

PBGC - IT Business Transformation

[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 - IT Business Transformation**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **012-12-03-00-01-1028-00**
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? **FY2008**
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 PBGC IT Business Transformation (ITBT) is not a systems development effort, but an initiative to significantly improve the effectiveness, efficiency, governance & risk management of PBGC's IT assets. PBGC relies substantially on information systems to support its business activities in support of maintaining solvency of the nation's pension programs. An IT Risk Assessment (ITRA) was performed using COBIT (Control Objectives for Information & related Technology), OMB & legal requirements, providing Executive Management with key issues: May not have appropriate IT skills & systems it needs to properly identify, assess, communicate, & monitor economic risks, or perform forecasting of pension scenarios; Office of IT does not have ability to respond to new & rapidly changing business requirements; May not meet increasing demands for customer & employee on-line access & still provide adequate time for systems maintenance; Systems may not have capacity or flexibility to handle additional plan terminations; Confusion over roles of the IT governance bodies hindering decision-making process; Lack of specific IT cost accounting. Maturity issues identified were: IT leadership & workforce skills gaps; no IT Strategic Plan; inadequate Capital Planning & Investment Control; inadequate project management & compliance with the Enterprise Architecture; inability to align IT costs with needs, & manage IT risks. New CIO focused on identifying the best solution for improving PBGC's approach to IT. Five alternatives were evaluated on the value basis in reducing risk, longevity of benefits, cost, organizational capacity, & risk using the Value Measuring Methodology (VMM). Best value alternative was selected by PBGC Executive Management as it transforms PBGC's approach to IT & IT performance issues by implementing mature governance, planning/operating processes, align IT resources with corporate business needs, achieve IT operations efficiency/effectiveness, mitigate risks & compliance issues (audit findings & FISMA); minimize business impact due to IT service disruption; streamline enterprise business processes & data integration; project status transparency for timely milestone decisions. This Exhibit 300 is a comprehensive & optimal solution for CIO to address IT**

issues for approx. \$32.4 M over a 5-year period, completed by FY11. All costs are covered by repurposing existing funds & contracts, realigning existing FTE staff, coordinated with IT Infrastructure 300.

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 **Srividhya S. Nicholson**
 Phone Number **202-326-4130**[redacted]
 E-mail **nicholson.srividhya@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)? **no**
 - 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
Expanded E-Government
Human Capital
 - a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **Addresses IT staffing, skills, & defining owners/roles/responsibilities for all IT processes/stakeholders; skills gap assessment, identify training, & continuous staff reviews. Funding addressed by restructuring IT contracts to performance-based; addresses audit findings related to IT security & business continuity in FY07 PART to improve corporate performance. Use EPA's Security LOB, further EA and CPIC to address streamlined enterprise/cross-gov business processes/data/systems.**
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 a PART review? **yes**
 - 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: **N/A**
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 **N/A**
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following?
- Hardware **0**
- Software **0**
- Services **62**
- Other **38**
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**

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.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
<i>(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)</i>									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.32	1.300	.500	2.800	0	0	0	0	0.796
Acquisition:	0	8.500	8.000	2.700	1.32	1.3	0	0	12.98
Subtotal Planning	0.32	9.800	8.500	5.500	1.32	1.3	0	0	13.776

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
& Acquisition:									
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	0.100	3.000	3.688	4.286	4.831	0	15.853
TOTAL:	0.32	9.800	9.100	8.500	5.008	5.586	4.831	0	29.629
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0	0	0.500	0.500	0.526	0.526	0	0	2.104
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	0	0	3	3	3	3	0	0	12

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 FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **This is the first submission for this business case.**

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

- 1.

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Contract or Task Order Number	NEW
Type of Contract/Task Order	FFP
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Nov 1, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Nov 15, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2008
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	0.48
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	yes
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	no
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
	taylor.susan@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]
Contract or Task Order Number	CT-05-0739
Type of Contract/Task Order	T&M
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Aug 1, 2005
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Aug 1, 2005
End date of Contract/Task Order	Jul 31, 2010
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	2.34
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
Contract or Task Order Number	DO-06-0239
Type of Contract/Task Order	FFP
Has the contract been awarded	Yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 5, 2006
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 5, 2006
End date of Contract/Task Order	Mar 31, 2008
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	0.186
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	No
Is it performance based?	Yes
Competitively awarded?	Yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	No
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	Yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
Contract or Task Order Number	DO-07-0080
Type of Contract/Task Order	FFP
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Mar 2, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Mar 2, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Mar 31, 2008
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	0.06
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
Contract or Task Order Number	NEW
Type of Contract/Task Order	FFP
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Nov 1, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Nov 15, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Mar 31, 2008
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	0.336
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
Contract or Task Order Number	CT-04-0687; TO-07-03
Type of Contract/Task Order	T&M
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Oct 1, 2003
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Oct 1, 2006
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2007
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	0.653
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
Contract or Task Order Number	PBGC-DO-07-0241
Type of Contract/Task Order	FFP
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Aug 14, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Aug 28, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Dec 31, 2007
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	0.893
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required	yes

