

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

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

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 09/08/2007
2. Agency: 449, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
3. Bureau: 00
4. Name of this Capital Asset: Electronic Documents
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 FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)
 Planning Full Acquisition Operations and Maintenance Mixed Life Cycle Multi-Agency Collaboration
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? BY09
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of

The SEC mission is to protect investors, maintain fair and orderly markets, and facilitate the formation of capital. Two primary goals of the SEC Strategic Plan are Enforce Securities Laws (specifically initiative #3 Document Management) and the strategic goal of Maximize SEC Resources; the Electronic Documents and Litigation Support (EDLS) project supports both. Each year the SEC receives approximately 50 million pages of documents in electronic and paper formats. SEC staff must review documents to ensure compliance with Federal securities laws and investigate potential violations. This project, EDLS, is a continuation of Document Imaging (DI), and will provide replacement software for the Concordance databases currently used to store and manage all incoming documents. It will provide replacement software that will easily store, manage, search and analyze the millions of documents provided during ENF investigations; provide advanced capabilities to locate key documents electronically rather than relying on manual searches through boxes of materials, and provide for more advanced administration and management reporting.

EDLS, in coordination with the SEC Document Imaging project, addresses an issues raised in OMB's PART review of the Enforcement program about staff efficiency as related to information technology support. EDLS benefits include:

(1) Increased Compatibility with regulated entities and outside parties. The SEC receives the majority of evidentiary documents in a variety of electronic formats. In order to read and to search these documents the SEC requires the capability to process and to convert the files,

and then to load the files into common repositories for efficient searching. As the industry that ENF provides oversight of increasingly uses electronic documents, ENF must also continue to use compatible technology and advance their electronic repositories in order to conduct effective investigations.

(2) Improved integration with other relevant SEC systems: EDLS will facilitate integration with SEC systems including their Case Management and enterprise document management system.

(3) Improved Staff Efficiency . In addition to the benefits already conveyed by the Document Imaging process, EDLS will offer a greatly-improved information management design that should reduce storage and support costs and greatly reduce dependence on contractors or SEC staff to upload and validate files..

(4) Improved Disaster Recovery . This project is one of the SEC's investments for disaster recovery to provide the ability to easily and quickly recover all documents following disasters from building loss, water, or fire damage.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? No
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 David Smith
Phone Number 202-551-8276
E-mail smithDav@sec.gov
a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?
Mid/Journeyman-level
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 EDLS investment expands the capability of the SEC to interact through electronic communications and file transfers with industry and other law enforcement agencies.

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

- a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review? Yes
- b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? Enforcement - SEC
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Results Not Demonstrated

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

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

For information technology investments only:

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

- Level 1
- Level 2
- Level 3

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

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

18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)? 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? N/A – products are not published to the public nor to the internet
22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:
Name Barbara Stance
Phone Number 202-551-7209
Title Associate Director/Chief Privacy Officer
E-mail StanceB@sec.gov
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration’s approval?
Yes
24. Does this investment support one of the GAO High Risk areas? (Y/N) – No

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.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and Earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.204					
Acquisition:	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.296					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.500					
Operations & Maintenance:	0.0	0.000	0.00	0.000					
TOTAL:	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.500					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above									
Government FTE Costs:	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.343					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	0.0	0.0	0.00	2					
OIT FTE	0.00	.00	0.00	.6					

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?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President’s budget request, briefly explain those changes.

This investment is identified as a new investment in this year's submittal whereas in the previous submittal it was included in the ongoing Document Imaging investment. The agency's decision to acquire an enterprise-class document management system in FY2007 created a substantial change in the alternatives that would be available for the new Document Imaging solution. That allowed us to think in terms of retiring this investment and integrating with the Document Management solution, or replacing this system with a different COTS product, or even not replacing it at all but using the DM solution entirely, as might be most appropriate. Last year we had only the options of simply investing in an upgrade of the present system or replacing it with a similar solution.

