

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: Document Imaging
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? BY07
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 Document Imaging (DI) project supports both. Each year the SEC receives the approximately 50 million pages of documents. SEC staff must review documents to ensure compliance with Federal securities laws and investigate potential violations. DI scans, converts to text, and loads documents, received in paper or electronic form, into a searchable repository, referred to as the Litigation Support System (LSS). DI permits staff members, using LSS, to locate key documents electronically rather than searching manually through boxes of materials. DI also permits detailed searching of documents across collections of documents and cross-referencing of information.

DI addresses a PART weakness of “SEC Enforcement” of staff efficiency as related to information technology support. One strategy is to use evolving technology to manage data from examination and oversight through litigation support. DI provides the following benefits:

Improved Staff Efficiency. For large cases, there are millions of pages of evidentiary documents and it is not feasible for staff to review these documents manually. Searching numerous documents is faster and more accurate with automated tools than manually.

Improved Disaster Recovery . The DI 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.

Remove documents from Offices/Hallways . Volumes of material stored in heavy boxes posed safety hazards in the workplace and in the event of an emergency. DI enables the SEC to store original documents off-site for evidentiary and federal records purposes while staff use electronic copies.

9. Did the Agency’s Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
a. If “yes,” what was the date of this approval? <TBD – August 2007>
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
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 Document Imaging DI investment supports the President's Management Agenda in the area of E-Government: DI supports efficient information interchange between the SEC, DOJ and other state and Federal regulatory authorities by sharing investigative material. It reduces costs by providing already imaged documents in electronic format to these agencies and the U.S. Courts.

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)? YES

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? N/A

1. If "yes," which compliance area: N/A

2. If "no," what does it address? N/A

b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52 : N/A

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following?
(This should total 100% - enter as decimal, e.g., .25 = 25%)
Hardware 4% Software 0% Services 96% 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:	0.220	0.000	0.000	0.000					
Acquisition:	23.244	0.000	0.000	0.000					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	23.464	0.000	0.000	0.000					
Operations & Maintenance:	26.447	10.562	11.047	11.493					
TOTAL:	49.911	10.562	11.047	11.493					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above									
Government FTE Costs:	1.090	0.304	0.293	0.314					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	8.35	2.13	2.00	2.00					
OIT FTE	6.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.44	0.42	0.39	0.00	10.25

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? This project does not require the agency to hire additional FTEs.

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President’s budget request, briefly explain those changes. The amount requested for 2007 has increased approximately 8.1% due to changes in electronic discovery. Due to the success of the program and progress in the legal industry, more electronic documents are being processed than previously budgeted, resulting in higher service maintenance costs. The SEC also has increased requirements for quality and delivery time, leading to increased unit prices for processing. Thus, the sytem life has been extended for 2009 to 2012, and the total increase through FY2012 will be \$18.73M. Additionally, the Electronic Documents and Litigation Support (EDLS) system is being proposed as a new initiative with a budget through FY2015 of \$18.489M. EDLS seeks a more efficient technical solution [with consequently lower storage and support costs] to requirements that were previously included under Document Imaging. An additional point is that a primary contract issued for Document Imaging also includes services for Forensics Services, independent yet related to Document Imaging. Therefore, the total of the contracts does not match the total of the project cost. The Summary of Spending table prior year amounts were adjusted due to additional information from the current budget review process. DI was initiated by the Enforcement Division of SEC and handed off to OIT during 2004; costs that had been identified in the milestones were not previously reflected in the Summary of Spending.

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

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																
Contractor Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the ward? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start & end date of Contact / Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? N	Does the contract include the Required security & privacy clauses?(Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level(Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? Y/N
SECHQ -05-A-0379 Labat Anderson Document	Performance Based Time and Materials	Yes	Aug 18, 2005	Aug. 18, 2005.	Aug. 18, 2010	\$105.649	No	No	Yes	None	Yes	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)
Imaging Litigation Support																
SECHQ1-05-D-0305 Abacus	Time and Materials and FP	Yes	Sept 20, 2005	Sep, 20, 2006	Sept. 20, 2007	\$0.440	No	No	Yes	None	Yes	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7303 newhartj@sec.gov	3	N/a
SECHQ1-05-H-0277 IQA	Time and Materials	Yes	June 14, 2005	June 14, 2005	Aug. 31, 2007	\$1.742	Yes	No	Yes	None	Yes	Yes	Linda Baier	202-551-7315 baierl@sec.gov	3	N/a
Millenia Lite Doc Processing Support GSC-TFMG-07-L059	Fixed Unit Price and Cost Plus Award Fee	Yes	Aug. 15, 2007		Aug. 16, 2012	\$30	Yes	No	Yes	None	No	Yes	Lisa Ellis		3	N/A
GSC-TFMG-07-31943	Time and Materials	N	Aug. 31, 2007	Sept. 4, 2007	Aug. 31, 2012	\$4.8	Yes	No	Yes	None	No	Yes	Lisa Ellis			
Lexis-Nexis	Fixed Price	Yes				\$0.06	No	No	No	None						
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
PC-HQ01H0447 Storage Engineering	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

