

PBGC – Premium Accounting (PA)

[redacted]

Agency: 012

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: **Sep 8, 2008**
2. Agency: **012**
3. Bureau: **12**
4. Name of this Capital Asset: **PBGC - Premium Accounting (PA)**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **012-12-01-01-01-2065-00**
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2010? **Mixed Life Cycle**
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? **FY2005**
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: **Premium Accounting (PA) is a set of systems that process approximately \$1.5 billion in insurance premiums paid by insured pension plans in accordance with ERISA. PA accrues interest and assesses penalties on past due payments. PA manages plan filer data, correspondence, images records, and enables online account maintenance. PA is critical to meet PBGC's mission mandated by law and federal regulation. In 2003, PBGC identified a need to modernize its legacy PA system. The system was approaching technological obsolescence and lacked important functionality that resulted in adverse audit findings. A modernization effort was undertaken to integrate the PA systems with the general ledger system and address anticipated requirements driven by legislative change. The first phase of PA was delivered within budget, but took longer than anticipated to implement. The final legislative changes would significantly increase the cost and complexity of the PA system. Contractor estimates to implement the changes greatly exceeded government cost estimates and mandated deadlines. In May 2008, a decision was made to place the PA effort on hold to review the approach to ensure that PBGC pursues the most effective solution. In September 2008, a Financial Management Segment Architecture (FMSA) was started to evaluate the PBGC enterprise financial management business and technical requirements. The FMSA will provide findings and recommendations to support future investment and development decisions. The PA SA and eventual modernization will address infrastructure, business process, security, privacy, and consolidation of separate applications. The legacy PA system is being modified to provide interim functionality. Once the FMSA is complete, PA modernization activities can begin to reduce technological risk; meet legislative requirements; address audit findings;**

enhance interoperability; and improve overall performance. The modifications to the legacy system and future PA system will continue to be managed by senior experienced project managers in conjunction with strong business involvement and executive oversight. The legacy PA system is not a viable long term alternative. The core system needs modernization and significant revision to incorporate complex legislative requirements and modifications to reduce the potential for malfeasance or error. Delay or rejection of this investment would lead to failure of significant portions of PBGC's mission.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? **yes**

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Aug 1, 2008**

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**

11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

Name **Scott Byrum**

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

E-mail **byrum.scott@pbgc.gov**

a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager? **Waiver Issued**

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned? **Oct 31, 2005**

c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification? **Sep 30, 2009**

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. **no**

a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? **yes**

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) **no**

1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? **[Not answered]**

2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? **[Not answered]**

3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? **[Not answered]**

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? **yes**

**Expanded E-Government
Financial Performance**

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **Financial Performance: improves accuracy of premium data; reduces administrative costs; and reduces amount of time needed to determine premium income, receivables, and payables**

to meet accelerated reporting objectives. Expanded E-Gov: creates a central repository for data; reduces reporting burden for premium filers; enables PBGC to share information with other government agencies; and web-based front-end application used by filers to submit premium filings under mandatory e-filing regulation.

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

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

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? **10002382 - 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. In addition to the answer in 11(a), 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 2008 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: **Financial Systems Integration per OMB Circular A-127, Financial Management 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 **PA consists of primarily two separate systems – (1) My Plan Administration Account (My PAA) and (2) Premium Accounting System (PAS).**

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following?

Hardware	0
Software	0
Services	100
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	Philip 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? **yes**

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) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	3.457	0.896	0.894	0.1	0	0	0	0	5.347
Acquisition:	17.987	2.186	7.613	1.861	1.054	1.106	1.161	1.218	34.186
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	21.444	3.082	8.507	1.961	1.054	1.106	1.161	1.218	39.533
Operations & Maintenance:	6.375	1.061	2.214	2.308	2.422	2.541	2.576	2.612	22.109
TOTAL:	27.819	4.143	10.721	4.269	3.476	3.647	3.737	3.83	61.642
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.721	0.721	0.865	0.865	0.721	0.721	0.721	0.721	6.056
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	5	42