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 Contract / Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? N	Does the contract include the Required security & privacy clauses?(Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level(Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? Y/N)
SECHQ-05-D-0305 Abacus	Time and Materials	Yes	Aug 8, 2005	Sep, 1, 2005	July 22, 2007	\$0.440	No	No	No	None	Yes	Yes	Joanie Newhart	202-551-7303 newhartj@sec.gov	3	N/a
CQ63000-06-2067 IPRO Maintenance	Service Agreement	Yes	November 25, 2005	Nov. 25, 2005.	Oct. 31, 2006	\$0.003	No	No	No	None	No	Yes	Joanie Newhart	202-551-7303 newhartj@sec.gov	3	N/a

Contracts/Task Orders Table:

Contractor Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start & end date of Contract / Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UEESC, 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)
PC-HQ01H0447 Storage Engineering Support	Time and Materials	Y	Oct. 21, 2005	Oct. 21, 2005	Aug. 31, 2008	\$0.202	Yes	No	No	None	No	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315 baierl@sec.gov	3	N/a
Litigation Support software licenses	Fixed price	N	June 2009				No	No	Yes	None	No	Yes				
Litigation Support Software implementation	Cost reimbursable	N	June 2009				No	Yes	Yes	None	Yes	Yes				
Litigation support server acquisition	Fixed price	N	March 2009				No	No	Yes	None	No	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 EDLS project plans to use EVM on the contracts where relevant which include the Program Management Support and the Litigation Support Software implementation. The remainder of the contracts are for Hardware and Software purchases which do not require EVM.

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.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? No
 - a. If "yes," what is the date?
 - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? Yes
 1. If "no," briefly explain why: N/A

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use the following Table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different

Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. This table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY2009.

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2009	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology-Information Management	% of users access LSS to support ENF investigations	Baseline data to be gathered.	Survey results show 85% of respondents use LSS to support their investigations	
2009	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Cycle Time for e-productions	5 business days for less than 200 GB and 10 business days for over 200 GB.	E-productions will be presented to requesting agency within 5 business days of request for less than 200 GB and 10 business days for over 200 GB.	
2009	Processes and Activities	Quality	Timeframe for Notification to users of Data updates and corrections	Baseline data to be gathered	Ensure that Users are notified within 48 hours of updates and data corrections	
2009	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Productivity of data loading staff	Baseline data to be gathered	10% improvement in database loading and system administration productivity	
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Inactive Case processing	Inactive cases currently not processed; scheduled for 2008	Inactive cases are processed at least 2x a year	
2009	Technology	Response Time-	Response times for Search queries	Time to retrieve search is under 3 minutes for 80% of users	Search query will return results with 60 seconds for simple queries for case involving 1 M documents	
2010	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology-Information Management	% of users access LSS to support ENF investigations	Baseline data to be gathered.	Survey results show 85% of respondents use LSS to support their investigations	
2010	Customer	Timeliness and	Cycle Time for e-	5 business	E-productions will be presented to	

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Results	Responsiveness	productions	days for less than 200 GB and 10 business days for over 200 GB.	requesting agency within 5 business days of request for less than 200 GB and 10 business days for over 200 GB.	
2010	Processes and Activities	Quality	Timeframe for Notification to users of Data updates and corrections	Baseline data to be gathered	Ensure that Users are notified within 48 hours of updates and data corrections	
2010	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Productivity of data loading staff	Baseline data to be gathered	10% improvement in database loading and system administration productivity	
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Inactive Case processing	Inactive cases currently not processed; scheduled for 2008	Inactive cases are processed at least 2x a year	
2010	Technology	Response Time-	Response times for Search queries	Time to retrieve search is under 3 minutes for 80% of users	Search query will return results with 60 seconds for simple queries for case involving 1 M documents	
2011	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology- Information Management	% of users access LSS to support ENF investigations	Baseline data to be gathered.	Survey results show 85% of respondents use LSS to support their investigations	
2011	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Cycle Time for e-productions	5 business days for less than 200 GB and 10 business days for over 200 GB.	E-productions will be presented to requesting agency within 5 business days of request for less than 200 GB and 10 business days for over 200 GB.	
2011	Processes and Activities	Quality	Timeframe for Notification to users of Data updates and corrections	Baseline data to be gathered	Ensure that Users are notified within 48 hours of updates and data corrections	
2011	Processes and	Efficiency	Productivity of	Baseline data to be	10% improvement in database	