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, UEFC, 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
Support														IGOV		

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 Contract for Millenia Lite Processing Support (GSC-TFMG-07-L059) does not require EVMS since the work is not schedule-based but is more a level of effort to validate and verify document processing. Contract GSC-TFMG-07-31943) does not require EVMS because it is a level of effort for document processing validation services. The Contracts with Lexis/Nexis, IPRO Maintenance (CQ63000-06-2067), and Storage Engineering Support (PC-HQ-01-H0447) do not have Earned Value requirements because the contracts are for as-needed technical and maintenance support and therefore cannot be appropriately managed using Earned Value. The Lexis/Nexis contract is maintenance only for the Concordance software. The IPRO contract is maintenance only, and is a direct function of the usage of IPRO software. The Storage contract is a task order to support day-to-day storage operations and maintenance. None of these contracts require EVM 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.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes
- a. If “yes,” what is the date? 1/31/2005
 - b. If “no,” will an acquisition plan be developed? N/A
 - 1. If “no,” briefly explain why: N/A

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

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

v

Performance Information Table 1:

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. 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.

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2004	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Reduce time employees spend in document management activities.	2004: Unknown. Managers believe that employees spend significant time in document management activities	Collect baseline data	DI not implemented widely enough to collect meaningful statistics. No data collected.
2004	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce cost to reconstruct and establish enforcement program activities in event of disaster to	FY 2002: \$13 million for estimated 80% reconstruction	Reduce to under \$13 million for estimated 80% reconstruction	\$13 million for estimated 80% reconstruction

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			under \$1 million.			
2004	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce time to reconstruct and establish enforcement program activities in event of a disaster.	FY 2002: 9 months	Reduce to under 3 months	6 weeks, based on backlog imaging and data loading
2004	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Increase the number of examinations processed via electronic format discovery.	FY 2003: 00 examinations using electronic documents	Increase by 10%	0% increase
2004	Process and Activities	Financial	Reduce the cost of converting to electronic material on a page equivalency basis	FY2003: Cost per page converted to accessible electronic media = \$0.65	20% reduction (\$0.56/page)	Cost per page is \$0.46 (30% reduction, 150% of goal)
2004	Process and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Reduce the time to process a mega-case or provide the ability to process 1-2 million pages in a month	FY2003; Impact of a large case == 100 staff days (10 people 5 months to review all the documents = imaging backlog average of 150 days	Reduce to under 120 days	100 days based on backlog imaging and data loading at SEC HQ and Eastern field offices.
2004	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Reduce the cost to regulated entities of printing required to respond to subpoenas,	FY2003: Total number of page equivalents received electronically = 0	Collect baseline data	25 million pages received electronically

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			assuming a cost of \$.03 per page.			
2004	Technology	Efficiency-Response Time	Percent reduction in search time to access documents for a particular case	FY2003: Total time 6 days (2 to identify box, 2 to get box from Iron Mountain, 2 to find document)	Collect baseline data using Pilot program	Pilot established

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Reduce time employees spend in document management activities.	No data collected to establish baseline	½ hour saved per person per week	Survey conducted: Employees spend up to 40% of their time (3 hours) in document management related activities; savings of ½ hour per person per week
2005	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce cost to reconstruct and re-establish enforcement program activities in event of disaster to under \$1 million.	FY2002: \$13 million for estimated 80% reconstruction	\$5 million per office	\$1 million for N.Y. Boston, Philadelphia and D.C.; Other offices remain at \$5 million per office
2005	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce time to reconstruct and establish	FY 2004 results: 6 weeks	Reduce to 4 weeks	4 weeks; based on on-going imaging and data loading

