

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

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

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 09/08/2007
2. Agency: 449, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
3. Bureau: 00
4. Name of this Capital Asset: Edgar
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 449-00-01-04-01-0001-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)
 Planning Full Acquisition Operations and Maintenance Mixed Life Cycle Multi-Agency Collaboration
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? BY06
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. [Limit 2500 characters]:

The Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis and Retrieval (EDGAR) system processes electronic submissions to the SEC and permits SEC staff to analyze those submissions. Overhauled in FY 2001, the base system has been stable with ongoing enhancements to meet user and regulatory needs. The majority of the Acquisition funding is simply infrastructure refreshment that we must count as DME: replacing outdated equipment (hardware or software) and upgrading security to meet current Federal standards. The agency's capital planning committee approves the overall level of EDGAR investment.

Since 2001, many small minor enhancements have automated the SEC's previously paper-driven business processes. The regulated community of tens of thousands of investment advisors (large, small and individual) now has the opportunity to file regulatory documents in an electronic form instead of on paper; as of FY07 EDGAR now contains almost 1 million electronically filed documents, which means they are also accessible to the public. That now represents over 90 percent of all filings. Over 36 percent are filed in a structured format, meaning that both the SEC staff and the general public are able to perform analyses of the data. The public can now see essentially the same information that used to be available only to major brokerages; EDGAR receives over half-a-million searches annually, the vast majority from individual members of the public.

In FY07 the original EDGAR support contract expired and we completed an open competition for system support and enhancements. We invested significant resources into preparing for the competition and were rewarded with a substantial reduction in the ongoing cost of maintenance. In FY07 we sponsored the first “interactive data tools” through which ordinary investors could conduct sophisticated analyses of the huge volumes of EDGAR data.

For FY09 and beyond we will continue the ongoing technical refresh activities. We will add more structured filings, based on the priorities established by the EDGAR Requirements Steering Committee, composed of agency business executives. We will convert the existing obsolete financial system embedded in EDGAR to integrate it with the agency FMS. In addition we will continue to respond to events within the financial markets themselves or matters of concern to Congress.

We expect to replace this system in FY2012, with the last increment of funding for the current system occurring in FY2011.

9. Did the Agency’s Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? NO
- a. If “yes,” what was the date of this approval? <unless routed before we submit>
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?
- Name Rick Heroux
Phone Number 202-551-8168
E-mail herouxr@sec.gov
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient, and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. (Answer applicable to non-IT assets only) N/A
- a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? N/A
- b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)) N/A
1. If “yes,” is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? N/A
2. If “yes,” will this investment meet sustainable design principles? N/A
3. If “yes,” is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? N/A
13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes
- If “yes,” check all that apply:
- Human Capital
- Budget Performance Integration
- Financial Performance
- Expanded E-Government
- Competitive Sourcing
- Faith Based and Community

- Real Property Asset Management
- Eliminating Improper Payments
- Privatization of Military Housing
- Research & Development Investment Criteria
- Housing & Urban Development Management & Performance
- Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives
- "Right Sized" Overseas Presence
- Coordination of VA & DoD Programs and Systems

a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? The Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis and Retrieval (EDGAR) system supports the Expanded E-Government initiative because EDGAR provides the regulated community an increasing ability to prepare electronic submittals, and provides the investing public with increasingly useful structured data that permits searching for information and cross-registrant comparisons.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)

Yes

- a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review? No [EDGAR is specifically referenced in the PART assessment as a key successful component of the program].
- b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? Full Disclosure
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Results Not Demonstrated

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

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

For information technology investments only:

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

- Level 1
- Level 2
- Level 3

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

- Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
- Project manager qualification is under review for this investment
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started
- No Project manager has yet been assigned to this investment

18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)? Yes

19. Is this a financial management system? No
- a. If “yes,” does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? N/A
 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 FY2008 funding request for the following?
(This should total 100% - enter as decimal, e.g., .25 = 25%)
Hardware 2% Software 11% Services 81% Other 0%
21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? Yes
22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:
Name Barbara Stance
Phone Number 202-551-7209
Title SEC Privacy Officer
E-mail stanceb@sec.gov
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration’s approval? YES.
24. Does this investment support one of the GAO High Risk areas? (Y/N) – No
- Protecting the Federal Government’s Information Systems and the Nation’s Critical Infrastructures