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? **yes**

a. If "yes", How many and in what year? **Five in FY 2009.**

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **The \$17.350 million increase in the Summary of Spending from last year is summarized below. Planning & Acquisition – the \$10.920 million increase is due to (1) unanticipated costs associated with the PPS development effort that were incurred during FY 2008; (2) additional funds to modify its legacy system for changes that the PBGC had deferred for several years, including changes related to the PPA, pending the deployment of the PPS that did not take place; and (3) costs that will be incurred when the PBGC completes its FMSA, considers alternatives, and begins work on a new Premium Accounting system. Operations & Maintenance – The \$4.794 million increase is related to the need to continue maintaining the legacy system for several years more than what was anticipated previously. Government FTE costs – The \$1.636 million increase is related to the one additional FTE per year to support the anticipated DM&E in FY 2009 and beyond. The PBGC recognizes the need to manage the projects more closely to avoid cost overruns and schedule delays by implementing more aggressive and recurring risk management; more accurate independent government estimates to evaluate contractor**

proposals; EVM for early warnings of cost/schedule delays; and use of performance based contracts, where possible. The PBGC would also like to point out that this investment includes costing estimates and milestones for activities to modernize the investment's systems and refresh the infrastructure the systems utilize. Under separate investments, PBGC is upgrading and standardizing its infrastructure including key decisions relating to PBGC's hardware, software, licensing, servers, communications, networking devices, storage, etc. This investment's modernization and refresh activities include all services needed to migrate to PBGC's to-be infrastructure obtained and maintained through separate investments.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Contract or Task Order Number	DO-07-0146 - Support the Premium Accounting System; provide data conversion support for the Premium and Practitioner System
Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Time and Materials
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Jun 1, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Jun 1, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2008
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	2
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Robert Price
CO Contact information (phone/email)	202-326-4000 [redacted]/price.robert@pbgc.gov
Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level	3
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	[Not answered]

Contract or Task Order Number	GS35F4594G - Support PBGC's My Plan Administration Account (PBGC's practitioner-facing e-filing system in support of GPEA, E-Gov and E-Filing)
Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Time and Materials
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Mar 31, 2006
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Apr 1, 2006
End date of Contract/Task Order	Feb 28, 2009
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	2.86
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	Mary Trimbell
CO Contact information (phone/email)	202-326-4000 [redacted]/trimbell.mary@pbgc.gov
Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level	3
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	[Not answered]

Contract or Task Order Number	Proposed Contract - Follow-on DM&E and support for a new Premium Accounting System
Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Firm Fixed Price, Cost Plus Fixed Fee or Incentive Fee
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 15, 2008
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Dec 1, 2008
End date of Contract/Task Order	Dec 1, 2013
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	[redacted]
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Robert Price
CO Contact information (phone/email)	202-326-4000 [redacted]/price.robert@pbgc.gov
Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level	3
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	[Not answered]

Contract or Task Order Number	Proposed Contract - Follow-on support for the My Plan Administration Account System
Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Cost Plus Fixed Fee, Labor Hour, or Incentive Fee
Has the contract been awarded	no
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Jan 31, 2009
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Jan 31, 2009
End date of Contract/Task Order	May 31, 2014
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	[redacted]
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Mary Trimbell
CO Contact information (phone/email)	202-326-4000 [redacted]/trimbell.mary@pbgc.gov
Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level	3
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	[Not answered]

1. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why: **The scope of DO-07-0146 was for operations and maintenance, and therefore, EVM is not required according to the criteria set forth by the PMO for reporting EVM. PBGC's project manager does manage cost, schedule, and performance on this contract by assessing progress reports using invoice tracking, and performing on-site observations against project schedules and proposal milestones as documented in MS Project Plan and Excel budgeting spreadsheets. While future proposed contracts will include EVM requirements, PBGC has deployed Primavera, a project, program, and portfolio management solution, to help assure project, IT and corporate governance; enhance processes and methods; improve project team collaboration; measure progress toward objectives.**
2. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
 - a. Explain why not or how this is being done? **PBGC addresses Section 508 compliance in two ways. It is a mandatory requirement enforced by the PBGC's Contracting Officer for all IT related procurements. PBGC's ITSLCM also requires the Infrastructure Administration group to conduct 508 compliance reviews on all new systems before implementation. Any new financial software must have an application interface that complies with the software application standards in Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act as detailed in 36 CFR 1194, Subpart B.**
3. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date? **Aug 8, 2008**
 1. Is it Current? **yes**
 - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? **[Not answered]**
 1. If "no," briefly explain why: **[Not answered]**