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			enforcement program activities in event of a disaster.			
2005	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Increase the number of examinations processed via electronic format.	FY2004: 00 examinations using electronic documents	Increase by 10%	Contract awarded late FY05 does include reporting required. No data collected in FY05
2005	Process and Activities	Financial	Reduce the cost of converting to electronic material on a page equivalency basis	FY2004: Cost per page converted to accessible electronic media - \$0.46	Reduce per page cost by 10%	Per page cost reduced by 17.7% to per page cost of \$0.3784
2005	Process and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Reduce the time to process a mega-case or provide the ability to process 1-2 million pages in a month	FY2004: 100 days	Reduce to 45 days	30 days, based on periods of high volume on-going document imaging, data loading , and incoming electronic submittals at SEC HQ and N.Y.
2005	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Reduce the cost to regulated entities of printing required to respond to subpoenas, assuming a cost of \$.03 per page.	FY2004: 25 million pages received electronically	Increase savings by 10%	Increased savings 20%. 30 million pages received electronically
2005	Technology	Efficiency-Response Time	Percent reduction in search time to	FY2004: Pilot phase established	Reduce time needed to	Time to retrieve case is under 3

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			access documents for a particular case		locate and review documents for a particular case in under 3	minutes for 80% of system users

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2006	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Reduce time employees spend in document management activities.	2005 Survey: Employees spend up to 40% of their time in document management related activities	1/2 hours saved per person per week	Survey results are pending
2006	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce cost to reconstruct and re-establish enforcement program activities in event of disaster to under \$1 million.	FY 2005: \$1 million for N.Y., Boston, Philadelphia and D.C.; Other offices remain at \$5 million per office	\$2 million for reconstruction costs per office	\$1 million for N.Y., Boston, Philadelphia, D.C., Miami, Atlanta, Chicago, and Ft. Worth; Other offices remain at \$5 million per office.
2006	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce time to reconstruct and establish enforcement program	FY 2005: 4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading	Reduce to 2 weeks	4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading processes

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			activities in event of a disaster.			
2006	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Increase the number of examinations processed via electronic format	Contract awarded late FY05 does include reporting required. No data collected in FY05	Increase by 10%	Data collection is in progress but not yet tabulated. Scheduled completion Sept 30.
2006	Process and Activities	Financial	Reduce the cost of converting to electronic material on a page equivalency basis	FY2005: Cost per page converted to accessible electronic media is .37.	10% savings	51% savings, cost per page reduced to \$0.31
2006	Process and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Reduce the time to process a mega-case or provide the ability to process 1-2 million pages in a month	FY 2005: 30 days	Reduce to under 21 days	20 days
2006	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Reduce the cost to regulated entities of printing required to respond to subpoenas, assuming a cost of \$.03 per page.	FY2005: 30 million pages received electronically	Increase savings by 10%	FY2006 : 42 million pages received electronically
2006	Technology	Efficiency-Response Time	Percent reduction in search time to access documents	FY2005: Time to retrieve case is under 3 minutes for 80% of system users	Response time under 3 minutes for all	Time to retrieve case is under 3 minutes for 80% of

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			for a particular case		users	system users.

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Technology	Effectiveness	Reduce time employees spend in document management activities.	2006-2007 Survey: Employees save approximately ½ per week using DI	1/2 hours saved per person per week	Survey results show 75% of respondents save time using DI services
2007	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce cost to reconstruct and re-establish enforcement program activities in event of disaster to under \$1 million.	FY 2006: \$1 million for N.Y., Boston, Philadelphia, D.C., Miami, Atlanta, Chicago, and Ft. Worth; Other offices remain at \$5 million per office	\$1 million for reconstruction costs per office	Reconstruction costs at \$1 million for N.Y., Boston, Philadelphia, D.C., Miami, Atlanta, Chicago, Ft. Worth; LA and Salt Lake City. Denver and San Fran offices are at \$5 million per office.
2007	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce time to reconstruct and establish enforcement program activities in event of a disaster.	FY 2006: 4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading	Maintain 4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading processes	4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading processes
2007	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Increase the number of examinations processed via electronic format	FY2006: Data collection is in progress. Scheduled completion Sept. 30.	Increase by 10%	Awaiting data collection results.