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (Reported In Millions) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and Earlier <2006	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and Beyond >2012	TOTAL
Planning:	1.077	0.000	0.000	0.000					
Acquisition:	13.587	2.687	1.930	2.130					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	14.665	2.687	1.930	2.130					
Operations & Maintenance:	57.724	7.130	11.787	12.346					
TOTAL:	72.389	9.817	13.717	14.476					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	12.574	1.887	3.377	3.934					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	95.84	13.18	23.02	25.03					
OIT FTE:	59.00	7.00	19.00	19.00	19.00	15.11	0.00	0.00	138.12

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

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No
 - a. If "yes," How many and in what year? N/A
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes. Yes, we are forecasting substantially lower ongoing maintenance costs [originally forecast at \$17M per year] owing to the re-competition of the base maintenance contract in FY2006/2007. However, we are seeing a much larger DME component because of the ongoing minor enhancement work, new initiatives driven by

market and Congressional interest, and DME work that would not have been done had we retired the system in FY2009 as originally planned.

We have also increased the count of SEC FTE involved with the system because in FY07 we transferred the Filer Support operation under the CIO and realized the extent to which we had underestimated the size of this effort by the mission program office.

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

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																
Contractor Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the ward? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start & end date of Contact / Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? N	Does the contract include the Required security & privacy clauses?(Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level(Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competences and skills necessary to support this acquisition? Y/N)
SECHQ1-06-F-0221	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.025	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	Yes
CQ 63000-06-2246	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.0223	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	Yes
SECHQ1-C-98-2001A	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.015	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	Yes
SECHQ1-05-F-0195	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.478	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	Yes
Ex Comp - COMPSCI - SECHQ1-04-A-0276 TO 033	FFP	Yes	03/02/2007	03/02/2007	03/01/2010	\$1.047	No	No	No	N/a	No	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315 baierl@SEC.gov	3	Yes
SECHQ1-06-C-0045 [Keane SS]	FFP	Yes	8-Sep-06	8-Sep-06	12/31/2012	\$31.000	No	Yes	Yes	N/a	No	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315 baierl@SEC.gov	3	Yes
Keane Enhancements - undefined	Short Text	Yes	8-Sep-06	8-Sep-06	12/31/2012	\$0.00	No	Yes	Yes	N/a	No	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315 baierl@SEC.gov	3	Yes
GS-35F-0089S [Rivet]	FFP	Yes	9/23/06	9/23/06	3/31/09	\$0.660	Yes	Yes	Yes	n/a	No	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315 baierl@SEC.gov	3	Yes
SECHQ1-06-P-0457 [WSOD]	FFP	Yes	9/25/06	9/25/06	9/30/2011	\$0.720	No	Yes	Yes	N/a	No	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315	3	Yes

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table:

Contractor Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start & end date of Contract / Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? N	Does the contract include the Required security & privacy clauses?(Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level(Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? Y/N)
														baierl@SEC.gov		
Apogen	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	Yes
Short Text	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	Yes
Short Text	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	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:

Most of the contracts within this investment are either for acquisition of COTS hardware and software products, or are under \$1 million annually and do not qualify as major investments requiring internal EVM reporting. The primary contract with Keane has 2 components, one for fixed level-of-effort maintenance and one for enhancements. The enhancements part should provide for Earned Value reporting if and when the enhancement is large enough to trigger such a requirement.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

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

a.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 15 Feb 2007 [IOC approval of program plan]

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? N/A

1. If "no," briefly explain why: N/A

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use the following Table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. This table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY2009.

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2003	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Total number of daily downloads	2002: 391,534	UNDEFINED	2003: 430,441
2004	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Total number of daily downloads	2002: 391,534	UNDEFINED	2004: 1.27 million
2005	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Total number of daily downloads	2002: 391,534	UNDEFINED	2005: 1.4 million
2006	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Total number of daily downloads	2002: 391,534	UNDEFINED	2006: NO DATA
2007	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Total number of daily downloads	2002: 391,534	UNDEFINED	2007: NO DATA
2003	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of paper filings	2002: 16,050 paper filings	Undefined; ultimately, zero paper filings	2003: 183,750 paper filings
2004	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of paper filings	2002: 16,050 paper filings	Undefined; ultimately, zero paper filings	100,876 paper filings
2005	Protect	Mission and	Financial	Total number	2002:	Undefined;	2005:

Short text - 250 characters Medium text - 500 characters Long text - 2500 characters

All dollar amounts must be reported in millions with at least 3 decimals (6 decimals available)

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Investors	Business Results	Sector Oversight	of paper filings	16,050 paper filings	ultimately, zero paper filings	102,750 paper filings projected
2006	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of paper filings	2002: 16,050 paper filings	Undefined; ultimately, zero paper filings	No data
2007	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of paper filings	2002: 16,050 paper filings	Undefined; ultimately, zero paper filings	No data
2003	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of electronic filings	2002: 375,677 electronic filings on EDGAR	Undefined	2003: 590,576 electronic filings
2004	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of electronic filings	2002: 375,677 electronic filings on EDGAR	Undefined	2004: 743,385 electronic filings
2005	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of electronic filings	2002: 375,677 electronic filings on EDGAR	Undefined	2005: 795,000 electronic filings projected
2006	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of electronic filings	2002: 375,677 electronic filings on EDGAR	Undefined	2006: no data
2007	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of electronic filings	2002: 375,677 electronic filings on EDGAR	Undefined	2007: no data
2003	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number of foreign paper filings	2002: 2,284 foreign paper filings per year	Undefined; ultimately zero	2003: 11,940 foreign paper filings
2004	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number of foreign paper filings	2002: 2,284 foreign paper filings per year	Undefined; ultimately zero	2004: 950 foreign paper filings
2005	Protect Investors	Mission and Business	Financial Sector	Number of foreign paper	2002: 2,284	Undefined; ultimately	No data

Short text - 250 characters Medium text - 500 characters Long text - 2500 characters

All dollar amounts must be reported in millions with at least 3 decimals (6 decimals available)

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
		Results	Oversight	filings	foreign paper filings per year	zero	
2006	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number of foreign paper filings	2002: 2,284 foreign paper filings per year	Undefined; ultimately zero	No data
2007	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number of foreign paper filings	2002: 2,284 foreign paper filings per year	Undefined; ultimately zero	No data
2003	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of foreign electronic filings per year	2002: 0	Undefined	2003: 4,771
2004	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of foreign electronic filings per year	2002: 0	Undefined	2004: 18,048
2005	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of foreign electronic filings per year	2002: 0	Undefined	2005: no data
2006	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of foreign electronic filings per year	2002: 0	Undefined	2006: no data
2007	Protect Investors	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Total number of foreign electronic filings per year	2002: 0	Undefined	2007: no data
2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number and volume of foreign entity registrations	2002: 130 foreign registrants, \$267B (first year of registration includes all backlog)	Undefined	2003: 200 registrants, \$414B
2004	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number and volume of foreign registrations	2002: 130 foreign registrants, \$267B (first year of	Undefined	2004: no data

Short text - 250 characters Medium text - 500 characters Long text - 2500 characters

All dollar amounts must be reported in millions with at least 3 decimals (6 decimals available)

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					registration includes all backlog)		
2005	Facilitate Capital formation	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number and volume of foreign entity registrations	2002: 130 foreign registrants, \$267B (first year of registration includes all backlog)	Undefined	2005: no data
2006	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number and volume of foreign entity registrations	2002: 130 foreign registrants, \$267B (first year of registration includes all backlog)	Undefined	2006: no data
2007	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Financial Sector Oversight	Number and volume of foreign entity registrations	2002: 130 foreign registrants, \$267B (first year of registration includes all backlog)	Undefined	2007: no data
2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in electronic format	2002: unknown	Undefined	2003: 71.8
2004	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in electronic format	2002: unknown	Undefined	2004: 71.8
2005	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in electronic format	2002: unknown	Undefined	2005: 71.8
2006	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in electronic format	2002: unknown	Undefined	2006: 73.0
2007	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in electronic format	2002: unknown	Undefined	2007 - no data
2003	Facilitate	Mission and	Efficiency	% of filings	2002:	Undefined	2003: 76.3

Short text - 250 characters Medium text - 500 characters Long text - 2500 characters

All dollar amounts must be reported in millions with at least 3 decimals (6 decimals available)