Section D: Performance Information

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2009
2008	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	70 out of a possible 100	69 out of a possible 100	72 out of a possible 100
2008	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	71% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	75% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	Q1 FY2009
2008	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	51% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	90% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Q1 FY2009
2009	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2010
2009	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	72 out of a possible 100	70 out of a possible 100	Q1 FY2010

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2009	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	71% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	75% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	Q1 FY2010
2009	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	90 % of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95 % of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Q1 FY2010
2010	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2011
2010	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	72 out of a possible 100	70 out of a possible 100	Q1 FY2011
2010	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	75% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	77% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	Q1 FY2011
2010	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted Electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted Electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2011
2011	Provide	Mission and	Collections and	% of Premium	99% of	Maintain	Q1 FY2012

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Business Results	Receivables	Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	baseline%	
2011	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	72 out of a possible 100	70 out of a possible 100	Q1 FY2012
2011	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	77% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	80% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	Q1 FY2012
2011	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2012
2012	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2013
2012	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	72 out of a possible 100	70 out of a possible 100	Q1 FY2013
2012	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within	77% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderati	80% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderat	Q1 FY2013

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Stakeholders			30 days	ions processed within 30 days	ions processed within 30 days	
2012	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2013
2013	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of receipt	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2014
2013	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	72 out of a possible 100	70 out of a possible 100	Q1 FY2014
2013	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	77% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	80% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	Q1 FY2014
2013	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2014
2014	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	Collections and Receivables	% of Premium Filings and Payments posted within 30 days of receipt	99% of Premium Filings and Payments were posted within 30 days of	Maintain baseline%	Q1 FY2015

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					receipt		
2014	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ACSI Score for Premium Filer Service	72 out of a possible 100	70 out of a possible 100	Q1 FY2015
2014	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	77% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	80% of premium refunds, waivers and reconsiderations processed within 30 days	Q1 FY2015
2014	Provide Exceptional Service to Customers and Stakeholders	Technology	Functionality	% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	95% of Premium Filings submitted electronically (E-Filing)	Meet or exceed Baseline Target	Q1 FY2015

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 certification and accreditation (C&A) update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
PAS	Contractor and Government	Sep 30, 2010	Sep 30, 2010
MyPAA	Contractor and Government	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
PAS	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	Jun 29, 2007	Other	Oct 1, 2006	Jun 1, 2008
MyPAA	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	Mar 5, 2008	Other	Jul 5, 2007	Oct 1, 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? **no**

- a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. **[Not answered]**
7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **All PBGC information systems identified above are operated and managed jointly by federal employees and contractor teams reporting to PBGC federal employees. PBGC contractual requirements provide for inspection of all new or renovated contractor hosting sites. When contractor external facilities are inspected, an inspection report is produced for the contractor, which identifies security deficiencies, if any, associated with physical, personnel, management, and operational controls. When deficiencies are found, follow-up inspections are conducted to review the deficiencies identified in the preceding inspection to verify if progress has been made by the contractor to resolve those deficiencies. Furthermore, 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. Role-based training is conducted by PBGC's Enterprise Security Team following orientation and annually thereafter for positions related to the Designated Approving Authority, Information System Owner, System Administrators, and Project Managers. 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
PAS	no	yes	http://www.pbgc.gov/docs/pia-cfs.pdf	yes	http://www.gpoaccess.gov/privacyact/index.html
MyPAA	no	yes	http://www.pbgc.gov/docs/PIA-MyPAA%209-7-07.pdf	yes	http://www.gpoaccess.gov/privacyact/index.html