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Process and Activities	Financial	Reduce the cost of converting to electronic material on a page equivalency basis	FY2006: Cost per page converted to accessible electronic media is .31.	10% savings	12% decrease in cost per page; reduced to \$0.277
2007	Process and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Reduce the time to process a mega-case or provide the ability to process 1-2 million pages in a month	FY 2006: 20 business days	Maintain at 20 business days to process mega-case (1 M pages)	FY2007 – 1M pages processed in 20 business days
2007	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Reduce the cost to regulated entities of printing required to respond to subpoenas, assuming a cost of \$.03 per page.	FY2006: 42 million pages received electronically	Increase savings by 10%	
2007	Technology	Efficiency-Response Time	Percent reduction in search time to access documents for a particular case	FY2006: Time to retrieve case is under 3 minutes for 80% of system users	Response time under 3 minutes for all users	Response time is 3 minutes for 80% of system users

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	Technology	Effectiveness	Reduce time employees spend in document management activities.	2006-2007 Survey: 75% of respondents save time using DI services	Increase to 90%	
2008	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce cost to reconstruct and	FY 2007: \$1 million for all offices except Denver and San Francisco	Maintain at \$1 million for	

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			re-establish enforcement program activities in event of disaster to under \$1 million.	which are at \$5 million per office	reconstruction costs per office	
2008	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce time to reconstruct and establish enforcement program activities in event of a disaster.	FY 2007: 4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading	Maintain 4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading processes	
2008	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Increase the number of examinations processed via electronic format	FY2007: Data collection shows.	Increase by 10%	
2008	Process and Activities	Financial	Reduce the cost of converting to electronic material on a page equivalency basis	FY2007: Cost per page converted to accessible electronic media is .26.	Maintain at current cost of .26	
2008	Process and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Reduce the time to process a mega-case or provide the ability to process 1-2 million pages in a month	FY 2007: 20 days	Maintain at 20 days to process mega-case	
2008	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Reduce the cost to regulated	FY2007: million pages received electronically		

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			entities of printing required to respond to subpoenas, assuming a cost of \$.03 per page.			
2008	Technology	Efficiency-Response Time	Percent reduction in search time to access documents for a particular case	FY2007: Time to retrieve case is under 3 minutes for 80% of system users	Response time under 3 minutes for all users	

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2009	Technology	Effectiveness	Reduce time employees spend in document management activities.	2006-2007 Survey: 75% of respondents save time using DI services	Increase to 90%	
2009	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce cost to reconstruct and re-establish enforcement program activities in event of disaster to under \$1 million.	FY 2007: \$1 million for all offices except Denver and San Francisco which are at \$5 million per office		
2009	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce time to reconstruct and establish enforcement	FY 2007: 4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading		

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			program activities in event of a disaster.			
2009	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Increase the number of examinations processed via electronic format	FY2007: Data collection shows.		
2009	Process and Activities	Financial	Reduce the cost of converting to electronic material on a page equivalency basis	FY2007: Cost per page converted to accessible electronic media is .26.		
2009	Process and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Reduce the time to process a mega-case or provide the ability to process 1-2 million pages in a month	FY 2007: 20 days		
2009	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Reduce the cost to regulated entities of printing required to respond to subpoenas, assuming a cost of \$.03 per page.	FY2007: million pages received electronically		
2009	Technology	Efficiency-Response Time	Percent reduction in search time to access documents for a particular	FY2007: Time to retrieve case is under 3 minutes for 80% of system users		

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			case			

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2010	Technology	Effectiveness	Reduce time employees spend in document management activities.	2006-2007 Survey: 75% of respondents save time using DI services		
2010	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce cost to reconstruct and re-establish enforcement program activities in event of disaster to under \$1 million.	FY 2007: \$1 million for all offices except Denver and San Francisco which are at \$5 million per office		
2010	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce time to reconstruct and establish enforcement program activities in event of a disaster.	FY 2007: 4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading		
2010	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Increase the number of examinations processed via electronic format	FY2007: Data collection shows.		
2010	Process and Activities	Financial	Reduce the cost of converting to	FY2007: Cost per page converted to accessible electronic media is		

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			electronic material on a page equivalency basis	.26.		
2010	Process and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Reduce the time to process a mega-case or provide the ability to process 1-2 million pages in a month	FY 2007: 20 days		
2010	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Reduce the cost to regulated entities of printing required to respond to subpoenas, assuming a cost of \$.03 per page.	FY2007: million pages received electronically		
2010	Technology	Efficiency-Response Time	Percent reduction in search time to access documents for a particular case	FY2007: Time to retrieve case is under 3 minutes for 80% of system users		

