

PBGC - Consolidated Financial Systems

[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 - Consolidated Financial Systems**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **012-12-01-01-01-2075-00**
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? **FY2004**
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 CFS Financial system supports one of PBGC's three over-arching strategic goals; the "effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources". Per the Audit of PBGC's FY 2003 and 2002 Financial Statements, PBGC needs to "Complete its efforts to integrate its financial management systems, in accordance with OMB Circular A-127 and its Five-Year Management Systems Plan." PBGC currently operates thirteen financial systems and interfaces that need to be integrated down to one integrated system plus interfaces in order to fully eliminate this reportable condition. To align PBGC's financial system requirements under the federal Line of Business arrangement would require a servicing agency to customize their systems to service PBGC's Trust Funds (defined benefit pension plans trustee by PBGC). PBGC's research confirmed it is unlikely these services could be obtained from any one provider and is therefore building fully integrated financial systems in-house. The CFS project, an implementation of Oracle Financials, is the first step to enable PBGC to integrate all financial systems. CFS became system of record October 1, 2006. During FY 2007 a Business Process Reengineering effort (referred to as TIGER) on the Investment Accounting Branch's business systems was performed. A contract to implement the new system was not awarded; those funds have been carried over into FY 2008. During FY 2008, funds have been earmarked and will be used based on the outcomes of a Enterprise Architecture analysis and a Strategic Portfolio Analysis that is currently underway. These efforts will provide PBGC with a roadmap of what investments to make in the financial systems going forward.**
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 **David Trumble**

Phone Number **202-326-4000** [redacted]

E-mail **trumble.david@pbgc.gov**

- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? **TBD**
- 12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energyefficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. **no**
 - a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? **yes**
 - b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) **no**
 - 1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? **no**
 - 2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? **no**
 - 3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? **no**
- 13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? **yes**

Financial Performance**Budget Performance Integration**

- a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **Budget and Performance Integration:CFS will provide improved reporting of resoures used and provide accountability for results to the program managers. Financial Performance:CFS will support improved financial performance through timely and accurate reporting of administrative and programmatic functions and through improved capabilities to achieve clean audit opinions by increasing: Financial Integrity/Auditability, Error Reduction, Strength of Internal Control, Web-Based Technology.**
- 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? **no**
 - b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? **Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation**
 - c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? **Moderately Effective**
- 15. Is this investment for information technology? **yes**

For information technology investments only:

- 16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **Level 2**
- 17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment**
- 18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4-FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)? **no**
- 19. Is this a financial management system? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? **yes**
 - 1. If "yes," which compliance area: **Integration of financial systems**
 - 2. If "no," what does it address? **[Not answered]**
 - b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52 **Operational system: Consolidated Financial Systems (CFS) Retiring systems: Performance Accounting (PA) Trust Plan Ledger (TPL) Financial Reporting System (FRS)**

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following?

- Hardware **2**
- Software **6**
- Services **92**
- Other **[Not answered]**

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? **n/a**

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name **Phil Hertz**
 Phone Number **202-326-4000**[redacted]
 Title **Assistant 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:	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.9	0.7	0	0	0	3.1
Acquisition:	9.1	1.5	2.5	0	3.9	0	0	0	16.9
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	9.5	1.7	3.3	0.9	4.6	0	0	0	20
Operations & Maintenance:	3	1.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	16.8
TOTAL:	12.5	2.9	5.4	3	6.7	2.1	2.1	2.1	36.8
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.625	0.5	0.30	0.50	0.435	0.29	0.29	0.325	3.255
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	5	4	2	4	3	2	2	2	24

