

# PBGC – Benefit Calculation and Valuation (BCV)

[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 - Benefit Calculation and Valuation**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **012-12-01-05-01-2075-00**
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? **FY2010**
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: **Benefits Calculation and Valuation (BCV) is a collection of systems that determine PBGC liabilities and participant benefits for the 3,700 plans and 1.3M participants that have been trusted by PBGC to date. Over the past ten years, PBGC has averaged over 120 new plans each year. These calculations are used to put retirees into pay status (representing over \$4B in annual payments) and as data for financial statements. BCV must handle all trusted pension plans (oftentimes including complex provisions involving generations of predecessor plans) while overlaying complicated, ERISA-specified calculation logic and benefit maximums. BCV is a directional change from a decision in 1999 to use a parameter-based, proprietary solution (Ariel). A 2007 evaluation of Ariel found that it had not yet delivered on cost and timeliness goals, had a significant vendor monopoly risk and did not provide a viable technology path for 3,400 plans still administered on legacy applications (ACT/Archive) that need to be maintained until the last plan participant dies (currently projected into the back half of the 21st century). BCV is a new investment as the replacement to Ariel after a comprehensive Alternatives Analysis was performed that evaluated risk, cost and business impact. BCV plans for the incorporation of the following components: Steady State costs of Ariel (\$8.4M) and ACT/Archive (\$4.5M) until their plans are converted to BCV, which has its own Steady State cost of \$6.6M from FY 2011-2014: DME costs of \$35.8M for a solution that delivers (a) business functionality pension plans and ERISA require while incorporating lessons learned from Ariel and**

**ACT/Archive; (b) technology that meets all IT requirements and the performance needs of the business; and (c) the ability to consume both data and business rules/calculation logic of the plans in ACT/Archive and Ariel: Strict and robust solution development oversight, including: Strong, prescribed project planning and management; Business process reengineering; Performance based contracts. If the initiative is not approved, major risks to the business include: significant costs and continued risks of staying with the present solution; the inability to sustain legacy ACT/Archive applications and address C&A findings; and impact on participants as timeliness, accuracy and levels of customer services are impacted by the system challenges.**

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	<b>Anand Kothari</b>
Phone Number	<b>202 326 4000 [redacted]</b>
E-mail	<b>Kothari.Anand@pbgc.gov</b>

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? **Dec 1, 2007**

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? **Mar 27, 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) **[Not answered]**

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**

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **The BCV investments will allow for increased internet services, reduced call volume, and more efficient processes for participants by allowing them to view their benefits estimated**

**online for all the plans. Online benefits estimates are available for ~150 plans from ~3700 plans . These improvements directly align with the expected results for Expanded E-Gov which include providing high quality customer service through increased web usage, thereby reducing the expense.**

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](http://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? **no**
- 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 | <b>2</b>  |
| Software | <b>2</b>  |
| Services | <b>86</b> |
| Other    | <b>10</b> |
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	<b>Philip Hertz</b>
Phone Number	<b>202-326-4000</b> [redacted]
Title	<b>Assistant General Counsel</b>
E-mail	<b>hertz.philip@pbgc.gov</b>

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.

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b> (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:	0.25	0.25	1.8	2.6	2.7	1	0.6	0.4	9.6
Acquisition:	0.75	0.75	5	7.7	8.1	3	1.7	1.3	28.3
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	1	1	6.8	10.3	10.8	4	2.3	1.7	37.9
Operations & Maintenance:	1.5	1.5	2.4	2.9	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	22.5
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>60.4</b>
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	0.72	0.72	0.9	0.9	1	1	1.05	1.09	7.38
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	38

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? **yes**
  - a. If "yes", How many and in what year? **1 FTE Starting in FY 2009**
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **This is a new investment that had been included as a line item on Exhibit 53 in participant services business case that is now renamed as Benefit Administration.**

**Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy**

<b>Contracts/Task Orders Table:</b>	
<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	PBGC01-CT03-0667 (Ariel)
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)</b>	Labor-Hour
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	yes
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Jan 1, 2003
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Jan 1, 2003
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Dec 31, 2008
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	38
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	no
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	no
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Robert Price
<b>CO Contact information (phone/email)</b>	202-326-4000 [redacted]/price.robert@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	[Not answered]

