

## **Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary**

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

---

#### **Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)**

1. Date of Submission: 09/08/2006
2. Agency: 449, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
3. Bureau: 00
4. Name of this Capital Asset: Edgar
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 449-00-01-02-01-0001-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)  
 Planning  Full Acquisition  Operations and Maintenance  Mixed Life Cycle   
E-Gov/LoB Oversight
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap. [Limit 2500 characters]:

The Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis and Retrieval (EDGAR) system processes electronic submissions to the SEC and permits SEC staff to analyze those submissions. Since the FY 2001 modernization, the system has been stable with minor enhancements to meet user and regulatory needs. Each year we invest approximately \$2 million to replace outdated equipment (hardware or software) and implement security enhancements to meet current Federal standards. The current EDGAR contract expires in 2006 and we will openly compete the system support. A disinterested contractor will support the re-competition planning and cost analysis. The agency's capital planning committee has reviewed and approved the EDGAR investment set described here.

The EDGAR Requirements Steering Committee, composed of agency business executives, provides specific priorities for system enhancements. Recent efforts include:

SEC Workstation Modernization: The workstations for SEC staff users of EDGAR are unsupported and cannot meet current GAO security guidelines. Migrating EDGAR code to new platforms requires software rewrites. To minimize the cost of rewrites and maintenance we are standardizing on a single server type and moving to a more standards based open environment. For SEC customers, we are updating the N-SAR (New/ Semi-Annual Report) so that filers no longer have to retain an obsolete older computer just to submit this report.

Securities Offering Reform: The SEC continues to deal with emergent issues in the capital markets by issuing new or modified rules on registration, filings, disclosures, communications with potential or current investors, and capital formation procedures. Each of these rules may require accompanying modifications to EDGAR.

Structured Filings: Most documents submitted to EDGAR system are free-form text documents that cannot be error-checked on submittal and are difficult to search. The SEC is moving to add structure to the filings using XML and its XBRL extension. Forms to be re-structured include: N-PX, 13F, 13G, 13-D, 24F-2NT, Form TA and Form D. The SEC also began in February 2005 a pilot effort of submitting XBRL-tagged filings through EDGAR to identify and resolve business and technical issues. Work continues to maintain and upgrade the pilot and provide interfaces to user groups. We are also providing unique identifiers for mutual funds to permit the SEC staff and investors to find fund-related information more easily.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes  
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?  
Name Rick Heroux  
Phone Number 202-551-8168  
E-mail herouxr@sec.gov
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient, and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. (Answer applicable to non-IT assets only) N/A  
a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? N/A  
b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) ) N/A  
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? N/A  
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? N/A  
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? N/A
13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes  
If "yes," check all that apply:  
 Human Capital  
 Budget Performance Integration  
 Financial Performance  
 Expanded E-Government  
 Competitive Sourcing  
 Faith Based and Community  
 Real Property Asset Management  
 Eliminating Improper Payments

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

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

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

Yes

- a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review? No
- b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? Full Disclosure
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Results Not Demonstrated

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

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

For information technology investments only:

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

- Level 1
- Level 2
- Level 3

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

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

18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)? No

19. Is this a financial management system? No

- a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? N/A
  - 1. If "yes," which compliance area: N/A
  - 2. If "no," what does it address? N/A

- b. If “yes,” please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A–11 section 52 N/A
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following?  
(This should total 100% - enter as decimal, e.g., .25 = 25%)  
Hardware 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 Barbara Stance  
Phone Number 202-551-7209  
Title SEC Privacy Officer  
E-mail stanceb@sec.gov
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration’s approval? <unknown>

**Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)**

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

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (Reported In Millions)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and Earlier <2005	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY+1 2009	BY+2 2010	BY+3 2011	BY+4 and Beyond >2012	TOTAL
<b>Planning:</b>	0.600	0.478	0.000	0.000					1.078
<b>Acquisition:</b>	3.400	10.188	3.621	4.500					21.709
<b>Subtotal Planning &amp; Acquisition:</b>	4.000	10.666	3.621	4.500					22.787
<b>Operations &amp; Maintenance:</b>	44.300	13.424	12.000	11.000					92.724
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>48.300</b>	<b>24.090</b>	<b>15.621</b>	<b>15.500</b>					<b>115.511</b>
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	10.467	2.287	1.608	2.011					17.532
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	79.78	12.53	11.05	13.12					123.48
<b>OIT FTE:</b>	<b>50.56</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>					<b>73.56</b>

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

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No
  - a. If "yes," How many and in what year? N/A
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes. Yes, we are forecasting potentially significant increases in the maintenance costs owing to the expiration of the base maintenance contract and the potential for substantially higher rates in the replacement contract despite open competition.