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? **no**

- a. If "yes", How many and in what year? [Not answered]
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **Per the Audit of PBGC's FY 2003 and 2002 Financial Statements, PBGC needs to Complete its efforts to integrate its financial management systems in accordance with OMB Circular A-127 and its Five-Year Management Systems Plan. PBGC is requesting additional funds in its FY 2009 request. The FY 2008 budget request was for \$30.3m; the current request is for [redacted]. This increase represents PBGC's efforts to fully integrate its financial systems and eliminate the reportable condition by 2010. In addition, the request represents an increase in O&M costs over the life of the project. At current approved funding levels, PBGC will be unable to fully integrate its financial systems until after FY 2013. The FY 2007 change in funding requested from the FY 2008 submission includes a \$0.3m reduction in O&M funding due to retirement of the old financial system. In addition, there was a \$2.5m reduction in Acquisition costs due to the BPR contract not being awarded; the funds were carried over into FY 2008. The FY 2008 change in funding requested from the FY 2008 submission includes a \$1.9m increase in Planning and Acquisition and an increase of \$0.6m in O&M. The \$1.9m increase is due to the FY 2007 carry over funds; these funds are earmarked and will be used for planning and corrective action purposes once the Financial Segment Architecture currently underway is finalized. The \$0.6 increase in O&M is due to an increase in maintenance work on existing releases of the financial systems. The FY 2009 change in funding requested from the FY 2008 submission includes a \$0.9m increase in Planning and Acquisition costs and an increase of \$0.9m in O&M. The \$0.9m increase represents earmarked funds for the planning and execution of additional corrective action items. The \$0.9 increase in O&M is due to an increase in maintenance work on existing releases of the financial systems. The FY 2010 change in funding requested from the FY 2008 submission includes a \$3.1m increase in Planning and Acquisition and a \$0.9 increase in O&M costs. The \$3.1m increase represents earmarked funds for the planning and execution of the outcomes of the Financial Segment Architecture. The \$0.9 increase in O&M is due to an increase in maintenance work on existing releases of the financial systems. The O&M expenses in fiscal years 2011 through 2013 were adjusted to more realistically reflect increases in operating costs as the systems mature and adjustments for inflation.**

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy [Edit](#)

1.

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Contract or Task Order Number	CT-05-0746
Type of Contract/Task Order	Time & Material
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 30, 2005
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Oct 1, 2005
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2013

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	25.9
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	Greg Smith
CO Contact information	202-326-4160 smith.greg@pbgc.gov
Contracting Officer Certification Level	NA
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes

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: **Contract CT-05-0746 has Firm Fixed Price, Labor Hour and Cost-Plus Fixed Fee components in the contract for delivery of the basic Consolidated Financial System and ongoing maintenance of the system, negotiated in the course of a competitive procurement. Delivery of the General Ledger and the O&M stages of the contract are Firm Fixed Price; development of the Reports and the Purchasing module are Labor Hour. Earned Value Management was tracked for Stages II and V of the contract (Development of the reports and the purchasing module.**
3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
 - a. Explain why: **Section 508 compliance is an explicit, mandatory requirement enforced by the Corporation's contracting officer. PBGC's Infrastructure Administration group conducts 508 compliance on all new systems prior to implementation. In order to comply with OFFM requirements, any financial software acquired by the Corporation must provide an application interface that complies with the software application standards required by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act as detailed in 36 CFR 1194, Subpart B.**
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **no**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date? **[Not answered]**
 - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? **yes**
 1. If "no," briefly explain why: **An Acquisition Plan was developed and approved internally on 9/28/2005. Upon further review, it was determined that the analysis was not sufficient. PBGC will develop an Acquisition Plan that fully meets the Agencies and OMB's requirements by 6/30/2008.**

Section D: Performance Information

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2006	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Obtain an Unqualified Audit Opinion	Prior year Unqualified Financial Audit Opinion	Maintain an unqualified opinion	Met target
2006	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Customer Results	Timeliness	% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days	90% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days of receipt	1% improvement over the baseline to 90% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days of receipt	91%
2006	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Processes and Activities	Productivity	% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30 calendar days	75% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30 calendar days	5% improvement over the baseline of 75% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days of receipt	80%
2006	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	% over or under O&M baseline budget	Current year baseline on financial systems	Maintain baseline budget for operating year – no overages	Met baseline: No Improvement
2007	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Obtain an Unqualified Audit Opinion	Prior Year Unqualified Financial Audit Opinion	Maintain an unqualified opinion	Met
2007	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Customer Results	Timeliness	% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days	91% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days of receipt	1% improvement over the baseline to 91% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days of receipt	91%
2007	Effective and Efficient Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Productivity	% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30	80% of internal travel vouchers	5% improvement over the baseline of	86%

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	of PBGC Resources			calendar days	paid within 30 calendar days	80% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days of receipt	
2007	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	% over or under O&M baseline budget	FY 2006 baseline on financial systems	Maintain baseline budget for operating year – adjusted for inflation, O&M budget will rise year over year	Met baseline: No Improvement
2008	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Obtain an Unqualified Audit Opinion	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain an unqualified opinion	Q1 FY2009
2008	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Customer Results	Timeliness	% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	1% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2009
2008	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Processes and Activities	Productivity	% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	5% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2009
2008	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	% over or under O&M baseline budget	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain baseline budget for operating year – adjusted for inflation, O&M budget will rise year over year.	Q1 FY2009
2009	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Obtain an Unqualified Audit Opinion	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain an unqualified opinion	Q1 FY2010
2009	Effective and	Customer Results	Timeliness	% of invoices paid within 30	Baseline will be	1% improvement	Q1 FY2010