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Capital Formation	Business Results		received electronically	unknown		
2004	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings received electronically	2002: unknown	undefined	2004: 88.1
2005	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings received electronically	2002: unknown	undefined	2005: 88.6
2006	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings received electronically	2002: unknown	undefined	2006: 90.0
2007	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings received electronically	2002: unknown	undefined	2007: no data
2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2003: 3.9
2004	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2004: 3.9
2005	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2005: 5.4
2006	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2006: 7.0
2007	Facilitate Capital Formation	Processes and Activities	IT Contribution to Process, Customer, or Mission	% of forms in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2007: no data
2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2003: 20.8
2004	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2004: 35.6
2005	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2005: 35.0
2006	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2006: 36.0
2007	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	% of filings in structured format	2002: 0	undefined	2007 - no data
2003	Facilitate	Mission and	Dissemination	Annual	2002: 96.9	undefined	2003:

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Capital Formation	Business Results		number of online searches for EDGAR filings (in millions)			141.5
2004	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Annual number of online searches for EDGAR filings (in millions)	2002: 96.9	undefined	2004: 284.0
2005	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Annual number of online searches for EDGAR filings (in millions)	2002: 96.9	undefined	2005: 379.0
2006	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Annual number of online searches for EDGAR filings (in millions)	2002: 96.9	undefined	2006: 531.0
2007	Facilitate Capital Formation	Mission and Business Results	Dissemination	Annual number of online searches for EDGAR filings (in millions)	2002: 96.9	undefined	2007: 739.0

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

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

For existing Mixed Life-Cycle investments where enhancement is planned, include the investment in both the “Systems in Planning” table (3) and the “Operational Systems” table (4). In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

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

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: Yes
 - a. If “yes,” provide the “Percentage IT Security” for the budget year: 3% - per Exhibit 53
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

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. a. If “yes,” specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. Long Text
7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? This system is operated within the SEC’s facility and must conform to all SEC IT policies and procedures including security. Compliance is monitored through periodic checks as well as the SEC’s general automated tools. With regard to physical security and personnel reliability, the SEC requires all personnel, including contractors, to complete clearance processes that include a background check and non-disclosure signatures before being allowed access to the facilities or any SEC data system. Risks are further mitigated by audit trails and separation of duties. The GAO has reviewed the SEC’s IT Security program over the past 2 years and has closed out almost all findings.

8. Planning & Operational Systems – Privacy:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	I Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or explanation
EDGAR	NO	NO	SORNs predate PIA requirement	YES	SORNs SEC-1 through SEC-8 cover the records in EDGAR. http://www.sec.gov/about/privacy/secprivacyoffice.htm
Short	Yes	1	1	Yes	1

8. Planning & Operational Systems – Privacy:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	I Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or explanation
Text					
Short Text	Yes	1	1	Yes	1
Short Text	Yes	1	1	Yes	1
<p>(d) If “Yes” to ©, provide the links to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If No to © provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted..</p> <p>(f) If “Yes” to (e), provide the links to where the current and up-to-date SORN is published in the Federal Register. If No to (e) provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn’t a current and up-to-date SORN</p> <p>Note links must be provided to specific documents, not general privacy websites.</p>					

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

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

1. Is this investment included in your agency’s target enterprise architecture? Yes
 - a. If “no,” please explain why? Long Text
2. Is this investment included in the agency’s EA Transition Strategy? Yes
 - a. If “yes,” provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency’s most recent annual EA Assessment. The SEC is a small, non-scorecard agency currently not required to perform Enterprise Architecture assessments.
 - b. If “no,” please explain why? Long Text
3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? (Y/N) NO
 If Yes, provide the name of the segment architecture: __ The SEC is a small, non-scorecard agency currently not required to perform Enterprise Architecture assessments. _____

3. Service Component Table:

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Process Tracking	Defines the set of capabilities to allow the monitoring of activities within the business cycle.	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking	FEA Enumeration	xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx	Internal	0%
Community management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the administration of online groups that share common interests.	Organizational Management	Workgroup / Groupware	FEA Enumeration	xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx	Internal	0%
Network Services	Defines the set of capabilities involved in monitoring and maintaining a	Organizational Management	Network Management	FEA Enumeration	xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx	Internal	0%