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

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																	
Contractor Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start & end date of Contact / Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? N	Does the contract include the Required security & privacy clauses?(Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level(Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? Y/N)	
SECHQ1-06-F-0221	Short Text	Yes				\$25,849.58											
CQ 63000-06-2246		Yes				\$22,943.04											
SECHQ1-C-98-2001A		Yes				\$15,521,386.00											
SECHQ1-05-F-0195		Yes				\$478,395.60											
Short Text	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	Yes	
Short Text	Short Text	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	12/31/2001	\$0.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	ESPC	Yes	Yes	Short Text	Short Text	1	Yes	

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why: The project manager elected not to require earned value reporting.
3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes  
Explain why: All SEC IT contracts require conformance to IT policies. Milestone reviews include the Section 508 compliance staff. Every IT system must complete acceptance testing before entering production; that includes automated 508 testing with the Federal BOBBY tool. The system must resolve any compliance issues or obtain a written waiver from the CIO. When the system has known users with disabilities, the project team often elects to include them in user testing.
  - a.
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes
  - a. If "yes," what is the date? June 2006
  - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? N/A
    1. If "no," briefly explain why: N/A

**Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)**

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

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006

Investment	First FY for this goal	Strategic goal(s) - SEC	Measurement Area - FEA PRM	Measurement Grouping - FEA PRM	Measurement Indicator	Baseline - 1st year or prior year actual	Planned Improvement to Baseline (End Goal)	Actual - 2003	Actual - 2004	Actual - 2005	Goal - 2006
EDGAR	2003	Protect Investors	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Total number of daily downloads	An average of 391,534 pages downloaded per day from the website.		430,431 pages downloaded per day.	1.27 million pages downloaded per day.	FY05- 1.4 million pages projected to be downloaded per day	
EDGAR	2003	Protect Investors	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Total number of paper filings	16,050 paper filings in FY2002		183, 750 paper filings.	100,876 paper filings.	102,750 paper filings projected.	
EDGAR	2003	Protect Investors	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Total number of electronic filings	375,677 electronic filings on EDGAR in FY2002		590,576 EDGAR filings.	743,385 EDGAR filings	795,000 EDGAR filings projected.	
EDGAR	2003	Protect Investors	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Total number of foreign paper filings	2,948 EDGAR foreign filings per year in FY2002		4,771 foreign EDGAR filings; 11,940 foreign paper filings.	18,048 foreign EDGAR filings; 950 foreign paper filings.		

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

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

Investment	First FY for this goal	Strategic goal(s) - SEC	Measurement Area - FEA PRM	Measurement Grouping - FEA PRM	Measurement Indicator	Baseline - 1st year or prior year actual	Planned Improvement to Baseline (End Goal)	Actual - 2003	Actual - 2004	Actual - 2005	Goal - 2006
EDGAR	2003	Protect Investors	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Total number of foreign electronic filings	0 EDGAR foreign electronic filings per year in FY2002		4,771 foreign EDGAR filings; 11,940 foreign paper filings.	18,048 foreign EDGAR filings; 950 foreign paper filings.		
EDGAR	2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>		130 foreign private issuers registering under the '33 and '34 Acts for the first time. \$267B in securities registered for sale under the 1933 Act by all foreign private issuers.		70 foreign companies registered. \$147B in investments registered.			
EDGAR	2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Percentage of forms in electronic format	No baseline		71.80%	71.80%	71.80%	73.00%
EDGAR	2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Percentage of filings received electronically	No baseline		76.30%	88.10%	88.60%	90.00%
EDGAR	2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Percentage of forms in structured format	No baseline		3.90%	3.90%	5.40%	7.00%
EDGAR	2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Percentage of filings received in structured format	No baseline		20.80%	35.60%	35.00%	36.00%