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources			calendar days	determined by prior year results	over prior year baseline	
2009	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Processes and Activities	Productivity	% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	3% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2010
2009	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	% over or under O&M baseline budget	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain baseline budget for operating year – adjusted for inflation, O&M budget will rise year over year	Q1 FY2010
2010	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Obtain an Unqualified Audit Opinion	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain an unqualified opinion	Q1 FY2011
2010	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Customer Results	Timeliness	% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	3% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2011
2010	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Processes and Activities	Productivity	% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2011
2010	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	% over or under O&M baseline budget	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain baseline budget for operating year – adjusted for inflation, O&M budget will rise year over year	Q1 FY2011
2011	Effective and Efficient Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Obtain an Unqualified Audit Opinion	Baseline will be determined by prior	Maintain an unqualified opinion	Q1 FY2012

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	of PBGC Resources				year results		
2011	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Customer Results	Timeliness	% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	1% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2012
2011	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Processes and Activities	Productivity	% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	1% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2012
2011	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	% over or under O&M baseline budget	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain baseline budget for operating year – adjusted for inflation, O&M budget will rise year over year	Q1 FY2012
2012	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Obtain an Unqualified Audit Opinion	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain an unqualified opinion	Q1 FY2013
2012	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Customer Results	Timeliness	% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	1% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2013
2012	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Processes and Activities	Productivity	% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	1% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2013
2012	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	% over or under O&M baseline budget	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain baseline budget for operating year – adjusted for inflation, O&M budget will rise year over year	Q1 FY2013

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2013	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Obtain an Unqualified Audit Opinion	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	an unqualified opinion	Q1 FY2014
2013	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Customer Results	Timeliness	% of invoices paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain improvement from prior year baseline	Q1 FY2014
2013	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Processes and Activities	Productivity	% of internal travel vouchers paid within 30 calendar days	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	1% improvement over prior year baseline	Q1 FY2014
2013	Effective and Efficient Stewardship of PBGC Resources	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	% over or under O&M baseline budget	Baseline will be determined by prior year results	Maintain baseline budget for operating year – adjusted for inflation, O&M budget will rise year over year	Q1 FY2014

Section E: Security and Privacy

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: **yes**
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: **7**
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment. **yes**

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
Tiger	Government Only	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008
FY File	Government Only	Sep 30, 2010	Sep 30, 2010
Electronic Vendor	Government Only	Sep 30, 2010	Sep 30, 2010

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)
Invoicing			
Procurement Interface	Government Only	Sep 30, 2010	Sep 30, 2010
FedTraveler Interface	Government Only	Sep 30, 2010	Sep 30, 2010

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
Consolidated Financial System	Government Only	Moderate	no	Jun 29, 2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	Jul 5, 2006	Feb 3, 2007

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? **yes**
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. **Note: PBGC is not requesting additional funding from OMB to remediate IT security weaknesses. PBGC has completed a NIST SP 800-37 compliant certification and accreditation of the CFS system June 29, 2007, and has a comprehensive plan of action & milestones (POA&M) for addressing the security deficiencies. PBGC is funding improvement actions defined in the POA&M to correct the weaknesses through existing budgets. The deficiencies will be corrected prior to initiating new development. PBGC completed testing security controls July 5, 2007. Deficiencies that were identified have been incorporated into the comprehensive POA&M for addressing the security deficiencies. As with the improvement actions resulting from the C&A, PBGC is funding improvement actions resulting from control testing to correct the weaknesses through existing budgets. With the implementation of new functionality, additional security controls are required. This business case requests seven percent of the project to be used for security. That funding will be used to conduct annual risk assessments, update system security plans, perform C&As, establish continuous monitoring for enhancements and perform the function of continuous monitoring associated with the new functionality**