<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	PBGC01-CT-07-0787 (ACT/Archive)
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)</b>	IDIQ - T&M
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	yes
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Sep 27, 2007
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Aug 27, 2008
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Sep 27, 2012
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	2.5
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	no
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	yes
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Mary Trimbell
<b>CO Contact information (phone/email)</b>	202-326-4000 [redacted]/trimbell.mary@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	[Not answered]

<b>Contract or Task Order Number</b>	Proposed Contract
<b>Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)</b>	IDIQ – Performance based. Task Order is cost + incentive fee or fixed price
<b>Has the contract been awarded</b>	no
<b>If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?</b>	Mar 28, 2009
<b>Start date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Mar 28, 2009
<b>End date of Contract/Task Order</b>	Mar 27, 2014
<b>Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)</b>	[redacted]
<b>Is this an Interagency Acquisition?</b>	no
<b>Is it performance based?</b>	yes
<b>Competitively awarded?</b>	yes
<b>What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?</b>	NA
<b>Is EVM in the contract?</b>	yes
<b>Does the contract include the required security &amp; privacy clauses?</b>	yes
<b>Name of CO</b>	Roland Thomas
<b>CO Contact information (phone/email)</b>	Thomas.Roland@pbgc.gov
<b>Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level</b>	3
<b>If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?</b>	[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: **[Not answered]**
2. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**



- a. Explain why not or how this is being done? **Section 508 compliance is an explicit, mandatory requirement enforced by the Corporation's contracting officer. PBGC's Infrastructure Administration group conducts 508 compliance on all new systems prior to implementation. In order to comply with OFFM requirements, any financial software acquired by the Corporation must provide an application interface that complies with the software application standards required by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act as detailed in 36 CFR 1194, Subpart B.**
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? **Jun 30, 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**

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
2006	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: rating from 0-100 by Participants completing online transactions through MyPBA; for comparison, private sector index for e-commerce rated at 80	68	75	72
2006	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: rating from 0-100 by Participants completing transactions through call center; for comparison, private sector index for e-commerce rated at 80	73	80	75
2006	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Percentage of total transactions (call volume and online transactions) completed with MyPBA	10%	15%	17%
2006	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Delivery Time	Time from Plan Trusteeship to Benefit Determination Letter to Participant	3.0	3.0	2.6
2007	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: MyPBA	68	70	79
2007	Provide exceptional service to	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for	73	80	78

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	customers and stakeholders			responding to trustee plan participant callers			
2008	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: MyPBA	68	79	Results expected Q1 FY 2009
2008	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for responding to trustee plan participant callers	73	80	Results expected Q1 FY2009
2008	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Percentage of online benefit estimates	10%	10%	Results expected Q1 FY 2009
2008	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Delivery Time	Ninety percent of plan valuations completed within specified timeframe	3.6 Years	3.6 Years	Results expected Q1 FY 2009
2009	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: MyPBA	68	80	Results expected in Q4 FY 2009
2009	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for responding to trustee plan participant callers	73	80	Results expected in Q4 FY 2009
2009	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Percentage of online benefit estimates	10%	10%	Results expected Q4 FY 2009
2009	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Delivery Time	Ninety percent of plan valuations completed within specified timeframe	3.6 years	3.0 years	Results expected Q4 FY 2009
2010	Provide exceptional	Mission and Business	General Retirement and	ACSI Survey: MyPBA	68	80	Results expected

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	service to customers and stakeholders	Results	Disability				Q4 FY 2010
2010	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for responding to trustee plan participant callers	73	80	Results expected Q4 FY 2010
2010	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Percentage of online benefit estimates	10%	10%	Results expected Q4 FY 2010
2010	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Delivery Time	Ninety percent of plan valuations completed within specified timeframe	3.6 Years	2.8 Years	Results expected Q4 FY 2010
2011	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: MyPBA	68	80	Results expected Q4 FY 2011
2011	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for responding to trustee plan participant callers	73	81	Results expected Q4 FY 2011
2011	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Percentage of online benefit estimates	10%	12%	Results expected Q4 FY 2011
2011	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Delivery Time	Ninety percent of plan valuations completed within specified timeframe	3.6 Years	2.75 Years	Results expected Q4 FY 2011
2012	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: MyPBA	68	81	Results expected Q4 FY 2012
2012	Provide exceptional service to	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for	73	81	Results expected Q4 FY 2012