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? **yes**

a. If "no," please explain why? **[Not answered]**

1. 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. **Premium Accounting**

b. If "no," please explain why? **[Not answered]**

2. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? **yes**

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. **no**

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		
PAS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Financial Management	Revenue Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
PAS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Data Management	Data Warehouse	Data Warehouse	[Not answered]	Internal	5
PAS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Financial Management	Auditing	Auditing	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PAS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting	Billing and Accounting	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PAS	Premium Collection and processing accounting system	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement	Payment / Settlement	012-12-01-	Internal	5

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		
					01-01-2075-00		
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings	Financial Management	Credit / Charge	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings	Customer Relationship Management	Contact and Profile Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
MyPAA	Customer facing website for electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
MyPAA	Customer facing website for	Content Management	Content Publishing and	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5

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		
	electronic filing of premiums due PBGC and the management of customer information related to premium filings		Delivery		ered]		
PAS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Document Conversion	Document Conversion	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PAS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR	Document Imaging and OCR	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PAS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Document Referencing	Document Referencing	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PAS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Indexing	Indexing	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PAS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Document Management	Library / Storage	Library / Storage	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5

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		
PAS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Records Management	Document Classification	Document Classification	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PAS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Records Management	Record Linking / Association	Record Linking / Association	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5
PAS	Image processing and storage system for PBGC documents	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management	Outbound Correspondence Management	012-12-01-01-2075-00	Internal	5

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Revenue Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent Technologies	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Revenue Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Revenue Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Networking standards
Revenue Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle Database PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Revenue Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Revenue Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Revenue Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Credit / Charge	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent Technologies	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Credit / Charge	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Credit / Charge	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Network standards
Credit / Charge	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle database PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Credit / Charge	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Credit / Charge	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
				Application
Credit / Charge	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Self-Service	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent Technologies	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	PBGC Network standards
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle database PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Self-Service	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Self-Service	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Self-Service	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Contact and Profile Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent Technologies	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Contact and Profile Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Contact and Profile Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Networking standards
Contact and Profile Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle Database PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Contact and Profile Management	Component	Security	Supporting Security	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Management	Framework		Services	Architecture
Contact and Profile Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Contact and Profile Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent Technologies	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Network standards
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle database PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Customer / Account Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Customer / Account Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent Technologies	Oracle Financials (Receivables)
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	PBGC Web standards regarding W3C, PIA, compliance (primary target MS IE)
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	PBGC Network standards

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle database PBGC standards and Hitachi SAN when relevant
Content Publishing and Delivery	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Will utilize the PBGC Common Security Services and Security Architecture
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EA Blueprint standards concerning J2EE and Oracle Application Server
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	EA Blueprint standards concerning Service Oriented Architecture

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., USA.Gov, 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 investment? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? **Aug 8, 2008**
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? [**Not answered**]
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: [**Not answered**]

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Baseline - Maintain PAS and My PAA in steady-state.	Legacy systems would be operated and maintained in steady-state with no DME. This alternative would not permit PBGC to make required legislative changes.	14.57	3.87
Alternative 1 - Modernize PAS and My PAA to be fully compliant with PPA legislation	Alternative 1 allows PBGC to continue modernization activities relating to improvements in security, efficiency, and performance measures, and complete all activities required to fully implement PPA legislative changes.	29.68	3.87
Alternative 2 – Complete PPS with all requirements and My PAA – Mixed Life Cycle	Alternative 2 allows PBGC to continue modernization activities relating to improvements in security, efficiency, and performance measures, and accomplish all activities required to fully implement legislative changes resulting from the Pension Protection Act of 2006. This alternative provides a comprehensive long-term solution to meet evolving requirements in this critical line of PBGC’s business.	38.2	3.87
Alternative 3 – Complete PPS with minimum requirements and My PAA – Mixed Life Cycle	Alternative 3 allows PBGC to continue with minimal modernization activities relating to improvements in security, efficiency, and performance measures, and implementing the minimum requirements of the PPA.	34.1	3.87

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **Alternative 1 is the best way to address the PPA changes. Alternative 1 is the only option for PBGC to continue its critical business function and the time to complete the FMSA and alternatives analysis. The**

baseline alternative and alternative 3 do not fully address the required legislative changes so that PBGC can continue operating. Alternative 2 has a significant cost increase and high degree of risk that the PBGC would not deploy the system in time to meet PPA mandates.