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **All PBGC systems are jointly run and managed by federal employees and contractor teams reporting to PBGC federal employees. PBGC contracts include language to ensure the suitability of contractors’ employees, and inspection of all new or renovated contractor hosting sites. PBGC federal employees and contractors are subject to suitability background investigations. New federal employees and contractors are issued roles of conduct, required to take computer security awareness orientation, and provided instruction on incident reporting procedures. Annually, federal employees and contractors are required to take refresher security awareness training. Role-based training is conducted during employee position training. For positions related to the Designated Approving Authority, Information System Owner, System Administrators and Project Managers, role-based training is conducted by PBGC’s Enterprise Security Team following orientation, and annually thereafter. Electronic security compliance is monitored by the OIT security team through routine checking of user ID account activity for suspicious or high-risk behavior. If such behavior is identified, the contracting officer is notified immediately to begin remediation procedures. PBGC also conducts user account recertification annually.**

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Internet Link or Explanation	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Internet Link or Explanation
Consolidated Financial Systems	no	yes	http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html	yes	http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/ind
TIGER	yes	no	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	no	No, because the system is not a Act system of records
FY File	yes	no	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time	no	No, because the system is not a Act system of records
Electronic Vendor Invoicing	yes	no	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time	no	No, because the system is not a Act system of records
Procurement Interface	yes	no	No, because a PIA si not yet required to be completed at this time	no	No, because the system is not a Act system of records
FedTraveler Interface	yes	no	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time	no	No, because the system is not a Act system of records

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

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

- a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **Consolidated Financial Systems**
- b. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]
- 3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **Financial Management Segment**

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		
Consolidated Financial System (CFS)	Financial system of record for PBGC operations.	Data Management	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	012-12-01-05-02-0500-00	Internal	5
Trust Ledger	Accounting system for tracking Trusted assets from Plans	Asset / Materials Management	Property / Asset Management	Data Warehouse	012-12-01-05-01-2075-00	Internal	5
Consolidated Financial System (CFS)	Financial system of record for PBGC operations.	Financial Management	Auditing	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	50
Trust Ledger	Accounting system for tracking Trusted assets from Plans	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	20
Trust ledger	Accounting system for tracking Trusted assets from Plans	Financial Management	Internal Controls	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	20

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Data Warehouse	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	XML/SOAP
Data Warehouse	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	JDBC/ADO.NET
Data Warehouse	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	SSL

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Data Warehouse	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	WS Security
Property / Asset Management	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	XML/SOAP
Property / Asset Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	JDBC/ADO.NET
Property / Asset Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	SSL
Property / Asset Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	WS Security
Auditing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Oracle Internet Directory / Active Directory
Billing and Accounting	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Oracle Internet Directory / Active Directory
Internal Controls	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Oracle Internet Directory / Active Directory
Auditing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10gAS, .NET
Billing and Accounting	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10gAS, .NET
Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10gAS, .NET

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

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? **no**
- a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? **[Not answered]**
- b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? **Jun 30, 2008**
- c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: **An Alternatives Analysis was developed and approved internally on 3/21/2007. Upon further review, it was determined that the analysis was not sufficient. PBGC will develop an Alternatives Analysis that fully meets the Agencies and OMB's requirements by 6/30/2008.**

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Baseline	Original baseline; CFS will be able to accomplish the following: Fully implement CFS including: development, implementation and O&M of the system, and the TIGER efforts related to the feeder accounting systems. Implement a scaled down version of TIGER rather than perform a full analysis of the as is and to be processes. Activity Based Management Accounting System will not be implemented. As a result, the benefits of ABM and a number of the TIGER recommendations will not be realized.	30.3	0
Suspend Integration Efforts	Alternative 1 represents a suspension of full integration efforts, leaving several financial systems and interfaces as they currently exist with no additional development work. This would be the most cost effective alternative; representing reduced system costs, but requires FTE's to continue performing manual data transfers between some systems. This alternative was not deemed viable as it does not address the reportable condition and data errors are more likely to occur.	31.46	0
Integrate all Information systems Across PBGC	Alternative 2 represents an increased effort to integrate all PBGC information systems, not just the financial systems. Additional interfaces and a data warehouse would be developed at an Agency level; allowing for additional synergies to be created between all PBGC lines of business. This alternative was not deemed viable at this time; it would close the reportable condition and enhance data analysis efforts, but would not provide a positive ROI due to excessive cost and time constraints.	50.05	0
Integrate Financial Systems and Close Reportable Condition	Alternative 3 is recommended. Strategic Portfolio Review and Architectural Analysis will allow earmarked funds to be used to more fully address the reportable condition and eliminate it by FY 2010. This alternative is the only one that fully addresses PBGC's reportable condition; this was the Corporations reason for recommending this alternative over the current baseline budget.	40.05	0

