0447	Firm Fixed Price	Yes	9/23/2005	9/23/2005	5/31/2006	$660,128	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315/baierl@sec.gov	2	Yes
SECHQ1-97-M-0265 TO0012	T&M	Yes	5/19/2006	6/1/2006	3/31/2007	$799,883	No	No	No	N/A	No	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315/baierl@sec.gov	2	Yes
SECHQ1-97M-0265-TO-0016	Software License	Yes	4/28/2006	5/1/2006	9/30/2006	$126,230	No	No	No	N/A	No	No	Joanie Newhart	202-551-7303/newhartj@sec.gov	2	Yes

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 is not required for those contracts that provide for ongoing maintenance and support of the Momentum system and its replacement. Those will be level-of-effort contracts with adjustments of the effort based on the volume of work experienced, but there are no inherent deliverables or milestones. EVM is also not required for contracts for packaged software or licenses.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

Explain why: All SEC IT contracts require conformance to IT policies. Milestone reviews include the Section 508 compliance staff. Every IT system must complete acceptance testing before entering production; that includes automated 508 testing with the Federal BOBBY tool. The system must resolve any compliance issues or obtain a written waiver from the CIO. When the system has known users with disabilities, the project team often elects to include them in user testing.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes
   a. If "yes," what is the date? 07/25/2005
   b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? N/A
      1. If "no," briefly explain why: N/A

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006

Investment	First FY for this goal	Strategic goal(s) - SEC	Measurement Area - FEA PRM	Measurement Grouping - FEA PRM	Measurement Indicator	Baseline - 1st year or prior year actual	Planned Improvement to Baseline (End Goal)	Goal - 2006	Actual - 2006	Goal - 2007	Goal - 2008	Goal - 2009	Goal - 2010
Momentum	2006	Maximize use of SEC resources	Mission and Business Results	Management of Government Resources	Cost of continuing to manage existing system vs. new system upgrade	2005: $150k management cost per year	Savings of 10% per year by using new system	Savings of 10% per year by using new system	No hard metric but customer managers spend almost no time on system problem resolution.				
Momentum	2006	Maximize use of SEC resources	Technology	Information and Data - is not an FEA entry. Used "Information Management" instead.	Data system and structure consistent with industry standard (to facilitate interaction with other systems)	2005: Over $750K/yr in break-fix and patch support	% custom code	Reduce system engineering customizations by 40% as a result of version upgrade	System documentation is inadequate and does not permit measurement of customization of code.	Reduce effort to support repairs to custom code to under $250K as a result of version upgrade	Reduce effort to support repairs to custom code to under $200K as a result of version upgrade	Eliminate code customization as a result of transitioning to full upgrade system	

Momentum	2006	Maximize use of SEC resources	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes & Activities)	Reduce annual maintenance costs	2005: $1.5M annual maintenance cost	Reduce annual maintenance costs by 20% to $1.1M	1.1	Costs increased to $1.3 because of the need to pay for documentation	0.9	0.9		deleted
Momentum	2006	Maximize use of SEC resources	Technology	Efficiency	Increase in system performance as measured by cycle time of particular tasks i.e. speed of database returns	2005: User reports very long report cycles; hard data has not been collected	20% reduction in report cycle time	Establish system performance baseline before and after version upgrade	User reports much faster cycles but quantitative baseline not established.	Reduce cycle time of particular tasks by 5%	10% reduction from baseline	20% reduction from baseline	deleted
Momentum	2006	Maximize use of SEC resources	Customer Results	Service Accessibility is not an FEA category - Service Recovery	% system downtime	2005: 10% system downtime under existing system	Reduce system downtime by 50%	Reduce system downtime by 50% [to 5%]	User reports much less downtime but quantitative baseline not established.	Reduce system downtime by 80% [to 2%]		Reduce system downtime by 95% [to 0.5%]	

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

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

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security, and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system(s) to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system(s).