<b>Performance Information Table</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	customers and stakeholders			responding to trustee plan participant callers			
2012	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Percentage of online benefit estimates	10%	14%	Results expected Q4 FY 2012
2012	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Delivery Time	Ninety percent of plan valuations completed within specified timeframe	3.6 Years	2.7 Years	Results expected Q4 FY 2012
2013	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: MyPBA	68	81	Results expected Q4 FY 2013
2013	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for responding to trustee plan participant callers	73	81	Results expected Q4 FY 2013
2013	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Percentage of online benefit estimates	10%	16%	Results expected in Q4 FY 2013
2013	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Delivery Time	Ninety percent of plan valuations completed within specified timeframe	3.6 Years	2.65 Years	Results expected Q4 FY 2013
2014	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	ACSI Survey: MyPBA	68	81	Results expected Q4 FY 2014
2014	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for responding to trustee plan participant callers	73	81	Results expected Q4 FY 2014
2014	Provide exceptional	Customer Results	New Customers and Market	Percentage of online benefit	10%	16%	Results expected

**Performance Information Table**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Measurement Area</b>	<b>Measurement Grouping</b>	<b>Measurement Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual Results</b>
	service to customers and stakeholders		Penetration	estimates			Q4 FY 2014
2014	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Processes and Activities	Delivery Time	Ninety percent of plan valuations completed within specified timeframe	3.6 Years	2.65 Years	Results expected Q4 FY 2014
2014	Provide exceptional service to customers and stakeholders	Mission and Business Results	General Retirement and Disability	Customer Satisfaction score for responding to trustee plan participant callers	73	81	Results expected Q4 FY 2014
2008	Exercise effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources	Technology	Compliance	Number of legacy applications not in EA Compliance	12	12	Results expected Q1 FY 2009
2009	Exercise effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources	Technology	Compliance	Number of legacy applications not in EA Compliance	12	12	Results expected Q4 FY 2009
2010	Exercise effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources	Technology	Compliance	Number of legacy applications not in EA Compliance	12	12	Results expected Q1 FY2010
2011	Exercise effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources	Technology	Compliance	Number of legacy applications not in EA Compliance	12	12	Results expected Q1 FY 2011
2012	Exercise effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources	Technology	Compliance	Number of legacy applications not in EA Compliance	12	2	Results expected Q1 FY 2012
2013	Exercise effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources	Technology	Compliance	Number of legacy applications not in EA Compliance	12	0	Results expected Q1 FY 2013
2014	Exercise effective and efficient stewardship of PBGC resources	Technology	Compliance	Number of legacy applications not in EA Compliance	12	0	Results expected Q1 FY 2014

**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)
Benefit Calculation and Valuation 2008 certification (for DME that supports consolidation of supporting applications in FY 2008 )	Contractor and Government	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008
Benefit Calculation and Valuation 2009 certification (for DME that supports consolidation of supporting applications in FY 2009)	Contractor and Government	Sep 30, 2009	Sep 30, 2009
Benefit Calculation and Valuation 2010 certification (for DME that supports consolidation of supporting applications in FY 2010)	Contractor and Government	Sep 30, 2010	Sep 30, 2010
Benefit Calculation and Valuation 2011 certification (for DME that supports consolidation of supporting applications in FY 2011)	Contractor and Government	Sep 30, 2011	Sep 30, 2011
Benefit Calculation and Valuation 2012 certification (for DME that supports consolidation of supporting applications in FY 2012)	Contractor and Government	Sep 28, 2012	Sep 28, 2012
Benefit Calculation and Valuation 2013 certification (for DME that supports consolidation of supporting applications in FY 2013)	Contractor and Government	Sep 30, 2013	Sep 30, 2013
Benefit Calculation and Valuation 2014	Contractor and Government	Sep 30, 2014	Sep 30, 2014

**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)
certification (for DME that supports consolidation of supporting applications in FY 2014)			

**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
Benefit Calculation and Valuation	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	May 30, 2008	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	Mar 31, 2008	Aug 29, 2008