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **Alternative 3 was selected. Per the Audit of PBGC's FY 2003 and 2002 Financial Statements by PricewaterhouseCoopers, PBGC needs to "Complete its efforts to integrate its financial management systems, in accordance with OMB Circular A-127 and its Five-Year Management Systems Plan. (OIG Control Number FOD-268)". To fully comply with the requirements of the audit finding, PBGC has been mandated to fully integrate all its disparate financial systems. The four alternatives listed above were presented and this alternative was selected and approved by PBGC's Executive Management Committee. The alternative includes all of the functions in the baseline alternative in addition to focusing on building interfaces to additional financial information systems in an accelerated**

manner. The focus of this alternative was also to concentrate on areas listed in the audit report and make sure PBGC was in full compliance. The alternative to suspend integration efforts, was not chosen due to the fact the reportable condition; non-integrated financial systems, would never be addressed. The alternative for integrating all PBGC information systems was not chosen due to the additional costs that would be incurred and the limited benefits the Agency would derive. The investment in these systems will help the agency comply with the accelerated financial reporting deadlines outlined in the PMA. These financial systems will enable PBGC to continue to meet the requirements for compliance with the government’s laws and regulations as follows: The Government Corporation Control Act (codified at 31 U.S.C section 9101 et seq.), Prompt Payment Act, Treasury FACTS I, GFRS and FACTS II reporting, CFO Act, JFMIP and many of the e-government requirements. Additionally, our performance goals are established to support the president’s management agenda. The substantial upfront investment in the integrated systems will increase the breakeven period to 2014. The system that was just retired, Performance Accounting, had a useful life of 10 years; if similar results are achieved by CFS and proposed feeder systems, the useful life of CFS should take PBGC to 2017, offsetting the quantitative benefits of the system with increased qualitative benefits.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **Benefits of the CFS system will be derived from having integrated financial systems and eliminating PBGC’s reportable condition. In addition, PBGC should see reduced operations costs for financial systems and improved business processes. These include: Architectural Fit: The recommended alternative is consistent with the PBGC Enterprise Architecture. Business Impact: This alternative provides the greatest efficiency in terms of data integrity and eliminates the need to manually move data between systems as required in the past. Design: The chosen alternative provides increased capacity for data storage, management and reporting. Ease of Use: Reengineered functions provide better integration with existing applications, and enhancements to the user interface increases usability. Quality: The alternative provides for continued performance tuning and reduction in data redundancy as well as improved accuracy and quality. Schedule: This alternative offers the potential for parallel interface development resulting in a greater number of features being developed more efficiently, and possibly faster, than in the other alternatives.**
5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment? **This Investment**
 - b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment or Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
Performance Accounting	[Not answered]	Jan 4, 2008

Section B: Risk Management

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **no**

- a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **[Not answered]**
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **yes**
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: **[Not answered]**
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? **Jun 30, 2008**
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? **Following the passage of The Pension Protection Act signed by President Bush in August, 2006, the CFS Risk Management Plan was reviewed for completeness and updated to reflect how Risks that arise due to legislative changes are identified, characterized (qualitatively and quantitatively), and managed. The CFS Project Team evaluated impacts of the legislative changes to DME activities underway and in planning.**
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **In the initial planning stages of the CFS project, a Risk Management Plan (RMP) was developed and continually updated during the development and implementation of the project. A Summary of Observations table was prepared based on information gained from the review of the CFS requirements and design documentation, as well as through focus group discussions with the CFS Project team. A Summary of Observations table summarizes the vulnerability/threat pairs that were identified for the application, as well as corresponding mitigating control options that are planned for the new system. Life cycle costs included funds for addressing and mitigating risks. The planned schedule also included risk management activities. With the progress of the project, the RMP has been updated, along with life cycle costs and project schedule planning. These activities are consistent with PBGC's Target EA, and the Agency's EA governance process requires risk management to reduce project uncertainty. Project planning is done on an ongoing basis to manage ongoing changes to CFS. When providing cost and schedule estimates for these various changes, the practice is to identify the probability, impact and exposure of the associated risks. Typically the risks identified have been encountered in previous like tasks, and cost and schedule are adjusted accordingly. The individual estimates are then added to the project plan which in turn is used to update the life cycle costs. This process ensures that the life cycle cost estimate and project schedule reflect investment risks and strategies for mitigating them. PBGC's EA governance process includes monitoring these activities and the resulting cost and schedule information. Risk Plans will be developed for the TIGER solution, the proposed new Procurement interface, FedTraveler and the COTS package for vendor invoicing automation.**