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2011	Technology	Effectiveness	Reduce time employees spend in document management	2006-2007 Survey: 75% of respondents save time using DI services		

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			activities.			
2011	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce cost to reconstruct and re-establish enforcement program activities in event of disaster to under \$1 million.	FY 2007: \$1 million for all offices except Denver and San Francisco which are at \$5 million per office		
2011	Mission and Business Results	Information Technology	Reduce time to reconstruct and establish enforcement program activities in event of a disaster.	FY 2007: 4 weeks based on on-going imaging and data loading		
2011	Process and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Increase the number of examinations processed via electronic format	FY2007: Data collection shows.		
2011	Process and Activities	Financial	Reduce the cost of converting to electronic material on a page equivalency basis	FY2007: Cost per page converted to accessible electronic media is .26.		
2011	Process and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Reduce the time to process a mega-case or provide the ability to process 1-2 million pages	FY 2007: 20 days		

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
			in a month			
2011	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Reduce the cost to regulated entities of printing required to respond to subpoenas, assuming a cost of \$.03 per page.	FY2007: million pages received electronically		
2011	Technology	Efficiency-Response Time	Percent reduction in search time to access documents for a particular case	FY2007: Time to retrieve case is under 3 minutes for 80% of system users		

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? Yes [C&A]
 - 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 Document Imaging (DI) 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, DI 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 and 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 only those 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, a review of contractor knowledge of security requirements, and verification that sensitive data is removed from user workstations according to policy. 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. Additionally, 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	http://www.sec.gov/about/privacy/secprivacyoffice.htm#edocs	Yes	SEC SORN #42, Enforcement Files, http://thefederalregister.com/d.p/2002-07-24-02-18646 .
Box, Document, Media Tracking	Yes	N	System does not contain, process or transmit personal identifying information.	No	System is not a Privacy Act System of Records.
<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: _____

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 Management	Classification	None	None	None	1%
		Document Management	Document Conversion	None	None	None	45%
		Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR	None	None	None	47%
		Document Management	Document Referencing	None	None	None	1%
		Document Management	Indexing	None	None	None	3%
		Document Management	Library / Storage	None	None	None	1%
		Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval	None	None	None	2%

- 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)
Classification	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	AL Coder
Document Conversion	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	IPRO eScan-IT
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	eScan-IT
Document Referencing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Concordance 8.2
Indexing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Concordance 8.2
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Software Engineering	Concordance 8.2
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Concordance 8.2
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platform	Hardware/Infrastructure	Scanner
Document Referencing, Indexing, Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Supporting Platform	Operating System Platforms	Windows Server 2003
Document Imaging and OCR	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	OCR
Document Referencing Indexing Library / Storage Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platform	Application Servers	Concordance 8.2

- 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. NOTE – this is last years’ information. DI would be in steady state for BY08 and should answer PART III instead.

PART III: For “Operation and Maintenance” investments ONLY (Steady State)

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as “Operation and Maintenance” (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

Section A: 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. **Note: Section B above has the text for this section.**

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
 - a. If “yes,” what is the date of the plan? 7/15/2005
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year’s submission to OMB? No.
 - c. If “yes,” describe any significant changes:
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? Yes
 - a. If “yes,” what is the planned completion date? March 2008
 - b. If “no,” what is the strategy for managing the risks? N.A

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

Note: Table C.3 above is the Table for this section. The current variance is 9.4% (see Financial worksheet tool) because of underspending on forecasted SS costs (which translates into being “behind schedule” on delivery of the original scope).

1. Was operational analysis conducted? No.
 - a. If “yes,” provide the date the analysis was completed.
 - b. If “yes,” what were the results?
 - c. If “no,” please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:
2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled

preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

- a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information?
Contractor Only

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table:						
Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M)	Schedule/Cost (# days/\$M)	
Initial Planning and Design	3/30/2004	.699	3/30/2004	.699	0	0
Document Imaging Version 1	7/30/2005	17.241	7/30/2005	16.971	0	.27
Award DILS contract	8/15/2005	.264	8/15/2005	.264	0	0
DILS Fully operational	10/30/2006	6.791	10/30/2006	6.112	0	.679
Document Imaging Version 2	8/15/2009	2.197	8/15/2009		0	
Operation and Retirement	8/30/2012					