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

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

Investment	First FY for this goal	Strategic goal(s) - SEC	Measurement Area - FEA PRM	Measurement Grouping - FEA PRM	Measurement Indicator	Baseline - 1st year or prior year actual	Planned Improvement to Baseline (End Goal)	Actual - 2003	Actual - 2004	Actual - 2005	Goal - 2006
EDGAR	2003	Facilitate Capital Formation	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	<pre-2004, FEA compliance not required>	Annual number of online searches for EDGAR filings (in millions)	96.9		141.5	288.9	379	480

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

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

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

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: Yes
  - a. If “yes,” provide the “Percentage IT Security” for the budget year: 5%
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

### 6. Planning & Operational Systems – Privacy:

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

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

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system? (1,2,3,4)	(d) Is the PIA available to the public? (1,2,3)	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06? (1,2,3,4,5)
EDGAR	N	??	??	??	??
Short Text	Yes	1	1	Yes	1
Short Text	Yes	1	1	Yes	1
Short Text	Yes	1	1	Yes	1

a. Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?

1. Yes.
2. No
3. No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.
4. No, because even though it has personal identifying information, the system contains information solely about federal employees and agency contractors.

b. Is the PIA available to the public?

1. Yes.
2. No, because a PIA is not required to be completed at this time.
3. No, because the PIA has not yet been prepared.

c. Was a new or amended SORN published in FY2006?

1. Yes, because this is a newly established Privacy Act system of records.
2. Yes, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was substantially revised in FY 06.
3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.
4. No; because the system is operational, but the SORN has not yet been published.

No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

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

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

1. Is this investment included in your agency’s target enterprise architecture? Yes
  - a. If “no,” please explain why? Long Text
2. Is this investment included in the agency’s EA Transition Strategy? Yes
  - a. If “yes,” provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency’s most recent annual EA Assessment. The SEC is a small, non-scorecard agency currently not required to perform Enterprise Architecture assessments.
  - b. If “no,” please explain why? Long Text

**3. Service Component Table:**

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Short Text	Medium Text	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking	FEA Enumeration	xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx	Internal	0%
Short Text	Medium Text	Organizational Management	Workgroup / Groupware	FEA Enumeration	xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx	Internal	0%
Short Text	Medium Text	Organizational Management	Network Management	FEA Enumeration	xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx	Internal	0%

**3. Service Component Table:**

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
		Content Management	Syndication Management				
		Content Management	Tagging and Aggregation				
		Document Management	Indexing				
		Document Management	Library / Storage				
		Knowledge Management	Categorization				
		Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval				
		Knowledge Management	Information Sharing				
		Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture				
		Records Management	Document Classification				
		Reporting	Ad-Hoc				

**3. Service Component Table:**

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
		Reporting	Standardized / Canned				
		Financial Management	Billing and Accounting				
		Financial Management	Financial Reporting				
		Financial Management	Payment / Settlement				
		Financial Management	Revenue Management				
		Security Management	Identification and Authentication				
		Search	Query				
		Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration				
		Forms Management	Forms Creation				
		Forms Management	Forms Modification				

**3. Service Component Table:**

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? I	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
		Data Management	Data Exchange				

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

**4. Technical Reference Model Table:**

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Process Tracking	Component Framework Service Area	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java
Forms Modification, Process Tracking	Component Framework Service Area	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Javascript
Tagging and Aggregation Categorization	Component Framework Service Area	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	XML

**4. Technical Reference Model Table:**

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

<b>FEA SRM Component (a)</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification (b)</b> (i.e., vendor and product name)
Information Retrieval Information Sharing Knowledge Capture				
Tagging and Aggregation Categorization Information Retrieval Information Sharing Knowledge Capture	Component Framework Service Area	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	XBRL - Used in EDGAR
Process Tracking	Component Framework Service Area	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	HyperText Markup Language (HTML)
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework Service Area	Security	Certificate / Digital Signature	Digital Certificate Authentication
Process Tracking	Service Access & Delivery	Access Channel	Web Browser	Internet Explorer
Information Retrieval Information Sharing	Service Access & Delivery	Delivery Channel	Extranet	EDGAR System
Identification and Authentication	Service Access & Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP)
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Object Request Broker (ORB) - CORBA - EDGAR
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Object Request Broker (ORB) - COM - EDGAR
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	EAS (EDGAR)
Extraction and Transformation Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Tuxedo
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Databases	Sybase
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Databases	MS SQL
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Jaguar
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Jrun
Credit / Charge Debt Collection Billing and Accounting Financial Reporting Payment / Settlement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Momentum