- a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.) **2020**
4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **The value of PA is primarily in its non-financial, qualitative benefits. In FY2009, PA aims to address the infrastructure, modernization, security, deferred enhancements, and legislative requirements described in Section 1. Below are the common lifecycle, qualitative benefits that will be realized. These correspond to the evaluation criteria defined to analyze the alternatives in Section 3.**
Improved Data Integrity More accurate and timely premium and plan data More accurate and timely plan records (i.e., account histories) More accurate and timely invoices (statements of account) and past due filing notices Improved Target Levels of Service to Customers More responsive and timely resolution of customer inquiries/requests (e.g., refund requests) More timely online access by premium filers to plan account histories to verify the status of their plan accounts Improved Financial Management More efficient and effective use of staff, e.g., less time on suspended filings/corrections and more time on more productive tasks (e.g., collections) More timely collection of premiums and late payment charges More accurate and timely financial reporting Improve handling of variable workloads Revamp outdated business processes Increased Internal Controls Strengthen internal controls Compliance with Federal Regulations Address PPA changes Adhere to the President's Management Agenda, specifically Improved Financial Performance and Expanded Electronic Government Comply with the Government Paperwork Elimination Act OIG Addressed Address long-standing audit findings on security, systems integration, and compliance with OMB Circular A-127, Financial Management Systems (A-127) Strategic Goals Aligned Alignment with PBGC's Strategic goals to: (1) safeguard the federal insurance system for the benefit of participants, plan sponsors, and other stakeholders, (2) provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders, and (3) exercise effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources.

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits (\$millions):				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY-1 and Prior	0	0	N/A	N/A
PY	0	0.15	N/A	Reduction in Data Capture – Savings of \$150K per year.
CY	0	0.329	N/A	Reduction in Data Capture – Savings of \$150K per year. Reduction in Printing and Mailing – Savings of \$178.5K per year.
BY	0	0.709	N/A	Reduction in Data Capture – Savings of \$150K per year. Reduction in Printing and Mailing – Savings of \$178.5K per year. Automation of Premium Filing Process – Savings of \$380K per year.
BY+1	0	0.709	N/A	Reduction in Data Capture – Savings of \$150K per year. Reduction in Printing and Mailing – Savings of \$178.5K per year. Automation of Premium Filing Process – Savings of \$380K per year.
BY+2	0	0.708	N/A	Reduction in Data Capture – Savings of \$150K per year. Reduction in Printing and Mailing – Savings of \$178.5K per year. Automation of Premium Filing Process – Savings of \$380K per year.
BY+3	0	0.708	N/A	Reduction in Data Capture – Savings of \$150K per year. Reduction in Printing and Mailing – Savings of \$178.5K per year. Automation of Premium Filing Process – Savings of \$380K per year.
BY+4 and Beyond	0	0.708	N/A	Reduction in Data Capture – Savings of \$150K per year. Reduction in Printing and Mailing – Savings of \$178.5K per year. Automation of Premium Filing Process – Savings of \$380K per year.
Total LCC Benefit	0	4.021	LCC = Life-cycle cost	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **no**

- a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment? **[Not answered]**
- b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment or Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
<i>There are no Legacy Investment or Systems.</i>		