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 systems identified above are jointly run and managed by federal employees and contractor teams reporting to PBGC federal employees. PBGC contracts include language to ensure the suitability of contractors' employees and inspection of all new or renovated contractor hosting sites. PBGC federal employees and contractors are subject to suitability background investigations. New federal employees and contractors are issued roles of conduct, required to take computer security awareness orientation, and provided instruction on incident reporting procedures. Annually, federal employees and contractors are required to take refresher security awareness training. Role-based training is conducted during employee position training. For positions related to the Designated Approving Authority, Information System Owner, System Administrators**



and Project Managers, role-based training is conducted by PBGC's Enterprise Security Team following orientation, and annually thereafter. Electronic security compliance is monitored by the OIT security team through routine checking of user ID account activity for suspicious or high-risk behavior. If such behavior is identified, the contracting officer is notified immediately to begin remediation procedures. PBGC also conducts user account recertification annually. Externally operated systems are required to provide SAS 70s and they procedures for security are subject to additional reviews by PBGC's external auditors and OIG.

<b>8. Planning &amp; Operational Systems - Privacy Table:</b>					
<b>Name of System</b>	<b>Is this a new system?</b>	<b>Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?</b>	<b>Internet Link or Explanation</b>	<b>Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?</b>	<b>Internet Link or Explanation</b>
Benefit Calculation and Valuation	no	yes	<a href="http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html">http://www.pbgc.gov/about/PIA.html</a>	yes	<a href="http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.html">http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.html</a>

**Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)**

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? **yes**
  - a. If "no," please explain why? **[Not answered]**
2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? **yes**
  - a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **Benefit Calculation and Valuation**
  - b. If "no," please explain why? **[Not answered]**
3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? **no**
  - 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>. **[Not answered]**

**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		
ACT/Archive	Legacy application that enables PBGC to estimate participant's benefits, value plans, and calculate final benefits	Analysis and Statistics	Mathematical	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	0
Ariel	Legacy service provider that enables PBGC to estimate participant's benefits, value plans, and calculate final benefits	Analysis and Statistics	Mathematical	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	0
Benefit Calculation	Consolidates ACT and Ariel	Analysis and Statistics	Mathematical	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	0
User Provisioning Tool	Provides a graphical user interface and 'one-stop' application to provision PBGC staff members	Security Management	Access Control	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	5

**5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:**

<b>FEA SRM Component</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification</b>
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle RDMBS
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Oracle Internet Directory Authentication Server
Mathematical	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Internet Explorer
Mathematical	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle RDBMS
Mathematical	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	J2EE
Mathematical	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Oracle BPEL Process Manager

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? **Mar 31, 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]**

<b>2. Alternatives Analysis Results:</b>			
<b>Alternative Analyzed</b>	<b>Description of Alternative</b>	<b>Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate</b>	<b>Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate</b>
Alternative 1 – Customization of COTS Package	Use of COTS product or combination of COTS products to meet the functional and technical requirements. Modernization of ACT/Archive suite of applications to support the 2500+ current plans (Final and estimated plans). Maintain Ariel to support current plans.	89.9	17.6
Alternative 2 – Customization of Proprietary Software	Use of Proprietary product to meet the functional and technical requirements. Modernization of ACT/Archive suite of applications to support the 2500+ current plans (Final and estimated plans). Maintain Ariel to support current plans.	73	17.6
Alternative 3 – Develop Custom Software	Develop Customized solution (phased approach) to meet PBGC's unique requirements and needs.. Maintain Ariel to support current plans.	55.3	17.72
Alternative 4 – Status Quo	Modernization of ACT/Archive suite of applications to support the 2500+ current plans (Final and estimated plans). Maintain Ariel to support current plans.	51.8	0