**4. Technical Reference Model Table:**

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

<b>FEA SRM Component (a)</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification (b)</b> (i.e., vendor and product name)
Revenue Management				
Tagging and Aggregation Indexing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Hummingbird
Process Tracking Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Internet Information Servers
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Netscape
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices	Firewall
Forms Creation Forms Modification	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	PureEdge
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Supporting Platform	Operating System Platforms	Sun Solaris
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Supporting Platform	Operating System Platforms	Windows NT
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage / Backup	Storage Area Network (SAN)

- a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications
- b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No

a. If “yes,” please describe. Long Text

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system? Yes

a. If “yes,” does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)? No

- 1. If “yes,” provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services). Medium Text

## **PART II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information**

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

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? Long Text

### **Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)**

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

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

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

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

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard – 748? Yes
2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs
  - a. What is the Planned Value (PV)? \$47.482
  - b. What is the Earned Value (EV)? \$44.709
  - c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? \$55.486
  - d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor Only
  - e. “As of” date: 8/31/06
3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)? 0.94
4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)? \$-(2.773)
5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)? 0.81
6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)? \$-(10.777)
7. Is the CV or SV greater than +/-10%? YES (CV=19%)  
(CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)
  - a. If “yes,” was it the? CV
  - b. If “yes,” explain the variance: We will incur a substantial increase in the ongoing support costs as a result of greatly increased market costs for IT support services since the initial contract award in 2001. We had budgeted for increases above inflation but we may be looking at increases of as much as 20%. We also incurred several million in unanticipated costs as a result of SEC mission decisions to improve the disaster recoverability of all systems, and the actual re-competition preparation cost us a great deal more than expected due to the need to produce large amounts of system documentation that had not been delivered previously.
  - c. If “yes,” what corrective actions are being taken? There is not much we can do about the market conditions. As a result of the improved documentation, we may reduce some of the support and repair costs but since these are being acquired on a level-of-effort basis that will be minimal. It will, however, better prepare us to begin planning for the replacement system.

- d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"? \$128.126
- 8. Is Have any significant changes been made to the past fiscal year?
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by OMB? Since we did not receive confirmation of our baseline as submitted in 2005, the proposed revision to the baseline is included as a part of this request.

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

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

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimate	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) Planned/Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned /Actual		Schedule/ Cost (# days/\$M)		
FY2004 O&M	9/30/2004	11.600	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	11.600	11.300	0	0.300	100.0%
FY2004 Enhancements	6/30/2005	1.900	6/30/2005	9/30/2005	1.900	1.900	-92	0.000	100.0%
FY2005 O&M	9/30/2005	11.600	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	11.600	12.011	0	-0.411	100.0%
ADC Conversion	5/31/2005	1.300	5/31/2005	7/31/2005	1.300	1.578	-61	-0.278	100.0%
FY05 funded DME work: releases 9.1, 9.2, 9.3	2/28/2006	2.500	2/28/2006	2/28/2006	2.500	2.442	0	0.058	100.0%
Other FY05 DME work	5/31/2006	0.000	5/31/2006	9/30/2006	0.000	1.417	-122	-1.417	100.0%
Contract Re-compete	3/31/2006	0.400	3/31/2006	9/30/2006	0.400	1.100	-183	-0.700	95.0%
Contract Transition	9/30/2006	4.200	9/30/2006	5/31/2006	4.200	5.489	122	-1.289	0.0%
FY2006 Enhancements: release 9.4 and other investments	9/30/2006	5.630	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	3.715	2.826	0	0.889	95.0%
FY2006 O&M	9/30/2006	11.900	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	11.900	15.423	0	-3.523	100.0%
FY2007 O&M	9/30/2007	12.400	9/30/2007		17.000				0.0%
FY2008 O&M	9/30/2008	12.600	9/30/2008		17.054				0.0%
FY2009 O&M	9/30/2009	12.600	9/30/2009		18.311				0.0%