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

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: 5%

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

6. Planning & Operational Systems – Privacy:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system? (1,2,3,4)	(d) Is the PIA available to the public? (1,2,3)	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06? (1,2,3,4,5)
FMS Replacement System	Yes	2	2	Yes	3
Momentum 3.7.1	No	1	1	Yes	3
Short Text	Yes	1	1	Yes	1
Short Text	Yes	1	1	Yes	1

(c) Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?
   1.   Yes.
   2.   No
   3.   No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.

						Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
6. Planning & Operational Systems – Privacy:						
(a) Name of System	**(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)**	**(c) Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system? (1,2,3,4)**	**(d) Is the PIA available to the public? (1,2,3)**	**(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)**	**(f) Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06? (1,2,3,4,5)**	

> 4. No, because even though it has personal identifying information, the system contains information solely about federal employees and agency contractors.
>
> (d) Is the PIA available to the public?
>   1. Yes.
>   2. No, because a PIA is not required to be completed at this time.
>   3. No, because the PIA has not yet been prepared.
>
> (f) Was a new or amended SORN published in FY2006?
>   1. Yes, because this is a newly established Privacy Act system of records.
>   2. Yes, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was substantially revised in FY 06.
>   3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.
>   4. No; because the system is operational, but the SORN has not yet been published.
>
> No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and
Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes

   a. If "no," please explain why? N/A

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. The SEC is a small, non-scorecard agency currently not required to perform Enterprise Architecture assessments.

   b. If "no," please explain why? Long Text

Service Component Table:

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

JBoss Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Short Text	Medium Text	Financial Management	Auditing	FEA Enumeration	Depends on source selected	External	5%
Short Text	Medium Text	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting	FEA Enumeration	Depends on source selected	External	10%
		Financial Management	Credit / Charge		Depends on source selected	External	5%
		Financial Management	Debt Collection		Depends on source selected	External	4%

Short text - 250 characters Medium text - 500 characters Long text - 2500 characters
All dollar amounts must be reported in millions with at least 3 decimals (6 decimals available)

Service Component Table:

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

JBoss Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
		Financial Management	Expense Management		Depends on source selected	External	10%
		Financial Management	Financial Reporting. There is no FEA Element – used information sharing instead		Depends on source selected	External	50%
		Financial Management	Payment / Settlement		Depends on source selected	External	5%
		Financial Management	Revenue Management		Depends on source selected	External	10%
		Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR				1%

a. Use existing Service Reference Model (SRM) Components or identify as "NEW." A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component

provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

---

4. Technical Reference Model Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Activity-Based Management, Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management, Financial Reporting = Information Sharing, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management, Document Imaging and OCR	Service Access & Delivery	Access Channel	Web Browser	Internet Explorer
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection,	Service Access & Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Hyper Text Transfer Protocol Secure (HTTPS)

4. Technical Reference Model Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Expense Management, Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management				
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management, Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Internet Information Servers
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	Scanners
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Supporting Platform	Operating System Platforms NOT A SERVICE	Windows 2000 - Server

4. Technical Reference Model Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Management, Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management			STANDARD	
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management, Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Supporting Platform	Operating System Platforms	Windows 2003 - Server
Document Imaging and OCR	Component Framework Service Area	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	OCR
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management,	Component Framework Service Area	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java Script

4. Technical Reference Model Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management				
Document Imaging and OCR,	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage / Backup	Storage Area Network (SAN)
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management, Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	WebLogic
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management, Financial	Component Framework Service Area	Data Management	Database Connectivity	ODBC

4. Technical Reference Model Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management				
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management, Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Databases	Oracle
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management, Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue	Component Framework Service Area	Business Logic	Platform Independent	HTML

4. Technical Reference Model Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Management				
Auditing, Billing and Accounting, Credit / Charge, Debt Collection, Expense Management, Financial Reporting, Payment / Settlement, Revenue Management	Component Framework Service Area	Business Logic	Platform Independent	C\C++

a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

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

a. If "yes," please describe. The first phase (now under way) leverages other financial-related systems. The final system we expect to be an e-Gov solution and therefore almost entirely leveraged. In the present system, externally-leveraged components include FPDS and E-Travel. The SEC uses FPDS on an interagency basis from the Department of the Interior. [It is not included as a contract within this investment because the SEC views these as separate investments, although there is an interface file]. The SEC is presently using Travel Manager which shares static files with Momentum. In FY04 we invested in Fed-Traveler, the EDS E-Travel offering, and in FY06 we invested in dynamic data interfaces to Momentum. EDS has recently been cleared to continue its work and we expect delivery of the system and the related interfaces during CY2006. We anticipate that the updates FMS system will be able to interface with these other systems much more effectively that the current obsolete version of Momentum because of the web services capabilities of any new FMS.