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **PBGC analyzed different approaches to alternative selection including outsourcing the entire function, making it part of the overall IT solution for BAPD (e.g. Benefit Administration), doing by hand, etc. The factors considered during alternatives analysis were: Each plan that PBGC trustees stays with us until the last participant dies. If we sourced work to a specific vendor (or vendor-owned software), we would be tied to that vendor for the life of the plan OR the cost of transitioning plans was**

inexpensive. For this reason, we decided that PBGC needed a software solution that PBGC owned; From a process-architecture perspective, the benefit calculation and valuation process stood separate from the benefit administration process. Combining the two processes would create a very large solution which would dramatically increase the overall risk of implementation; The nature of the data and the calculations requires PBGC to use automation to appropriately protect the data and make the overall process more efficient and auditable; PBGC has over 2,500 legacy plans that need to be replatformed as their underlying BCV software has obsolete technology. The above analysis quickly guided PBGC to consider various types of software as the feasible alternatives. Industry Research conducted in December 2007 showed that due to the unique nature of PBGC's business, there were no COTS products and ASP providers that could be used for Benefit Calculation without significant customization. Significant customization of either COTS product or ASP service results in significant costs as evident in Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 was the chosen after analyzing the Costs, benefits and risks of each of these alternatives. The benefits for alternative 3 outweigh the benefits of Alternative 4. Alternative 3 will address the same performance measures but will result in a better solution. The current ACT/Archive solution that will be the base of the new solution administers large number of current terminated plans (2500+). Alternative 3 eliminates risk of monopoly by being dependent on a single vendor and has a longer life span as ownership of the software is with PBGC. The development services can be competed every five years and reduces the risks on life cycle costs by having plans in solution that is owned by PBGC. Alternative 3 also provides user additional flexibility that results in acceptance of solution and produce desired outcomes for the business.

- a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.) **Beyond 2021**
4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **The overall goal of BCV is to ensure that the agency can continue to provide excellent customer service to retirees in a manner consistent with the way private sector financial services are delivered. This includes secure and accurate communication regardless of whether the customer contacts the agency by phone, in person, or through the internet. BCV solution will provide improved customer service qualitative benefits. Consolidation of supporting applications will reduce business process complexity and improve data quality. These activities will reduce data entry errors which will drive more efficient and accurate customer service. Consolidation of supporting applications will enable more timely completion of C&As, which will garner additional confidence in security of PBGC systems by participants as more self-service options are made available through the internet. The substantial upfront investment in the integrated systems will increase the breakeven period significantly. It is expected that the useful life of Benefit Calculation and Valuation will be very long (25 years plus). Given the scenario - it should take PBGC upto 2020, offsetting the quantitative benefits of the system with increased qualitative benefits of supporting PBGC's core mission of paying participants.**

<b>5. Federal Quantitative Benefits (\$millions):</b>				
	<b>Budgeted Cost Savings</b>	<b>Cost Avoidance</b>	<b>Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings</b>	<b>Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance</b>
PY-1 and Prior	0	0	N/A	N/A
PY	0	0	N/A	N/A
CY	1.06	0.75	Actuarial Cost Savings by using federal actuaries rather than contractors for plan valuations (less the cost of training federal actuaries).	Cost of building another database for a COTS and or ASP service.
BY	1.88	0.78	Actuarial Cost Savings by using federal actuaries rather than contractors for plan valuations (less the cost of training federal actuaries).	Cost of building another database for a COTS and or ASP service.
BY+1	1.56	0.81	Actuarial Cost Savings by using federal actuaries rather than contractors for plan valuations (less the cost of training federal actuaries).	Cost of building another database for a COTS and or ASP service.
BY+2	2.59	0.84	Actuarial Cost Savings by using federal actuaries rather than contractors for plan valuations (less the cost of training federal actuaries). Ability to provide plan estimates online for all plans.	Cost of building another database for a COTS and or ASP service.
BY+3	2.69	0.87	Actuarial Cost Savings by using federal actuaries rather than contractors for plan valuations (less the cost of training federal actuaries). Ability to provide plan estimates online for all plans.	Cost of building another database for a COTS and or ASP service.
BY+4 and Beyond	2.79	0.9	Actuarial Cost Savings by using federal actuaries rather than contractors for plan valuations (less the cost of training federal actuaries). Ability to provide plan estimates online for all plans.	Cost of building another database for a COTS and or ASP service.
<b>Total LCC Benefit</b>	12.57	4.95	<b>LCC = Life-cycle cost</b>	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **yes**
- a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment? **This Investment**
  - b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

<b>List of Legacy Investment or Systems</b>		
<b>Name of the Legacy Investment or Systems</b>	<b>UPI if available</b>	<b>Date of the System Retirement</b>
ACT/Archive (suite of 10 applications)	[Not answered]	Mar 30, 2012
PACS	[Not answered]	Sep 30, 2012
MPC	[Not answered]	Sep 30, 2012