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
security & privacy clauses?	
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
Contract or Task Order Number	DO-06-0287
Type of Contract/Task Order	T&M
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 27, 2006
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 27, 2006
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2009
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	2.184
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
Contract or Task Order Number	NEW
Type of Contract/Task Order	FFP
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Oct 15, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Oct 15, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2010
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	2.4
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
<hr/>	
Contract or Task Order Number	NEW
Type of Contract/Task Order	FFP
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Oct 15, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Oct 15, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2011
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	11
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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]
<hr/>	
Contract or Task Order Number	NEW
Type of Contract/Task Order	FFP
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Jun 1, 2008
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Jul 1, 2008
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2011
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	[redacted]
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	No
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Susan Taylor
CO Contact information	(Telephone) 202-326-4100[redacted]; (email) taylor.susan@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: **PBGC initiated EVM requirements on systems development contracts first. EVM is not required by the current contracts since they are not systems development contracts. EVM will be required for the new contracts. EVM will be required by existing contracts when they perform tasks for the ITBT DME tasks.**
3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
 - a. Explain why: **Section 508 Compliance is an explicit, mandatory requirement enforced by PBGC’s CO and supported by its Gen. Counsel and its CIO. PBGC’s Infrastructure Admin group conducts compliance review on new systems and documents prior to implementation/publication as part of approving the Change Control Record (CM Process). All policies, processes & procedures developed as part of this initiative will be developed using such 508 compliant tools (i.e. MsOffice).**
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date? **Aug 31, 2007**
 - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? **[Not answered]**
 1. If "no," briefly explain why: **N/A**

Section D: Performance Information

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources	Processes and Activities	Security	# of Major Systems and GSS establish baseline C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	# of C&As completed is 0 of the 11 C&As required in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	# of C&As completed is 1 of the 11 C&As required in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	1
2008	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient	Processes and Activities	Security	# of Major Systems and GSS establish	# of C&As completed is 1 of the 11 C&As	# of C&As completed is 11 of the 11	Data to be compiled

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	stewardship of PBGC's resources			baseline C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	required in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	C&As required in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	at the end of FY 2008
2008	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	# out of a total 15 select COBIT processes implemented with a targeted COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 is 0 of the 15 total processes targeted for implementation	# of COBIT processes implemented that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 is 2 of the 15 total processes targeted for implementation	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2008
2008	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Mission and Business Results	Management Improvement	# out of 8 select COBIT control processes (subset of 15 total) that focus in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 0 of 8.	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 2 of 8.	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2008
2008	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Technology	Availability	# out of 7 select COBIT control processes (subset of 15 total) that focus in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 0 of 7.	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 0 of 7.	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2008

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
				communicated"			
2008	Goal 2 – exceptional service to customers and stakeholders Agency; Goal 3 – effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of customers who rate Help Desk Services above average or excellent	The baseline will be determined at the end of FY2007	1% increase in percentage of customers who rate Help Desk Services above average or excellent	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2008
2009	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources	Processes and Activities	Security	# of Major Systems and GSS establish baseline C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	# of C&As completed is 11 of the 11 C&As required in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	# of C&As completed is 11 of the 11 C&As required in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	Data to be compiled at the end of FY 2009
2009	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	# out of a total 15 select COBIT processes implemented with a targeted COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 is 2 of the 15 total processes targeted for implementation	# of COBIT processes implemented that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 is 7 of the 15 total processes targeted for implementation	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2009
2009	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources	Mission and Business Results	Management Improvement	# out of 8 select COBIT control processes (subset of 15 total) that focus in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 2 of 8	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 4 of 8	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2009
2009	Goal 3 –	Technology	Availability	# out of 7	# of COBIT	# of COBIT	Data to