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? **no**
2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than $\pm 10\%$? (CV% = $CV/EV \times 100$; SV% = $SV/PV \times 100$) **no**
 - a. If "yes," was it the? **[Not answered]**
 - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance: **[Not answered]**
 - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions **[Not answered]**

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? **no**
 a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? [Not answered]

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual		Schedule:Cost (# days/\$M)		
Stage I: Phase I Project Initiation	Nov 11, 2005	0	Nov 11, 2005	Nov 11, 2005	0	0	0	0	100
Stage I: Phase II Definition and Analysis	Sep 29, 2006	0	Sep 29, 2006	Sep 29, 2006	0	0	0	0	100
Stage I: Phase III Design and Planning	Aug 25, 2006	0	Aug 25, 2006	Aug 25, 2006	0	0	0	0	100
Stage I: Phase IV Development	Sep 27, 2006	0	Sep 27, 2006	Sep 27, 2006	0	0	0	0	100
Stage I: Phase V Operations and Maintenance	Oct 27, 2006	4.98	Oct 27, 2006	Oct 27, 2006	4.98	4.98	0	0	100
Stage II: Phase I Project Initiation	Apr 1, 2006	0.01	Apr 1, 2006	Apr 1, 2006	0.01	0.01	0	0	100
Stage II: Phase II Definition and Analysis	Sep 29, 2006	0.33	Sep 29, 2006	Sep 29, 2006	0.33	0.33	0	0	100
Stage II: Phase III Design and Planning	Sep 7, 2006	0.38	Sep 7, 2006	Sep 7, 2006	0.38	0.38	0	0	100
Stage II: Phase IV Development	Sep 29, 2006	1.51	Sep 29, 2006	Sep 29, 2006	1.51	1.51	0	0	100
Stage II: Phase V Operations and Maintenance	Oct 24, 2006	0.07	Oct 24, 2006	Oct 24, 2006	0.07	0.43	0	0.36	99
Stage III: Phase I Project Initiation	Dec 31, 2006	0	Dec 31, 2006	Dec 31, 2006	0	0	0	0	100
Stage III: Phase II Definition and Analysis	May 24, 2007	1.03	May 24, 2007	Jun 8, 2007	1.03	1.03	15	0	100
Stage III: Technical Evaluation	Aug 31, 2007	0	Aug 31, 2007	[Not answered]	0	0	0	0	10

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)		
Panel									
Stage III: Phase III Design and Planning	Dec 31, 2007	0.57	Dec 31, 2007	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	0	0	0
Stage III: Phase IV Development	Jun 30, 2008	2.5	Jun 30, 2008	[Not answered]	2.5	[Not answered]	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC Project Management Oversight	Dec 31, 2006	0.5	Dec 31, 2006	Dec 31, 2006	0.5	0.5	0	0	100
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC O&M Oversight	Dec 31, 2006	0.13	Dec 31, 2006	Dec 31, 2006	0.13	0.13	0	0	100
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2006	3	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	3	3	0	0	100
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC Project Management Oversight	Dec 31, 2007	0.4	Dec 31, 2007	Dec 31, 2007	0.4	0.4	0	0	50
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC O&M Oversight	Dec 31, 2007	0.1	Dec 31, 2007	Dec 31, 2007	0.1	0.1	0	0	50
Stage IV: Certification and Accreditation	Jun 1, 2007	0.1	Jun 1, 2007	Jun 1, 2007	0.1	0	0	0	100
Stage IV: Risk Assessment Update	Jul 1, 2007	0.1	Jul 1, 2007	Jul 1, 2007	0.1	0	0	0	100
Stage IV: Security Testing	Aug 1, 2007	0.1	Aug 1, 2007	Aug 1, 2007	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: COOP Testing	Aug 15, 2007	0.1	Aug 15, 2007	Aug 15, 2007	0.1	0	0	0	100
Stage IV:	Sep 30,	0.8	Sep	[Not answered]	0.8	0	0	0	50

