

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:

9/8/2008

2. Agency:

Social Security Administration

3. Bureau:

Systems

4. Name of this Capital Asset:

DCPS - Disability Case Processing System

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)

016-00-01-02-01-2141-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)

Planning

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?

FY2010

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

SSA's disability-related workload consumes over half of its operational workyears and is arguably the most complex component of SSA's programs. The medical decisions for its disability claims are made by State agencies called Disability Determination Services (DDS).

The current systems environment in the 54 State DDSs is made up of locally administered and maintained legacy processing systems and associated hardware. These systems are primarily derivatives of 5 core systems, provided by different vendors that have been significantly customized to meet local processing needs. The current DDS systems require significant SSA and contractor resources to support, maintain and enhance the various systems. And making even a relatively minor update to these systems to support policy changes, user-requested enhancements or business process changes, is a major logistical effort to coordinate software releases with each DDS and is time-consuming-often taking 6-12 months to complete.

In FY 2008, SSA worked directly with the end-user community to determine the feasibility of creating a new, modernized common Disability Case Processing System (DCPS) that will provide common functionality and consistently support the business processes of all DDSs.

Moving from a multi-vendor environment to a common case processing system will be a complex, multiyear effort; however, having a system built on a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) that provides consistent functionality to each site will ultimately simplify the process of DDS systems maintenance and reduce the rate of growth of overall infrastructure costs. Additionally, having a common system that provides intelligent analysis functionality, integrates Health IT and better supports other efforts to improve disability case processing, such as rapid distribution of policy changes, will positively impact processing times and the accuracy of disability decisions. The implementation of DCPS would allow for the retirement of DDS Automation.

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

Yes

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?

8/4/2008

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?

Yes

11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

Name

Phone Number

Email

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

Senior/Expert/DAWIA-Level 3

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned?

7/11/2008

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

Friday, May 08, 2009 - 4:44 PM

Page 1 of 16

9/5/2008

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?

Yes

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

Yes

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)

No

1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

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

Yes

If "yes," check all that apply:

Expanded E-Government

Eliminating Improper Payments

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)

E-Government: DCPS addresses the scalability limitations of the current legacy environment. Replacing the many state-oriented disability claims processing systems with a common system will enable convenient sharing of data between federal and states as well as reduced expenses.

Eliminating Improper Payments: DCPS is an initiative designed to move the Agency toward an electronic disability process with error-reducing electronic validations designed to eliminate improper payments

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

Yes

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

Yes

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?

10000370 - Social Security Disability Insurance

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?

Moderately Effective

15. Is this investment for information technology?

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 3

17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)

(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)

No

19. Is this a financial management system?

No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMA compliance area?

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

2. If "no," what does it address?

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

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware

31.900000

Software

12.100000

Services

56.000000

Other

0.000000

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

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name

Phone Number

Title

Lead Social Insurance Specialist

E-mail

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?

Yes

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?

No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

- 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 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0.504	10.128	0					
Acquisition:	0	0	0	27.693					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0	0.504	10.128	27.693					
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	0	0					
TOTAL:	0	0.504	10.128	27.693					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0	0.317	1.915	4.966					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	0	3	16	40					

Note: For the multi-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

- If "yes," How many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

N/A - this is a new project.

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

- 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:

Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	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 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? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA 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)
Contractor services (Help Desk/Operations)	Firm Fixed Price	No	10/1/2009	10/1/2009	3/29/2014		No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Burgesen, Michelle	410-965-9462 / michelle.burgesen@ssa.gov	Level 3	
Contractor services (design development, programming, ect.)	Firm Fixed Price	No	9/1/2009	10/1/2009	3/29/2014		No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Burgesen, Michelle	410-965-9462 / michelle.burgesen@ssa.gov	Level 3	
Mainframe Hardware	BPA	No	9/1/2009	10/1/2009	3/29/2014		No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Burgesen, Michelle	410-965-9462 / michelle.burgesen@ssa.gov	Level 3	
Mainframe Software	BPA	No	9/1/2009	9/1/2009	3/29/2014		No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Burgesen, Michelle	410-965-9462 / michelle.burgesen@ssa.gov	Level 3	
Recurring costs	BPA	No	10/1/2009	10/1/2009	3/29/2014		No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Burgesen, Michelle	410-965-9462 / michelle.burgesen@ssa.gov	Level 3	
Recurring costs (lease, maint, etc.)	BPA	No	9/1/2009	9/1/2009	3/29/2014		No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Burgesen, Michelle	410-965-9462 / michelle.burgesen@ssa.gov	Level 3	
LM - SS00-05-60011 Task Order TBD	Task-based Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) Time + Materials (T+M) Task Order	No	9/30/2008	9/30/2008	9/29/2011		No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Burgesen, Michelle	410-965-9462 / michelle.burgesen@ssa.gov	Level 3	