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Activities		data loading staff	gathered	loading and system administration productivity	
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Inactive Case processing	Inactive cases currently not processed; scheduled for 2008	Inactive cases are processed at least 2x a year	
2011	Technology	Response Time-	Response times for Search queries	Time to retrieve search is under 3 minutes for 80% of users	Search query will return results with 60 seconds for simple queries for case involving 1 M documents	
2012	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology-Information Management	% of users access LSS to support ENF investigations	Baseline data to be gathered.	Survey results show 85% of respondents use LSS to support their investigations	
2012	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Cycle Time for e-productions	5 business days for less than 200 GB and 10 business days for over 200 GB.	E-productions will be presented to requesting agency within 5 business days of request for less than 200 GB and 10 business days for over 200 GB.	
2012	Processes and Activities	Quality	Timeframe for Notification to users of Data updates and corrections	Baseline data to be gathered	Ensure that Users are notified within 48 hours of updates and data corrections	
2012	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Productivity of data loading staff	Baseline data to be gathered	10% improvement in database loading and system administration productivity	
2012	Technology	Efficiency	Inactive Case processing	Inactive cases currently not processed; scheduled for 2008	Inactive cases are processed at least 2x a year	
2012	Technology	Response Time-	Response times for Search queries	Time to retrieve search is under 3 minutes for 80% of users	Search query will return results with 60 seconds for simple queries for case involving 1 M documents	

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.
Yes

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? NO
 - a. If “yes,” have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency’s plan of action and milestone process? Yes.
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? No.
 - a. a. If “yes,” specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. N/A.
7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

The EDLS project provides contractor access to documents that could potentially be used in investigation and litigation of fraudulent activity. The SEC must assure that no persons, contractor nor SEC staff, disclose any such information without explicit authorization. The Security procedures for contractors supporting the project are monitored, verified and validated as follows: Security requirements are defined in the contract. In as much, EDLS contracts have security procedures defined within them that the contractor must adhere to. This includes requiring all contractor staff to sign the SEC Non-disclosure Agreement. Additionally, all contractor personnel undergo a general background check before being provided access to SEC’s facilities and information. Contractor access to SEC facilities is verified and validated by SEC-issued badges. Access to SEC information and systems is verified and validated by following standard SEC Office of Information Technology (OIT) security procedures. Contractors are required to attend an initial SEC security awareness briefing, as well as ongoing security and ethics-related classes hosted by the OIT Security Group. Access to the network is granted by SEC OIT administrators upon completion of the required security training and paperwork. Network access is password controlled and contractor staff are granted access to network volumes and databases that are required for their job functions. The OIT Security Group monitors user access to hold users’ accountable for their actions and to enforce the provisions of compliance. As a regular duty, the COTR regularly inspects contractor facilities to assure compliance with the requirements set forth in contracts. This inspection includes a review of contractor software that is used to monitor tracking of EDLS processes, a review of the required disclosures and security paperwork for contractor staff currently working on the project and a review of contractor knowledge of security requirements. Any deficiencies noted by the COTR are identified and presented to the contractor for resolution. In addition to these security activities, during the certification and accreditation process for the BDMT, SEC conducted an on-site assessment of security, both physical and IT security, at the contractor’s site. Also, the SEC IG conducted an assessment of security providing recommendations for additional tasks to ensure security risks are reduced.