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)		
Operations and Maintenance	2007		30, 2007						
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC Project Management Oversight	Dec 31, 2008	0.2	Dec 31, 2008	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC O&M Oversight	Dec 31, 2008	0.05	Dec 31, 2008	[Not answered]	0.05	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Risk Assessment Update	Jul 1, 2008	0.1	Jul 1, 2008	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Security Testing	Aug 1, 2008	0.1	Aug 1, 2008	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: COOP Testing	Aug 15, 2008	0.1	Aug 15, 2008	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: COOP Testing	Aug 15, 2008	0.1	Aug 15, 2008	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2008	0.9	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.9	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC Project Management Oversight	Dec 31, 2009	0.43	Dec 31, 2009	[Not answered]	0.43	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC O&M Oversight	Dec 31, 2009	0.11	Dec 31, 2009	[Not answered]	0.11	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Risk Assessment Update	Jul 1, 2009	0.1	Jul 1, 2009	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Security Testing	Aug 1, 2009	0.1	Aug 1, 2009	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: COOP Testing	Aug 15, 2009	0.1	Aug 15, 2009	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	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)		
			2009						
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2009	0.9	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.9	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC Project Management Oversight	Dec 31, 2010	0.35	Dec 31, 2010	[Not answered]	0.35	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC O&M Oversight	Dec 31, 2010	0.09	Dec 31, 2010	[Not answered]	0.09	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Re-Certification and Accreditation	Jun 1, 2010	0.1	Jun 1, 2010	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Risk Assessment Update	Jul 1, 2010	0.1	Jul 1, 2010	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Security Testing	Aug 1, 2010	0.1	Aug 1, 2010	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: COOP Testing	Aug 15, 2010	0.1	Aug 15, 2010	[Not answered]	0.1	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2010	1.3	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	1.3	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC Project Management Oversight	Dec 31, 2011	0.23	Dec 31, 2011	[Not answered]	0.23	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC O&M Oversight	Dec 31, 2011	0.06	Dec 31, 2011	[Not answered]	0.06	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Risk Assessment Update	Jul 1, 2011	0.2	Jul 1, 2011	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Security	Aug 1, 2011	0.2	Aug 1, 2011	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	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)		
Testing									
Stage IV: COOP Testing	Aug 15, 2011	0.2	Aug 15, 2011	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2011	1.3	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	1.3	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC Project Management Oversight	Dec 31, 2012	0.23	Dec 31, 2012	[Not answered]	0.23	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC O&M Oversight	Dec 31, 2012	0.06	Dec 31, 2012	[Not answered]	0.06	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Risk Assessment Update	Jul 1, 2012	0.2	Jul 1, 2012	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Security Testing	Aug 1, 2012	0.2	Aug 1, 2012	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: COOP Testing	Aug 15, 2012	0.2	Aug 15, 2012	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2012	1.5	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	1.5	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC Project Management Oversight	Dec 31, 2013	0.26	Dec 31, 2013	[Not answered]	0.26	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance PBGC O&M Oversight	Dec 31, 2013	0.07	Dec 31, 2013	[Not answered]	0.07	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Re-Certification and Accreditation	Jun 1, 2013	0.2	Jun 1, 2013	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Risk Assessment	Jul 1, 2013	0.2	Jul 1, 2013	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	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)		
Update									
Stage IV: Security Testing	Aug 1, 2013	0.2	Aug 1, 2013	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: COOP Testing	Aug 15, 2013	0.2	Aug 15, 2013	[Not answered]	0.2	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2013	1.5	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	1.5	0	0	0	0
Stage V: Phase I Project Initiation	Sep 29, 2006	0.35	Sep 29, 2006	Sep 29, 2006	0.35	0.35	0	0	100
Stage V: Phase II Requirements Analysis and Design	Sep 15, 2006	0.8	Sep 15, 2006	Sep 15, 2006	0.8	0.8	0	0	100
Stage V: Phase III Development and Testing	Jun 4, 2006	0.1	Jun 7, 2006	Jun 7, 2006	0.1	0.1	0	0	100
Stage V: Phase III Development and Testing	Jun 4, 2006	0.1	Jun 7, 2006	Jun 7, 2006	0.1	0.1	0	0	100
Stage V: Phase IV Cutover and Deployment	Oct 2, 2006	0.97	Oct 2, 2006	Oct 2, 2006	0.97	1.62	0	0.66	100