3. Service Component Table:

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
	communications network in order to diagnose problems, gather statistics and provide general usage.						
Syndication Management	Defines the set of capabilities that control and regulate an organization's brand.	Content Management	Syndication Management				
Tagging and Aggregation	Defines the set of capabilities that support the identification of specific content within a larger set of content for collection and summarization.	Content Management	Tagging and Aggregation				
Indexing	Defines the set of capabilities that support the rapid retrieval of documents through a structured numbering construct.	Document Management	Indexing				
Library / Storage	Defines the set of capabilities that support document and data warehousing and archiving.	Document Management	Library / Storage				
Categorization	Defines the set of capabilities that allow classification of data and information into specific layers or types to support an organization.	Knowledge Management	Categorization				
Information Retrieval	Defines the set of capabilities that allow access to data and information for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval				

3. Service Component Table:

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Information Sharing	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of documents and data in a multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing				
Knowledge Capture	Defines the set of capabilities that facilitate collection of data and information.	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture				
Classification	Defines the set of capabilities that support the categorization of documents.	Records Management	Document Classification				
Ad-Hoc	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis.	Reporting	Ad-Hoc				
Standardized / Canned	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Reporting	Standardized / Canned				
Billing and Accounting	Defines the set of capabilities that support the charging, collection and reporting of an organization's accounts.	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting				
		Financial Management	Financial Reporting	Not in FEA			
Payment / Settlement	Defines the set of capabilities that support the process of accounts payable.	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement				
Revenue Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the allocation and re-investment of	Financial Management	Revenue Management				

3. Service Component Table:

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
	earned net credit or capital within an organization.						
Identification / Authentication	Defines the set of capabilities that support obtaining information about those parties attempting to log on to a system or application for security purposes and the validation of those users	Security Management	Identification and Authentication				
Query	Defines the set of capabilities that support retrieval of records that satisfy specific query selection criteria.	Search	Query				
Enterprise Application Integration	Support the redesigning of disparate information systems into one system that uses a common set of data structures and rules	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration				
Forms Creation	Defines the set of capabilities that support the design and generation of electronic or physical forms and templates for use within the business cycle by an organization and its stakeholders.	Forms Management	Forms Creation				
Forms Modification	Defines the set of capabilities that support the maintenance of electronic or physical forms, templates and their respective elements and fields.	Forms Management	Forms Modification				

3. Service Component Table:

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Data Exchange	Support the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications; includes verification that transmitted data was received unaltered.	Data Management	Data Exchange				

- a. Use existing Service Reference Model (SRM) Components or identify as “NEW.” A “NEW” component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.
- b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.
- c. ‘Internal’ reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. ‘External’ reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.
- d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the % of the BY requested funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in this column can, but need not, add up to 100%.

4. Technical Reference Model Table:

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Process Tracking	Component Framework Service Area	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java
Forms Modification, Process Tracking	Component Framework Service Area	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Javascript
Tagging and Aggregation Categorization Information Retrieval Information Sharing Knowledge Capture	Component Framework Service Area	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	XML
Tagging and	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	XBRL - Used in EDGAR

4. Technical Reference Model Table:

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Aggregation Categorization Information Retrieval Information Sharing Knowledge Capture	Service Area			
Process Tracking	Component Framework Service Area	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	HyperText Markup Language (HTML)
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework Service Area	Security	Certificate / Digital Signature	Digital Certificate Authentication
Process Tracking	Service Access & Delivery	Access Channel	Web Browser	Internet Explorer
Information Retrieval Information Sharing	Service Access & Delivery	Delivery Channel	Extranet	EDGAR System
Identification and Authentication	Service Access & Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP)
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Object Request Broker (ORB) - CORBA - EDGAR
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EAS (EDGAR)
Extraction and Transformation Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Tuxedo
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Databases	Sybase
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Databases	MS SQL
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Jaguar
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Jrun
Credit / Charge Debt Collection Billing and Accounting Financial Reporting [not an FEA Component] Payment / Settlement Revenue Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Momentum
Tagging and Aggregation Indexing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Hummingbird
Process Tracking Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Internet Information Servers
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Netscape
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices	Firewall
Forms Creation Forms Modification	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	PureEdge
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Supporting Platform	Operating System Platforms [Not an FEA Component]	Sun Solaris
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Supporting Platform	Operating System Platforms	Windows NT
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage / Backup	Storage Area Network (SAN)