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources			select COBIT control processes (subset of 15 total) that focus in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	processes implemented in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 0 of 7.	processes implemented in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 3 of 7.	be compiled at end of FY 2009
2009	Goal 2 – exceptional service to customers and stakeholders Goal 3 – effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of customers who rate Help Desk Services above average or excellent	The baseline will be determined at the end of FY2008	1% increase in percentage of customers who rate Help Desk Services above average or excellent	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2009
2010	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Processes and Activities	Security	# of Major Systems and GSS maintain C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	# of Major Systems and GSS establish baseline C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	# of Major Systems and GSS establish baseline C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	Data to be compiled at the end of FY 2010
2010	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	# out of a total 15 select COBIT processes implemented with a targeted COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 is 7 of the 15 total processes targeted for implementation	# of COBIT processes implemented that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 is 12 of the 15 total processes targeted for implementation	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2010
2010	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient	Mission and Business Results	Management Improvement	# out of 8 select COBIT control	# of COBIT processes implemented in	# of COBIT processes implemented in	Data to be compiled

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	stewardship of PBGC's resources			processes (subset of 15 total) that focus in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 4 of 8	the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 6 of 8	at end of FY 2010
2010	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Technology	Availability	# out of 7 select COBIT control processes (subset of 15 total) that focus in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 3 of 7	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 6 of 7	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2010
2010	Goal 2 – exceptional service to customers and stakeholders; Goal 3 – effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of customers who rate Help Desk Services above average or excellent	The baseline will be determined at the end of FY2009	1% increase in percentage of customers who rate Help Desk Services above average or excellent	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2010
2011	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC's resources	Processes and Activities	Security	# of Major Systems and GSS maintain C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	# of Major Systems and GSS establish baseline C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	# of Major Systems and GSS establish baseline C&As in accordance with (FISMA & NIST)	Data to be compiled at the end of FY 2011

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2011	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	# out of a total 15 select COBIT processes implemented with a targeted COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 is 12 of the 15 total processes targeted for implementation	# of COBIT processes implemented that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 is 15 of the 15 total processes targeted for implementation	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2011
2011	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources	Mission and Business Results	Management Improvement	# out of 8 select COBIT control processes (subset of 15 total) that focus in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 6 of 8	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Plan and Organize" and "Monitor and Evaluate" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 8 of 8	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2011
2011	Goal 3 – Effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources	Technology	Availability	# out of 7 select COBIT control processes (subset of 15 total) that focus in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated"	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 6 of 7	# of COBIT processes implemented in the areas of "Acquire & Implement" and "Deliver & Support" that achieve COBIT maturity Level 3 - defined as "Processes are documented and communicated" is 7 of 7	Data to be compiled at end of FY 2011
2011	Goal 2 – exceptional service to	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of customers who rate Help Desk	The baseline will be determined at	1% increase in percentage of customers who	Data to be compiled

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	customers and stakeholders Goal 3 – effective & efficient stewardship of PBGC’s resources			Services above average or excellent	the end of FY2010	rate Help Desk Services above average or excellent	at end of FY 2011

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:
17.799999
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)
<i>There are no Systems in Planning.</i>			

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
<i>There are no Operational Systems.</i>							

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? **no**
 - a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. [**Not answered**]

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **Not Applicable - This initiative is not a system development or implementation effort, rather it is an IT Business Transformation initiative to significantly improve the effectiveness, efficiency, governance & risk management of PBGC’s IT assets. The scope of this initiative includes maturing and furthering PBGC's IT Security program policies, processes, procedures and training. The implementation of the security program requirements will occur in the IT Infrastructure Operations contract per the IT Infrastructure Exhibit 300.**

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
<i>There are no Planning & Operational Systems.</i>					

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (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. **IT Business Transformation**
 - b. If "no," please explain why? **N/A**
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. **IT 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		
<i>There are no Service Components.</i>							

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
<i>There are no mappings to Technical Reference Models.</i>				

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," please describe. **EPA’s Information Security LoB. PBGC is also leveraging the EPA ISS LoB (ASSERT), to implement an integrated**

solution for FISMA reporting. ASSERT will be used for system categorization, systems inventory management, risk identification, control tailoring, continuous monitoring of POA&M tasks, management oversight, and FISMA reporting compliance. It will further compliance with FISMA through the development and implementation of new or major enhancement to applications and general support systems.