## 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? **May 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: **This is a new investment and new risk management plan has been developed for the investment.**
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? **[Not answered]**
  1. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? **[Not answered]**
  2. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? **[Not answered]**
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **The investment schedule reduces the risk of higher than expected costs through systematic improvements in EV reporting, acquisitions, security, BPR, and Alternative Analysis. These systematic improvements allow for more timely updates to the risk index in order to catalog risks and identify impacts to supporting applications and the overall investment. Life cycle spending for Project Management will support maintenance of the risk index and RMP. In addition to the risk index and RMP, Project Management will support recurring discussions at a monthly – quarterly level on how to best allocate budgeted amounts for risk management activities against risks identified in the risk index. For the Benefit Calculation and Valuation plan, roughly 15% of overall funding is allocated to risk management activities. These activities are identified in Cost and Schedule Performance- section 1.2.3, 1.3.2, 1.4.2, 1.5.2, 1.6.2, and 1.8.2. That allocation is consistent with guidance from the Project Management Institute that bases the accuracy range of budget estimates at -10% to +25%.**



**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) **no**
  - a. If "yes," was it the? **[Not answered]**
  - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance: **[Not answered]**
  - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions **[Not answered]**
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? **no**
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? **[Not answered]**

<b>4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:</b>									
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)		
1. Benefit Calculation and Valuation Project	Dec 31, 2014	60.3	Dec 31, 2014	[Not answered]	60.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	7.5
1.0 FY 07	Sep 30, 2007	2.5	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	2.5	2.5	0	0	100
1.0.2.1 Operations and Maintenance of ACT/Archive	Sep 30, 2007	0.5	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2008	0.5	0.5	0	0	100
1.0.2.2 Operations and Maintenance of Ariel	Sep 30, 2007	1	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	1	1	0	0	100
1.0.3 Add Plans to Ariel	Sep 30, 2007	1	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	1	1	0	0	100
1.1 FY 08	Sep 30, 2008	2.5	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	2.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	80
1.1.1 Plan Purchase and Acquisition	Sep 30, 2008	0	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	80
1.1.2 Steady State Costs	Sep 30, 2008	1.5	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	1.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	80
1.1.2.1 Operations and Maintenance of ACT/Archive	Sep 30, 2008	0.5	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	80
1.1.2.2 Operations and Maintenance of Ariel	Sep 30, 2008	1	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.1.3 Add Plans to Ariel	Sep 30, 2008	1	Sep 30, 2008	[Not answered]	1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2 FY 09	Sep 30,	9.2	Sep 30,	[Not answered]	9.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0

**4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:**

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned: Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned: Actual		Schedule: Cost (# days: \$M)		
	2009		2009						
1.2.1 Procure Services for Approved Solution	Apr 24, 2009	0	Apr 24, 2009	[Not answered]	0	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.2 Project Planning	Sep 28, 2009	1.8	Sep 28, 2009	[Not answered]	1.8	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.2.1 Develop ITSLCM Tailoring and Compliance Plan (Artifacts) Project Charter and Project Management Plan	Aug 13, 2009	0.25	Aug 13, 2009	[Not answered]	0.25	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.2.2 Identify Scope	Jun 1, 2009	0.3	Jun 1, 2009	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.2.3 Identify Dependencies (Technical/Business)	Jun 1, 2009	0.4	Jun 1, 2009	[Not answered]	0.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.2.4 Develop Sequential Plan	Jul 6, 2009	0.35	Jul 6, 2009	[Not answered]	0.35	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.2.5 Develop Detailed Work Breakdown Structure	Sep 28, 2009	0.5	Sep 28, 2009	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.3 Risks Mitigation Costs	Sep 28, 2009	1.4	Sep 28, 2009	[Not answered]	1.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.4 Other Costs	Sep 29, 2009	1	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.4.1 ITTO Costs	Sep 30, 2009	0.297	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.297	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.4.2 Security	Sep 30, 2009	0.406	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.406	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.4.3 Quality Assurance Costs	Sep 30, 2009	0.297	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.297	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.5 Phase 1 DME	Sep 30, 2009	2.6	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	2.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.6 Steady State Costs	Sep 30, 2009	2.4	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	2.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.6.1 Operations and Maintenance of ACT/Archive	Sep 30, 2009	1	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.2.6.2 Operations and Maintenance of Ariel	Sep 30, 2009	1.4	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	1.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3 FY 10	Sep 30,	13.2	Sep 30,	[Not answered]	13.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0