- a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications
 - b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.
5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No
- a. If “yes,” please describe. Long Text
6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system? Yes
- a. If “yes,” does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)? No
 1. If “yes,” provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services). Medium Text

PART II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? No
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? Unknown
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: General direction of EDGAR was set prior to 2001 and has not changed since. A replacement system has been under discussion in the SEC since at least 2004 and the project manager believes that this investment is more accurately characterized as a steady-state investment that is only doing necessary enhancements while awaiting the strategic decision on a replacement.

a. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Lifecycle Costs estimate	Lifecycle Benefits estimate
1. SELECTED ALTERNATIVE	SELECTED ALTERNATIVE: As described: maintain system through 2010, with ongoing maintenance, and ongoing modernization related upgrades on the order of \$2 million (25% of budget) to accommodate interactive data and other rulemaking efforts. Estimated benefits have increased as a result of decision to extend system life by 2 years, and the inclusion of the filer support (FTE) effort.	154.716	154.716
2 - Replace	2 - Clean-sheet rebuild of the system, with retirement of most or all of the current system's components. Would have very high cost and technical risk; benefits would be limited unless accompanied by a comprehensive revisiting of virtually all CF/IM filing rules, which would be difficult given the various other rulemaking priorities within those Divisions.	154.716	154.716
3 - Phase out centralized filing	3- Move towards a disclosure model focused on leverage of company websites and third party data vendors, eventually leading to the decommissioning of EDGAR and the removal of the SEC from the filing-dissemination value chain. While theoretically feasible, and a subject of internal discussion, this model will	154.716	154.716

a. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Lifecycle Costs estimate	Lifecycle Benefits estimate
	require significantly more evaluation over time in order to assess this possibility.		
4. Status Quo: Limited/no adoption of interactive data	Status Quo: Preserve HTML as the primary format for EDGAR filings (other than those forms already represented in tagged format). Would be lower risk, lower cost, and still provide room for improving the system over time, but would fail to capture the intended benefits of interactive data for the investing public.	154.716	154.716

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency’s Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **The proposed alternative (#1) was selected. The consensus of the management team was that a “continuous modernization” approach, coupled with the leverage of interactive data, would provide a platform for ongoing improvements with a manageable level of technical and political risk. The approach will allow for the refreshment of various systems components (such as the Momentum subsystem listed below, but also including other technical subsystems), while allowing for a managed transition of business processes and agency regulations.**

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? Improved access for the public, the regulated community and the SEC staff to the massive volumes of information that SEC regulations require the financial services industry to provide. Making no change to the system and continuing to post these volumes of material as separate and non-searchable documents would have continued a process whereby the public and small investors are seriously disadvantaged in their access to knowledge about market conditions. The remainder of the SEC staff would also be greatly hampered in conducting their work. We would spend a great deal of our accountants’ and attorneys’ time in low-value activities such as opening and closing thousands of files looking for information that might or might not be there, instead of working with processed data that can enable such personnel to move on to mission-productive activities such as analyzing behavior patterns etc.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in part or in whole? (Y/N) 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, Legacy investment, Migration investment>>

b. If “Yes”, please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investments or Systems

Name of the Legacy Investment or System	UPI if available	Date of the system retirement
Momentum (embedded)	n/a	9/30/2008

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 04/26/2005 .
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: N/A
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? N/A
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? N/A
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? N/A
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: SEC IT PMO guidance for project planning includes a comprehensive risk analysis process. This risk analysis process includes identification of risks, using the 19-factor framework established in OMB Circular A-11, and the risks are scored according to probability and impact. The score is translated into a cost and schedule buffer based on the total project cost. The project execution cost is then appended with this risk buffer amount, thereby creating the risk loading that OMB recommends. Once the investment moves into the execution phase, the risk management plan is updated at least as often as each phase gate to reflect the current situation and the status of mitigation activities, and the buffers are adjusted or drawn down as appropriate.