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? **May 14, 2007**
 - 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: **N/A**

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Baseline	Status Quo	0	0
1 - Treat Symptoms: Provide low-cost, short-term fixes to limit damage from the most critical risk impacts. This is considered the minimum action necessary and would tend to only treat symptoms and cross-cutting factors contributing to risks.	Establish IT Strategic Plan; Align IT initiatives with corporate plan; Make IT leadership permanent; Process to enforce ITLSCM, EA, security and privacy standards; create IT financial management for cost accountability. VMM = 64.	4.4	0
2 - Omnibus Fix: Establish long-term process and organizational improvements reducing residual risk associated with 20 COBIT elements identified currently as High Risks resulting in mature processes and marginal or low risk in all 34 COBIT elements.	Define IT Strategic Plan, Info. Arch., Tech. Dir. & IT processes organ., & relationships; Comm. Mgmt. aims; Mng. Qual'y & Proj.; Assess/Mng. IT Risks; ID/Acquire/Main. Autom'd Sol.; Acq./Maintain IT Infrast.; Procure IT Resources; Install/Accredit Sol.; Mng. IT Invest.; Serv. Levels, Config., 3rd-party Serv., Perf. Capacity, Data, Phys Envir., & OPS; Ensure Continuous Serv., Sys. Security & Regulat'y Compl.; ID/Allocate Costs; Monitor/Eval. IT Perform./Internal Control; Provide IT Gov VMM=170.	36.7	0
3- IT Bus. Transf'n (Select): Focus on process & organ'l reforms across COBIT elem'ts: most value in improv'g process matur. & reduc'g risks VS cost of	Define IT Strategic Plan, Information Architecture, & IT processes organization, & relationships; Manage Projects; Assess/Manage IT Risks; Identify/Acquire/Maintain Automated Solutions; Acquire/Maintain IT Infrastructure;	32.4	0

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
implem. Creates oppor'ty for residual effects of impr'd del. of IT Serv to support perform. goals.	Manage IT Investments, Service Levels, Performance, Capacity, & Data; Ensure Continuous Service, Systems Security & Regulatory Compliance; Monitor/Evaluate IT Performance. VMM=541.41.		

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **Alt3 - ITBT was selected as the most cost-effective solution. Using COBIT framework, five alternatives were evaluated on the basis of value in reducing risk & costs, the longevity of anticipated benefits, & PBGC's capacity to implement the necessary reforms, using OMB's Value Measuring Methodology (VMM). VMM Score = [(Org. Capacity X Timeliness of Benefits X Longevity of Benefits) X (Risk Reduction Value)] DIVIDED BY [Normalized Cost (Risk Adjusted)] VMM Formula Factors (OMB A-11 Guidance):**

 - **Organizational Capacity=PBGC's ability to provide resources to address alternative**
 - **Timeliness of Benefits=Timing with which the solution allows PBGC to achieve overall goals within 5 years**
 - **Longevity/Persistence of Benefits=Sustainability over five years**
 - **Risk Reduction Value=Ability of the solution to either decrease risk to moderate/low or increase process maturity level to levels 3/4. (COBIT v4.0 for maturity definitions.)**
 - **Normalized Cost (Risk Adjusted)=Cost taking into account worst case impact of risk for that alternative**

Operations Integration Board (OIB - PBGC Executives-COO, CIPO, CFO, DD/OPEA, GC, CMO, & CIO) met on 4/26/07 to review 5 alternatives. 2 alternatives were selected for further analysis pending development of an implementation strategy & sequencing plans. On 5/14/07, OIB reviewed the analysis & implementation plans. Alt.1 addressed risk symptoms & documented some processes, but scored low as it did not resolve underlying issues & problems which would likely recur within 5 years. Alt.2 would significantly improve processes in 28 of 34 COBIT elements, but costs & risks of this omnibus approach outweighed value gained. Alt.3, IT Business Transformation, was selected because it scored more than twice the next closest alternative, & it did the best job of mitigating IT risks, achieving long-term gains, & results within available capacity. ITBT garnered strong support from the new CIO & Executives as it transforms PBGC's approach to IT by implementing mature planning & operating processes, aligning IT resources with business needs, enhancing IT capabilities, achieving efficiencies & effectiveness in IT operations, & risk avoidance. OIB was particularly focused on the ability of ITBT alternative to close the gap in the PART score, resolve reportable conditions raised by auditors & achieve compliance with the FISMA.
4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **The IT Business Transformation alternative will significantly improve PBGC's value from its IT spending. It will mitigate information security issues identified as reportable conditions in PBGC audits and bring PBGC into compliance with Federal Information Management Security Act (FISMA) requirements. It will also create the capability and practices needed for PBGC to experience minimal business impact in the event of an IT service disruption, including**

the ability to resist and recover from failures due to error, deliberate attack, or disaster. Third, this alternative will provide needed clarity in roles, responsibility and accountability for IT staff and stakeholders. Fourth, this alternative will enable OIT to more rapidly and cost-effectively meet PBGC business requirements, and increase OIT accountability for supporting PBGC business priorities. Fifth, the alternative will reduce risks of financial loss and non-compliance with laws due to records management issues thereby focusing on risk avoidance. Sixth, the alternative will define processes, strategies, and standards needed to streamline business processes and improved data integration across the enterprise. Finally, the alternative will provide transparency of project status and timely project management decisions at critical milestones, resulting in delivery of projects on-time and on-budget, while meeting quality standards. In summary, the IT Business Transformation is a holistic change that aligns IT spending with the agency’s strategic needs by addressing the way in which IT services are administered. The process and organization changes will also enable PBGC to close the gap on the PART score and achieve compliance with IT Security, records management, and other federal guidelines, while enabling PBGC to manage IT-related business risks.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **no**
 - 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
<i>There are no Legacy Investment or Systems.</i>		