8. Planning & Operational Systems – Privacy:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or explanation
LSS	No	Y	PIA is in the review process and will be published when finalized	Yes	http://thefederalregister.com/d.p/2002-07-24-02-18646 .
<p>(d) If "Yes" to ©, provide the links to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If No to © provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted..</p> <p>(f) If "Yes" to (e), provide the links to where the current and up-to-date SORN is published in the Federal Register. If No to (e) provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up-to-date SORN</p> <p>Note links must be provided to specific documents, not general privacy websites.</p>					

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

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

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes
 - a. If "no," please explain why? N/A
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?
3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? (Y/N) No.

If Yes, provide the name of the segment architecture: __ Does the SEC have any segments? _____

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? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Document Conversion	Defines the set of capabilities that support the changing of files from one type of format to another	Document Management	Document Conversion	None	None	None	45%
Document Referencing	Defines the set of capabilities that support the redirection to other documents and information for related content.	Document Management	Document Referencing	None	None	None	10%
Indexing	Defines the set of capabilities that support the rapid retrieval of documents through a structured numbering construct	Document Management	Indexing	None	None	None	20%
Library/Storage	Defines the set of capabilities that support document and data warehousing and archiving.	Document Management	Library / Storage	None	None	None	10%
Information Retrieval	Defines the set of capabilities that allow access to data and information for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval	None	None	None	15%

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

4. Technical Reference Model Table:				
To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.				
FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Document Conversion	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	To be acquired.
Document Referencing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	To be acquired.
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Storage	To be acquired.
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	To be acquired.
Document Referencing, Indexing, Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Supporting Platform	Servers/Computers	Microsoft Windows XP and Windows Server 2003
Document Referencing Indexing Library / Storage Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platform	Application Servers	To be acquired.

- 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.
- 6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system? No
 - a. If “yes,” does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)? N/A
 - 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). N/A

PART II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

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

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? 08/11/2007
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? N/A
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: N/A

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:

Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Lifecycle Costs estimate	Lifecycle Benefits estimate
1-SELECTED ALTERNATIVE. Replace Concordance with new Litigation Software	Replace Concordance with new software, migrate and augment the existing electronic repository. Outsourced Scan and OCR services will be provided by Document Imaging project. Load electronic documents into an SEC operated repository and search using automated tools incorporated into new software. Benefits are that it will allow integration with other SEC systems, align with Technical EA and provide additional technology features to reduce initial processing and administrative efforts	18.726	18.726
2-Replace Concordance with Enterprise DMS	Replace Concordance with Enterprise DMS, migrate and augment the existing electronic repository. Outsourced Scan and OCR services will be provided by Document Imaging project. Load electronic documents into an SEC operated repository and search using automated tools incorporated into DMS software. DMS will add the ability to automate Records Management functions but incurs additional costs for custom development of bulk loading routines since DMS generally do not provide these features.	19.339	18.726
3-Replace Concordance with Custom Built Application	Replace Concordance with custom built litigation-DMS software, migrate and augment existing electronic repository. Outsourced Scan and OCR services will be provided by Document Imaging project. Load electronic documents into an SEC operated repository and search using automated tools incorporated into software. Potentially, an added	22.804	16.591

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:

Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Lifecycle Costs estimate	Lifecycle Benefits estimate
	feature would be the ability to automate Records Management functions. This alternative would require additional costs and risk for development time and effort.		
4- Outsource All	Allow Enforcement staff to outsource all of the electronic document services. This would include continuing to outsource the document imaging, document processing (OCR and Coding) to a service provider who would also load and maintain the electronic repository. ENF would continue to convert paper documents to electronic form and store original paper documents off-site for disaster recovery after scanning. Users would be able to perform searching through the electronic repository with the aid of automated tools. The benefits would be that the entire operation would be operated and managed outside. However the issues would be maintaining the continuity of operations, security and ensuring the document integrity as well as the integrity of the loading processes, and extra maintenance and storage costs.	24.861	14.045