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)?

        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). N/A

PART II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? In the incremental upgrade we expect to reduce customer frustration with consistent processing problems and frequent system crashes caused by the patchwork of code used to maintain the old unsupported application against a non-conforming DBMS. This upgrade will also permit Momentum to take advantage of improvements in the SEC technical architecture, such as server cluster management, and will resolve a few of the findings both in Financial Management and IT Security. The full upgrade will permit full compliance with financial and security standards; full compliance with the agency's architecture; full service backup and recovery; far higher reliability and maintainability; and much simpler integration through web services with other related applications.

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate, or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? YES
    a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 8/31/2005.
    b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No
    c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: Long Text
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?   n/a
    a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
    b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? Long Text
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: SEC PMO guidance for project planning includes a comprehensive risk analysis process. This risk analysis process includes identification of risks, using the 19-factor framework established in OMB Circular A-11, and the risks are scored according to probability and impact. The score is translated into a cost and schedule buffer based on the total project cost. The project execution cost is then appended

with this risk buffer amount, thereby creating the risk loading that OMB recommends. Once the investment moves into the execution phase, the risk management plan is updated at least as often as each phase gate to reflect the current situation and the status of mitigation activities, and the buffers are adjusted or drawn down as appropriate.

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

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)? $6.019
   b. What is the Earned Value (EV)? $6.001
   c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? $6.292
   d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor Only
   e. "As of" date: 08/31/2006
3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)? 1.00
4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)? $-0.018
5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)? 0.95
6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV–AC)? $-0.291
7. Is the CV or SV greater than +/-10%?
   (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No
   a. If "yes," was it the? n/a
   b. If "yes," explain the variance: n/a

   c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken? No corrective action necessary because the project milestones that have completed were lower than the initial baseline

   d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"? $13.149

8. Have any significant changes been made to the past fiscal year? Yes

   a. If "yes," when was it approved by OMB? We are submitting now for approval of the revised baseline because we have gained more information on expected costs and degree of difficulty since last year's submittal. The changes are insertion of a two-FY transition period in FY07-08 and an increase in the ongoing costs of maintaining the existing system associated with the delay in making the final transition. These changes are based on the experience gained to date and on the vendor proposal for a 1-step conversion received after submittal of the prior Exhibit 300.

7. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline: `Formatted: Bullets and Numbering`

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

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Current Baseline Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) Planned	/Actual	Total Cost ($M) Planned	/Actual	Current Baseline Variance Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	Percent Complete
Planning	9/30/2004	0.135	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	0.200	0.200	0	0.000	100.0%
Preliminary HW/SW acquisitions	12/31/2004	1.000	12/31/2004	11/1/2004	1.000	0.990	60	0.010	100.0%
DBMS Oracle upgrade	6/30/2006	0.600	3/31/2006	5/31/2006	0.940	0.741	-61	0.199	100.0%
Full FMS planning			3/31/2007	4/30/2007	0.500	0.500	-30	0.000	0.0%
Full FMS upgrade phase 1			6/30/2007		1.500		0	0.000	0.0%
System O&M <FY 05	9/30/2005	$1.30	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	2.725	2.725	0	0.000	100.0%
System O&M FY 06	9/30/2006	$0.70	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	1.136	1.136	0	0.000	100.0%
System O&M FY07	9/30/2007	$0.70	9/30/2007		1.400		0	0.000	0.0%
System O&M FY 08	9/30/2008	$0.70	9/30/2008		1.400		0	0.000	0.0%
System O&M FY 09	9/30/2009	$0.70	9/30/2009		0.514		0	0.000	0.0%
System O&M FY10-12	9/30/2012	$2.10	9/30/2010		2.029		0	0.000	0.0%