**4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:**

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned: Actual	Total Cost (\$M) Planned: Actual			Schedule: Cost (# days: \$M)		
	2010		2010						
1.3.1 DME Phase 1	Sep 30, 2010	6.6	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	6.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.1.1 Requirements Phase	Jan 5, 2010	1.2	Jan 5, 2010	[Not answered]	1.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.1.2 Design Phase	Mar 30, 2010	1.5	Mar 30, 2010	[Not answered]	1.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.1.3 Construction Phase	Jul 13, 2010	1.8	Jul 13, 2010	[Not answered]	1.8	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.1.4 Testing Phase	Sep 21, 2010	1.8	Sep 21, 2010	[Not answered]	1.8	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.1.5 Implementation Phase	Sep 30, 2010	0.3	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.2 Risks Mitigation Costs	Sep 30, 2010	2.2	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	2.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.3 Other Costs	Sep 30, 2010	1.5	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	1.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.3.1 ITTO Costs	Sep 30, 2010	0.442	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.442	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.3.2 Security	Sep 30, 2010	0.616	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.616	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.3.3 Quality Assurance Costs	Sep 30, 2010	0.442	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.442	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.4 Steady State Costs	Sep 30, 2010	2.9	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	2.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.4.1 Operations and Maintenance of ACT/Archive	Sep 30, 2010	1.5	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	1.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.3.4.2 Operations and Maintenance of Ariel	Sep 30, 2010	1.4	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	1.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4 FY 11	Sep 30, 2011	14.2	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	14.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.1 DME Phase 2	Sep 30, 2011	6.6	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	6.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.1.1 Requirements Phase	Jan 5, 2011	1.2	Jan 5, 2011	[Not answered]	1.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.1.2 Design Phase	Mar 30, 2011	1.5	Mar 30, 2011	[Not answered]	1.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.1.3 Construction Phase	Jul 13, 2011	1.8	Jul 13, 2011	[Not answered]	1.8	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.1.4 Testing	Sep 22,	1.8	Sep 22,	[Not	1.8	[Not	[Not	[Not	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)		
Phase	2011		2011	answered]		answered]	answered]	answered]	
1.4.1.5 Implementation Phase	Sep 30, 2011	0.3	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.2 Risks Mitigation Costs	Sep 30, 2011	2.2	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	2.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.3 Recurring Costs to Add New Plans to the New Solution	Sep 30, 2011	0.5	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.4 Other Costs	Sep 30, 2011	1.5	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	1.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.4.1 ITTO Costs	Sep 30, 2011	0.442	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.442	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.4.2 Security	Sep 30, 2011	0.616	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.616	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.4.3 Quality Assurance Costs	Sep 30, 2011	0.442	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0.442	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.5 Steady State Costs	Sep 30, 2011	3.4	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	3.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.5.1 Operations and Maintenance of ACT/Archive	Sep 30, 2011	2	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.4.5.2 Operations and Maintenance of Ariel	Sep 30, 2011	1.4	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	1.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5 FY 12	Sep 28, 2012	7.5	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	7.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.1 DME Phase 3	Sep 28, 2012	2.25	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	2.25	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.1.1 Requirements Phase	Jan 6, 2012	0.4	Jan 6, 2012	[Not answered]	0.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.1.2 Design Phase	Mar 30, 2012	0.441	Mar 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0.441	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.1.3 Construction Phase	Jul 13, 2012	0.4	Jul 13, 2012	[Not answered]	0.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.1.4 Testing Phase	Sep 20, 2012	0.409	Sep 20, 2012	[Not answered]	0.409	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.1.5 Implementation Phase	Sep 28, 2012	0.6	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.2 Risks Mitigation Costs	Sep 28, 2012	0.75	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.75	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0