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency’s Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

The Agency Executive Committee has not been asked for a decision on this alternative so far; this analysis of alternatives depends for now on very rough order of magnitude estimates pending the fielding of the agency's new document management system (driving alternative 2). In the interim, we selected alternative 1, Replace Existing Concordance litigation software with new Litigation software, which achieves full functionality using COTS software that specifically addresses ENF requirements. It allows for maintaining existing systems which will minimize the risk of productivity loss due to the new software implementation. It provides a much higher quality solution and is more cost-effective than the alternatives. All of the alternatives support the President’s Management Agenda for improved electronic government. Alternative 1 enables the SEC to continue to focus on its core mission areas while maximizing the use of technology to support ENF activities.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

EDLS will provide for the replacement of the existing database and litigation software. On top of the staff efficiencies already realized in the retiring Document Imaging system, this replacement will allow for improving mostly technical efficiencies by providing for continued automated searching for documents, improving the SEC’s ability to share documents between regional offices and within one office; improving methods and practices for storing original documents; enhancing disaster recovery; eliminating unnecessary copies of documents and for facilitating the administration and records

management of millions of documents. The SEC needs tools to manage and search the increased volumes of paper and electronic documents it receives and produces. Document productions received in response to ENF requests come as both paper and electronic. Handling those materials requires an electronic capability which facilitates the input of millions of pages and documents. Managing the vast volume of documents in terms of security and records management also requires an electronic capability. Additionally, SEC receives increasing volumes of documents in electronic format (e.g. e-mails, native files, Lotus Notes files), but not necessarily a format compatible with standard SEC office systems. EDLS will continue to provide tools to interpret, store, and search the various formats so our staff can then prepare and access this material easily. As a result of EDLS, there will be soft efficiencies for users: we will need the same enforcement staff, but they will be freed to address higher order tasks as document handling and processing become more technically efficient, and as document searching and response becomes faster. This will also increase user confidence and reliance on the system and users will want to use it more, thereby increasing productivity further. EDLS will provide additional management and administration tools which will facilitate better storage management and better tracking of documents and materials submitted in response to document requests. Although some regional offices maintain a consistent record of materials collected from firms and registrants, others are not as structured or consistent. In the event of a disaster situation, recovery of these documents would be more complicated. EDLS provides enhanced disaster recovery as well as its own internal controls over sensitive, non-public information.

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

Yes.

a. If “Yes”, are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment? This investment

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

List of Legacy Investments or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment or System	UPI if available	Date of the system retirement
Litigation Support System (Document Imaging)	449-00-01-02-01-0001-00	9/30/2010

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? No
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? N/A
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? February 15, 2008
 - 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 risks are scored according to probability and impact. The score is translated into a cost and schedule buffer based on the total project cost, 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 every phase gate to reflect the current situation and the status of mitigation activities, and the buffers are adjusted or drawn down as appropriate.

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

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

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard – 748?
Yes
2. Is the CV or SV greater than +/-10%? No
($CV\% = CV/EV \times 100$; $SV\% = SV/PV \times 100$)
 - a. If "yes," was it the?
 - b. If "yes," explain the variance:
 - c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? (Y/N) No
 - a. If "yes", when was it approved by the agency head? <date>
 - b. If "yes", when was it approved by OMB? <date>

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:

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

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) Planned/Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned /Actual		Schedule/ Cost (# days/\$M)		
Initial Analysis	6/30/2009	0.204	7/30/2008		0.204				0%
Planning and Contract Award	8/30/2009	0.050	8/30/2009		0.050				0
Pilot Program	11/30/2009		11/30/2009						0%
Implement (Migration – Testing- Training)	6/30/2010		6/30/2010						0
Operation and retirement	9/30/2015		9/30/2012						0%