Proposed Contract I: Phase I Project Initiation	Oct 1, 2009	0.67	Oct 1, 2009	[Not answered]	0.67	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase II Definition and Analysis: Analysis / Interview Documents	Nov 2, 2009	0.01	Nov 2, 2009	[Not answered]	0.01	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase II Definition and Analysis: Change	Oct 5, 2009	0.03	Oct 5, 2009	[Not answered]	0.03	0	0	0	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)				
Management									
Proposed Contract I: Phase II Definition and Analysis: Development Strategy	Oct 19, 2009	0.08	Oct 19, 2009	[Not answered]	0.08	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase II Definition and Analysis: Instance Management	Oct 12, 2009	0.01	Oct 12, 2009	[Not answered]	0.01	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase II Definition and Analysis: Project Management Plan	Oct 5, 2009	0.03	Oct 5, 2009	[Not answered]	0.03	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase II Definition and Analysis: Project Plan	Oct 5, 2009	0.01	Oct 5, 2009	[Not answered]	0.01	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase II Definition and Analysis: Quality Assurance Management	Oct 19, 2009	0.03	Oct 19, 2009	[Not answered]	0.03	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase II Definition and Analysis: To-Be Processes	Nov 30, 2009	0.27	Nov 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.27	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase III Definition and Analysis: Business	Dec 21, 2009	0.37	Dec 21, 2009	[Not answered]	0.34	0	0	0	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)		
Requirements Documents									
Proposed Contract I: Phase III Definition and Analysis: Functional Specification Documents	Dec 31, 2009	0.13	Dec 31, 2009	[Not answered]	0.13	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase III Definition and Analysis: Security Plan	Dec 31, 2009	0.05	Dec 31, 2009	[Not answered]	0.05	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase III Design and Planning: Conduct Testing and Training	Jun 30, 2010	0.34	Jun 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.34	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase III Design and Planning: System Integration	Mar 30, 2010	2.02	Mar 30, 2010	[Not answered]	2.02	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase III Design and Planning: Test Scripts	Apr 15, 2010	0.17	Apr 15, 2010	[Not answered]	0.17	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase III Design and Planning: Training	Apr 15, 2010	0.17	Apr 15, 2010	[Not answered]	0.17	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development: Creation of Test Scripts	Jan 31, 2010	0.13	Jan 31, 2010	[Not answered]	0.13	0	0	0	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)		
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development: Develop Regulatory & Standard Reports	Aug 30, 2010	0.34	Aug 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.34	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development: Initial Data Conversion Development	Jul 31, 2010	0.52	Jul 31, 2010	[Not answered]	0.52	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development: Maintain RTM	Mar 31, 2010	0.34	Mar 31, 2010	[Not answered]	0.34	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development: Performance Testing	Sep 30, 2010	0.45	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.45	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development: Standard Operating Procedures	Mar 31, 2010	0.3	Mar 31, 2010	[Not answered]	0.3	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development: Test Standard & Regulatory Report	Nov 30, 2010	0.5	Nov 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.5	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development: Training	Nov 30, 2010	0.17	Nov 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.17	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase IV Development:	Feb 15, 2010	0.13	Feb 15, 2010	[Not answered]	0.13	0	0	0	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)				
User Training									
Proposed Contract I: Phase V Operations and Refinement: Deployment Cutover	Jun 30, 2010	0.67	Jun 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.67	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase V Operations and Refinement: Maintain RTM	Jun 30, 2010	0.08	Jun 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.08	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase V Operations and Refinement: Post Implementation Review	Aug 31, 2010	0.17	Aug 31, 2010	[Not answered]	0.17	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase V Operations and Refinement: Production Services Support	May 31, 2010	0.34	May 31, 2010	[Not answered]	0.34	0	0	0	0
Proposed Contract I: Phase V Operations and Refinement: Project Closeout Report	Sep 30, 2010	0.08	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.08	0	0	0	0
Stage IV: Establish Federal Management Segment Base Architecture, Develop One Subsegment Target Architecture and	Feb 28, 2008	0	Feb 28, 2008	[Not answered]	0	[Not answered]	0	0	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)				
Sequencing Plan.									
Stage IV: Assess Federal Financial Management Line of Business	Jun 30, 2008	0	Jun 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0	[Not answered]	0	0	0
Stage IV: Restructure Financial Management OMB300 Business Case w/ Background Artifacts	Jul 31, 2008	0	Jul 31, 2008	[Not answered]	0	[Not answered]	0	0	0