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **Jul 30, 2008**
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **yes**
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: **The PBGC recognizes the need to manage the projects more closely to avoid cost overruns and schedule delays by implementing more: aggressive and recurring risk management; accurate independent government estimates to evaluate contractor proposals; EVM for early warnings of cost/schedule delays; and use of performance based contracts. The PBGC developed a Risk Management Plan (RMP) for this investment. RMP is based on industry best practice from the PMBOK® and CMMI, PBGC's ITSLCM, and guidance from PBGC's CPIC team. This process ensures comprehensive and proactive risk management throughout the project lifecycle. The specific goals of risk management for this investment are to: (1) develop a shared vision based on common purpose, shared ownership and collective commitment to success; (2) foster an atmosphere of collaboration and teamwork in which the PBGC stakeholders work cooperatively to achieve a common goal—pooling talent, skills and knowledge; (3) promote a forward-looking view where managers and team members, identify uncertainties, and anticipate potential outcomes; (4) weigh opportunity against risk and recognize both the potential value of opportunity and the potential impact of adverse effects, such as cost overrun, time delay, or failure to meet product specifications; (5) encourage open communication and the free-flow of information between all levels; (6) make risk management an integral and vital part of project management; and (7) provide the team with the tools and infrastructure to manage risks collaboratively. This year, the PBGC identified 89 risks covering the 19 OMB risk areas and five PBGC identified risk areas. Overall investment exposure was identified and the risk probability level and impact was established for each risk. PBGC plans to monitor the risks for this investment by having senior project managers certified through PMI and Executive level oversight throughout the life cycle of the investment. This will include several channels, such as weekly executive sponsorship status meetings; weekly project team meetings; periodic director investment review meetings; and periodic executive management committee investment review meetings.**
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? **[Not answered]**
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? **[Not answered]**
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? **[Not answered]**
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **When developing the PA lifecycle cost estimate and schedule, the PBGC held facilitated sessions to identify risks. At these sessions, the PA team members with responsibility for risk identification and management reviewed all existing risks and then brainstormed additional program and project risks across the OMB 19 risk categories and**

additional five PBGC defined risk categories. The risks were then analyzed to determine the likelihood of occurrence (probability) and the impact to the investment. The criticality of a risk depends on the combination of probability and impact. The most critical risks are those that have both a high probability of occurring and a high impact to the investment. Next the risks were rated based on the probability and impact. The risk owner(s) determined the appropriate response strategy for each risk. The resulting product is the PA Risk Register. PBGC takes into account the information from the Risk Register to develop the risk-adjusted cost estimate and corresponding schedule for the investment lifecycle. Where appropriate, risk contingencies and mitigation strategies were considered in the initiative's costs and schedules estimates. The PA team uses various information to track activities relating to risk, such as MOUs and ISAs, OMB reporting, application and data releases, partner working groups and meetings, and overall program management. During the analysis, opportunity was weighed against risk-recognizing both the potential value of opportunity and the potential impact of adverse effects, such as cost overrun, time delay, or failure to meet the requirements of a modernized Premium Accounting Services program that provides superior customer service while further consolidating PBGC's financial systems to address audit findings. Contingency and mitigation plans specific to the risk, are actionable, costed, scheduled, and tracked to completion.

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

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? **no**
2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than ± 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) **yes**
 - a. If "yes," was it the? **SV**
 - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance: **The schedule variance is due to primarily initial contractor delays; extended integration and user acceptance testing; and increases in the scope of the project that caused the cost variances.**
 - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions **As discussed in Part II. B. 1.C., PBGC has initiated actions to minimize the risk of cost and schedule variances exceeding ten percent. Among other things, the PBGC is implementing more: aggressive and recurring risk management; accurate independent government estimates to evaluate contractor proposals; and use of performance based contracts that will include EVM. PBGC has also deployed Primavera - a project, program, and portfolio management solution to help assure project, IT, and corporate governance; enhance processes and methods; improve project team collaboration; and measure progress toward objectives. Overall risk management was also increased by identifying investment exposure and establishing the risk probability level and impact for each risk. PBGC plans to monitor the risks for this investment by having senior project mangers certified through PMI and executive-level oversight throughout the life cycle of the investment. This will include several channels, such as weekly executive sponsorship status meetings; weekly project team meetings; periodic director investment review meetings; and periodic executive management committee investment review meetings.**
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? **Jun 27, 2008**

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)		
FY2007 and earlier PAS/PPS DME	Sep 30, 2007	12.554	Sep 30, 2007	Mar 22, 2008	12.418	15.773	-174	-3.355	100