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

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

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard – 748? Yes
2. Is the CV or SV greater than +/-10%? NO (CV= 4% overage [SV = 0.8% overage])
(CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)

- a. If “yes,” was it the? n/a
 - b. If “yes,” explain the variance: [Not needed: Included here just in case budget decisions send the SV or CV over 10%] On the DME side, the actual costs increased by several million in FY07 as a result of adding several new public-oriented components to the program (Executive compensation, XBRL tools) and continued enhancements to the base system, and these costs are expected to continue to accrue pending a decision on whether and when to replace or modernize the system.
 - c. If “yes,” what corrective actions are being taken? [Not needed:Included here just in case budget decisions send the SV or CV over 10%] Until a decision is made on whether to modernize or replace this system, we cannot do much about the continued cost accrual. We will provide a revised baseline for OMB approval in March 2008.
 - d. What is most current “Estimate at Completion”? \$143.345
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? (Y/N) YES
- a. If “yes”, when was it approved by the agency head? <date> 15 February 2007
 - b. If “yes”, when was it approved by OMB? <date> Not yet submitted for approval

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '0' for any milestone no longer active. RELEASE 9.2

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimate	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) Planned/Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned /Actual		Schedule/ Cost (# days/\$M)		
Pre-2004 Enhancements	9/30/2003	0.650	9/30/2003	9/30/2004	0.650	0.650	-366	0.000	100.0%
Pre-2004 O&M	9/30/2003	32.624	6/30/2003	9/30/2005	32.624	32.624	-823	0.000	100.0%
FY2004 Enhancements	6/30/2005	1.900	6/30/2005	9/30/2005	1.900	1.900	-92	0.000	100.0%
FY2004 O&M	9/30/2004	11.600	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	11.600	11.300	0	0.300	100.0%
FY2005 O&M	9/30/2005	11.600	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	11.600	12.011	0	-0.411	100.0%
ADC Conversion			5/31/2005	7/31/2005	0.000	1.578	-61	-1.578	100.0%
FY05 funded DME work: releases 9.1, 9.2, 9.3	2/28/2006	2.500	2/28/2006	2/28/2006	2.500	2.442	0	0.058	100.0%
Other FY05 DME work	5/31/2006	0.000	5/31/2006	9/30/2006	0.000	1.417	-122	-1.417	100.0%
Contract Re-compete	3/31/2006	0.400	3/31/2006	9/30/2006	0.400	1.100	-183	-0.700	100.0%
Contract Transition	9/30/2006	4.200	9/30/2006	3/31/2007	4.200	7.052	-182	-2.852	100.0%
FY2006 Enhancements: release 9.4 and other investments	9/30/2006	5.630	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	5.630	1.263	0	4.367	100.0%
FY2006 O&M	9/30/2006	11.900	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	11.900	15.423	0	-3.523	100.0%
FY07 Enhancements			9/30/2007	9/30/2007	1.592	1.133	0	0.459	100.0%
FY07 Exec Comp			9/30/2007	12/31/2007	0.250	0.800	-92	-0.550	75.0%
Investor Tools (WSOD/Rivet)			9/30/2007	9/30/2007	0.250	0.500	0	-0.250	100.0%

Short text - 250 characters Medium text - 500 characters Long text - 2500 characters

All dollar amounts must be reported in millions with at least 3 decimals (6 decimals available)

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '0' for any milestone no longer active. RELEASE 9.2

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) Planned/Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned /Actual		Schedule/ Cost (# days/\$M)		
FY07 Momentum Upgrade			9/30/2007	12/31/2008	1.000	1.000	-458	0.000	0.0%
FY2007 O&M	9/30/2007	12.400	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	9.000	5.725	0	3.275	100.0%
FY2008 Enhancements			9/30/2008	9/30/2008	0.000		0		0.0%
FY2008 O&M	9/30/2008	\$12.60	9/30/2008	9/30/2008	10.276		0		0.0%
FY2009 Enhancements			9/30/2009	9/30/2009			0		0.0%
FY2009 O&M	9/30/2009	\$12.60	9/30/2009	9/30/2009			0		0.0%
FY2010 Enhancements			9/30/2010	9/30/2010			0		0.0%
FY2010 O&M			9/30/2010	9/30/2010			0		0.0%
FY2011 O&M			9/30/2011	9/30/2011			0		0.0%