**4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:**

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned: Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned: Actual		Schedule: Cost (# days: \$M)		
1.5.3 Recurring Costs to Add New Plans to the New Solution	Sep 28, 2012	0.5	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.4 Other Costs	Sep 28, 2012	0.5	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.4.1 ITTO Costs	Sep 28, 2012	0.15	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.15	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.4.2 Security	Sep 28, 2012	0.2	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY2014 O&M Security	Sep 30, 2014	0.169	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0.169	0	0	0	0
1.5.4.3 Quality Assurance Costs	Sep 28, 2012	0.15	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	0.15	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.5 Steady State Costs	Sep 28, 2012	3.5	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	3.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.5.1 Operations and Maintenance of Ariel	Sep 28, 2012	1.4	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	1.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.5.5.2 Operations and Maintenance of Custom Solution	Sep 28, 2012	2.1	Sep 28, 2012	[Not answered]	2.1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6 FY 13	Oct 1, 2013	5.9	Oct 1, 2013	[Not answered]	5.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.1 DME Phase 4	Sep 30, 2013	1.225	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	1.225	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.1.1 Requirements Phase	Jan 4, 2013	0.149	Jan 4, 2013	[Not answered]	0.149	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.1.2 Design Phase	Mar 29, 2013	0.138	Mar 29, 2013	[Not answered]	0.138	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.1.3 Construction Phase	Jul 12, 2013	0.3	Jul 12, 2013	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.1.4 Testing Phase	Sep 23, 2013	0.238	Sep 23, 2013	[Not answered]	0.238	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.1.5 Implementation Phase	Sep 30, 2013	0.4	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.2 Risks Mitigation Costs	Sep 30, 2013	0.275	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.275	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.3 Recurring Costs to Add New	Sep 30, 2013	0.5	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0

**4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:**

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned: Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned: Actual		Schedule: Cost (# days: \$M)		
Plans to the New Solution									
1.6.4 Other Costs	Oct 1, 2013	0.3	Oct 1, 2013	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.4.1 ITTO Costs	Oct 1, 2013	0.075	Oct 1, 2013	[Not answered]	0.075	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.4.2 Security	Oct 1, 2013	0.15	Oct 1, 2013	[Not answered]	0.15	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.4.3 Quality Assurance Costs	Oct 1, 2013	0.075	Oct 1, 2013	[Not answered]	0.075	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.5 Steady State Costs	Sep 27, 2013	3.6	Sep 27, 2013	[Not answered]	3.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.5.1 Operations and Maintenance of Ariel	Sep 27, 2013	1.4	Sep 27, 2013	[Not answered]	1.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.6.5.2 Operations and Maintenance of Custom Solution	Sep 27, 2013	2.2	Sep 27, 2013	[Not answered]	2.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7 FY 14	Sep 29, 2014	5.4	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	5.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.1 DME Phase 5	Aug 15, 2014	0.75	Aug 15, 2014	[Not answered]	0.75	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.1.1 Requirements Phase	Nov 11, 2013	0.0853	Nov 11, 2013	[Not answered]	0.0853	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.1.2 Design Phase	Feb 3, 2014	0.12	Feb 3, 2014	[Not answered]	0.12	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.1.3 Construction Phase	May 19, 2014	0.1425	May 19, 2014	[Not answered]	0.1425	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.1.4 Testing Phase	Aug 5, 2014	0.2	Aug 5, 2014	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.1.5 Implementation Phase	Aug 15, 2014	0.2	Aug 15, 2014	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.2 Risks Mitigation Costs	Sep 29, 2014	0.25	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	0.25	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.3 Recurring Costs to Add New Plans to the New Solution	Sep 29, 2014	0.5	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	0.5	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.4 Other Costs	Sep 29, 2014	0.2	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.4.1 ITTO Costs	Sep 29, 2014	0.05	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	0.05	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0

**4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:**

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned: Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned: Actual		Schedule: Cost (# days: \$M)		
1.7.4.2 Security	Sep 29, 2014	0.1	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	0.1	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.4.3 Quality Assurance Costs	Sep 29, 2014	0.05	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	0.05	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.5 Steady State Costs	Sep 29, 2014	3.7	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	3.7	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.5.1 Operations and Maintenance of Ariel	Sep 29, 2014	1.4	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	1.4	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
1.7.5.2 Operations and Maintenance of Custom Solution	Sep 29, 2014	2.3	Sep 29, 2014	[Not answered]	2.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0