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned: Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned: Actual		Schedule: Cost (# days: \$M)		
FY2007 and earlier PAS O&M	Sep 30, 2007	1.775	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	1.775	1.775	0	0	100
FY2007 and earlier MyPAA DME	Sep 30, 2007	4.268	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	4.268	4.268	0	0	100
FY2007 and earlier MyPAA O&M	Sep 30, 2007	4.183	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	4.183	4.183	0	0	100
FY2007 and earlier Security Activities: DME	Sep 30, 2007	1.403	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	1.403	1.403	0	0	100
FY2007 and earlier Security Activities: O&M	Sep 30, 2007	0.417	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.417	0.417	0	0	100
FY2007 PBGC Practitioner Services Program Management (FTE)	Sep 30, 2007	0.721	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.721	0.721	0	0	100
FY2008 PBGC Practitioner Services Program Management (FTE)	Sep 30, 2008	0.721	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.721	0.721	0	0	100
FY2008 PAS/PPS DME	Sep 30, 2008	0	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0	1.374	-366	1.374	100
FY2008 PAS O&M	Sep 30, 2008	0.396	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.396	0.396	0	0	100
FY2008 MyPAA DME	Sep 30, 2008	1.506	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	1.506	1.506	0	0	100
FY2008 MyPAA O&M	Sep 30, 2008	0.596	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.596	0.596	0	0	100