Section B: Risk Management

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **May 23, 2007**
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **[Not answered]**
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: **N/A - This is the first submission for this business case**
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 initial Risk Management Plan was established in 5/23/2007. Risks will be re-assessed and the RMP updated at the end of planning by 9/30/2007, as part of the Project Management Plan. Risk Management plan is to continuously assess and manage risks associated with this investment and re-baseline when significant events occur, such as award of new contracts, modification to existing contracts, evaluation of Federal staff’s skills, and achievement of milestones. Risks, such as staff availability, staff skills, the organization’s capacity to implement and adapt change, etc. were identified and documented during the development of the WBS and cost estimates to produce a risk-adjusted cost and schedule,**

achievable by the PBGC. VMM scoring formula contains risk factor as part of the formula. Risks were then formally documented in a matrix, and scored by the Project Manager, Deputy CIOs, CIO, CPIT Lead, by each of the 19 OMB categories (and an additional elements) and PMBOK. Risks were scored on a one to five scale in terms of schedule and cost impact which were summed together and multiplied times the results impact times the probability. The results impact was entered taking into consideration not only the level of impact upon that work element, but also the criticality to the outcome in relative terms to the entire investments. This list of results crosses all work elements and consists of a prioritized list of 12 specific desired outcomes from the project. The risks identified were directly tied back to the WBS (costs & schedule) and were analyzed for impact and mitigation at a granular level. The implementation will be led by 3 Federal FTE Certified Project Managers. An ITBT Steering Committee will be established to review the progress, cost & schedule performance using EVM, risks and issues on a bi-weekly weekly basis for the first 6 months, then monthly. Additionally, briefings to the OIB (Executive Management) will be delivered as part of the milestone review process on a quarterly or requested basis.

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? **yes**
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? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? **May 14, 2007**

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)		
Conduct IT Risk Assessment & Deliver Report (POA&M – CTO-6, OIT-47)	Jan 29, 2007	0.394	Jan 29, 2007	Mar 29, 2007	0.394	0.394	44	0	100
ITBT Program Planning	Sep 30, 2007	0.376	Sep 30,	[Not answered]	0.376	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	80

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)		
			2007						
PBGC IT Strategic Plan & Annual Update Process Established	Sep 30, 2008	2.12	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	2.12	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Enterprise Information Architecture Program Implemented	Jun 30, 2008	1.24	Jun 30, 2008	[Not answered]	1.24	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
IT Processes, Organization and Relationships (IT Management) Framework Established	Jun 30, 2009	1.3	Jun 30, 2009	[Not answered]	1.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
IT Investment Management Framework Established	Jun 30, 2010	0.6	Jun 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
IT Risk Management Process and Risk Coordinator Established	Sep 30, 2010	0.28	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.28	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Revised Project Management Process Deployed	Sep 30, 2011	0.24	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.24	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Revised ITSLCM Process Deployed	Sep 30, 2010	0.98	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.98	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Revised IT Infrastructure Plan Established	Jun 30, 2009	0.6	Jun 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
SLAs for Critical Services and an Update &	Mar 31, 2011	0.62	Mar 31, 2011	[Not answered]	0.62	[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)		
Monitoring Process Established									
IT Performance and Capacity Management Process in Coordination with SLAs Established	Sep 30, 2010	0.64	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.64	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
IT Disaster Recover Plan and Annual Training, Testing and Exercise Program Established	Mar 31, 2009	1.32	Mar 31, 2009	[Not answered]	1.32	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
All Major Systems and GSS have Current and Complete C&As	Mar 31, 2008	1.34	Mar 31, 2008	[Not answered]	1.34	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
IT Data Management Framework Established	Jun 30, 2010	0.82	Jun 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.82	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
IT Performance Accountability Reporting Established	Sep 30, 2011	0.64	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.64	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
Regulatory Monitoring Process Established	Dec 31, 2009	0.24	Dec 31, 2009	[Not answered]	0.24	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0