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:									
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned: Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned: Actual	Schedule: Cost (# days: \$M)			
			2008	2008					
FY2008 Security Activities: DME	Sep 30, 2008	0.202	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.202	0.202	0	0	100
FY2008 Security Activities: O&M	Sep 30, 2008	0.069	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.069	0.069	0	0	100
FY2009 2008 Legislative Changes	Sep 30, 2009	1.898	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	1.898	0	0	0	0
FY2009 Deferred Functionality (SCR/PTR)	Sep 30, 2010	0.919	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.919	0	0	0	0
FY2009 Infrastructure Upgrade	Sep 28, 2010	1.701	Sep 28, 2010	[Not answered]	1.701	0	0	0	0
FY2009 2009 Forms Change	Jan 30, 2009	0.411	Jan 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.411	0	0	0	0
FY2009 2009 Usability	Jul 31, 2009	0.408	Jul 31, 2009	[Not answered]	0.408	0	0	0	0
FY2009 DM&E Security @7%	Sep 30, 2009	0.509	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.509	0	0	0	0
FY2009 Infrastructure @ 5%	Sep 30, 2009	0.363	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.363	0	0	0	0
FY2009 PPQA @5%	Sep 30, 2009	0.363	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.363	0	0	0	0
FY2009 PBGC Practitioner Services	Sep 30, 2009	0.869	Sep 30,	[Not answer	0.869	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)				
Program Management (FTE)			2009	ed]					
FY2009 FOD Staff Augmentation	Sep 30, 2009	0.403	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.403	0	0	0	0
FY2009 PAS Data Conversion from Tweaks to 2008 Legislative Changes	Sep 30, 2009	0.45	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.45	0	0	0	0
FY2009 Interfaces	Sep 30, 2009	0.14	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.14	0	0	0	0
FY2009 Labor for workarounds	Sep 30, 2009	0.35	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.35	0	0	0	0
FY2009 PPA additional PM Support	Sep 30, 2009	0.335	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.335	0	0	0	0
FY2009 Alternatives Analysis	Sep 30, 2009	0.255	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.255	0	0	0	0
FY2009 O&M	Sep 30, 2009	2.071	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	2.071	0	0	0	0
FY2009 O&M Security	Sep 30, 2009	0.143	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.143	0	0	0	0
FY2010 Interest on Refunds	Aug 30, 2011	0.518	Aug 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.518	0	0	0	0
FY2010 2010 Forms Change	Jan 25, 2010	0.727	Jan 25, 2010	[Not answered]	0.727	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)				
FY2010 2010 Usability	Jul 30, 2010	0.43	Jul 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.43	0	0	0	
FY2010 DM&E Security @7%	Sep 30, 2010	0.117	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.117	0	0	0	
FY2010 Infrastructure @5%	Sep 30, 2010	0.084	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.084	0	0	0	
FY2010 PPOA @5%	Sep 30, 2010	0.084	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.084	0	0	0	
FY2010 PBGC Practitioner Services Program Management (FTE)	Sep 29, 2010	0.868	Sep 29, 2010	[Not answered]	0.868	0	0	0	
FY2010 O&M	Sep 30, 2010	2.158	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	2.158	0	0	0	
FY2010 O&M Security	Sep 30, 2010	0.15	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.15	0	0	0	
FY2011 2011 Forms Change	Jan 20, 2011	0.45	Jan 20, 2011	[Not answered]	0.45	0	0	0	
FY2011 2011 Usability	Aug 1, 2011	0.451	Aug 1, 2011	[Not answered]	0.451	0	0	0	
FY2011 DM&E Security @7%	Sep 30, 2011	0.063	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.063	0	0	0	
FY2011 Infrastructure @5%	Sep 30, 2011	0.045	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.045	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)				
FY2011 PPQA @5%	Sep 30, 2011	0.045	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.045	0	0	0	0
FY2011 PBGC Practitioner Services Program Management (FTE)	Dec 30, 2011	0.72	Dec 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.72	0	0	0	0
FY2011 O&M	Sep 30, 2011	2.265	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	2.265	0	0	0	0
FY2011 O&M Security	Sep 30, 2011	0.157	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.157	0	0	0	0
FY2012 2012 Forms Change	Jan 20, 2012	0.471	Jan 20, 2012	[Not answered]	0.471	0	0	0	0
FY2012 2012 Usability	Jul 31, 2012	0.472	Jul 31, 2012	[Not answered]	0.472	0	0	0	0
FY2012 DM&E Security @7%	Sep 28, 2012	0.066	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.066	0	0	0	0
FY2012 Infrastructure @5%	Sep 28, 2012	0.047	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.047	0	0	0	0
FY2012 PPQA @5%	Sep 28, 2012	0.047	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.047	0	0	0	0
FY2012 PBGC Practitioner Services Program Management (FTE)	Dec 31, 2012	0.723	Dec 31, 2012	[Not answered]	0.723	0	0	0	0
FY2012 O&M	Sep 28, 2012	2.376	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	2.376	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)				
			2012	ed]					
FY2012 O&M Security	Sep 28, 2012	0.165	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.165	0	0	0	0
FY2012 2013 Forms Change	Jan 18, 2013	0.493	Jan 18, 2013	[Not answered]	0.493	0	0	0	0
FY2013 2013 Usability	Aug 1, 2013	0.495	Aug 1, 2013	[Not answered]	0.495	0	0	0	0
FY2013 DM&E Security @7%	Sep 30, 2013	0.069	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.069	0	0	0	0
FY2013 Infrastructure @5%	Sep 30, 2013	0.049	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.049	0	0	0	0
FY2013 PPQA @5%	Sep 30, 2013	0.049	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.049	0	0	0	0
FY2013 PBGC Practitioner Services Program Management (FTE)	Dec 31, 2013	0.723	Dec 31, 2013	[Not answered]	0.723	0	0	0	0
FY2013 O&M	Sep 30, 2013	2.409	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	2.409	0	0	0	0
FY2013 O&M Security	Sep 30, 2013	0.167	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.167	0	0	0	0
FY2014 2014 Forms Change	Jan 20, 2014	0.521	Jan 20, 2014	[Not answered]	0.521	0	0	0	0
FY2014 2014	Jul 21, 2014	0.521	Jul 21,	[Not	0.521	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)				
Usability			2014	answered]					
FY2014 DM&E Security @7%	Sep 30, 2014	0.073	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0.073	0	0	0	
FY2014 Infrastructure @5%	Sep 30, 2014	0.052	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0.052	0	0	0	
FY2014 PPQA @5%	Sep 30, 2014	0.052	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0.052	0	0	0	
FY2014 PBGC Practitioner Services Program Management (FTE)	Dec 31, 2014	0.724	Dec 31, 2014	[Not answered]	0.724	0	0	0	
FY2014 O&M	Sep 30, 2014	2.443	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	2.443	0	0	0	
FY2014 O&M Security	Sep 30, 2014	0.169	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0.169	0	0	0	