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:

SSA's earned value management (EVM) policy and implementation has been reviewed by OMB, OIG and others and deemed consistent with the intent of OMB guidance and the ANSI standards which define a compliant EVM. SSA performs the vast majority of our work in-house, and thus conducts EVM and program management at the total program level which includes both Government costs and support contracts. The inclusion of earned value in SSA contracts is based on the type of contract let, the services performed, and the date when the contract was let. When applicable per policy, earned value management requirements are applied to SSA contractors in one of two ways. The first is to require the contractor to satisfy requirements utilizing their own earned value management system (EVMS) in accordance with FAR 52.234. The second is for the contractor to provide necessary data directly into SSA's in-house EVMS.

An example of the second case is the Lockheed Martin (LM) AWSSC Task Order contract where LM provides SSA with IT labor support. AWSSC task orders are issued annually on a fixed hour and dollar basis with very detailed work scopes, deliverables and schedules. In these scenarios SSA realizes efficiency advantages by mandating that LM utilize SSA's EVMS, which includes more consolidated and consistent tracking of program level resources and lower contractor costs. SSA's IT Advisory Board allocates these contractors to projects at the same time that it allocates Federal IT employees to the same projects. This is due to the fact that these contractors work side by side with federal employees, charge to the same work break down codes and perform the same work according to SSA mandated schedules, budgets and scope agreements. SSA has an in-house, program level EVMS that produces data attributable to the component and sub-component levels, thereby enabling these contractor's efforts to be easily separately monitored. The LM AWSSC Task Order contract also has many related progress, schedule and cost monitoring tools. Finally, instead of having contractor reporting be a month behind government reporting (as the case would be if we waited for separate contractor EVM reports) this process allows for expedited time reporting.

AWSSC task orders are issued in annual fixed hour and dollar increments with very detailed work scope, deliverables and schedules.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done?

SSA ensures that any applicable IT requirements comply with Section 508 standards. The SSA includes Section 508 contract clauses and evaluation criteria in its solicitations and contracts as appropriate and ensures during the review of technical proposals that offerers are fully compliant or as compliant as possible based on the state of the technology in the marketplace. This is accomplished through review of technical documentation as well as through actual testing of the product.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?

Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date?

9/5/2008

1. Is it Current?

Yes

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

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 (indicators) 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 Federal Enterprise Architecture (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 each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2010	Service - To deliver high-quality, citizen-centered service	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Ensure DCPS meets operational needs by performing user testing/validation	System has yet to be developed and thus cannot be tested/validated	Completion by June 2010	Results available Q1 2011
2010	Service - To deliver high-quality, citizen-centered service	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	System Development	Complete development of common Disability Case Processing	System has yet to be developed	Completion by June 2010	Results available Q1 2011

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
Electronic Disability System	Government Only	8/15/2010	8/15/2010

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Electronic Disability System	Government Only	Moderate	yes	7/21/2008	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	7/2/2008	1/12/2008

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

Yes

a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?

Yes

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

No

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

This is not a contractor system.

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which 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
Electronic Disability System	No	Yes	http://www.ssa.gov/foia/piadocuments/FY07/Accelerated%20eDib%20FY07.htm	Yes	http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/14mar20010800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2003/pdf/03-31432.pdf [SOR 60-0320 - Electronic Disability Claim File; 68 F.R 71214, Dec. 22, 2003]

Details for Text Options:

Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) 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.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

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

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate 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?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

No

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

b. If "no," please explain why?

This investment is new this year. SSA's Transition Strategy will be updated to include this investment for our annual EA Assessment for 02/2009.

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture?

Yes

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.

003-000

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) 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.egov.gov>.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Global Reference Tables	Global Reference Tables (GRTs) are constructed to utilize common codes throughout SSA. GRTs standardize code structures and code usage of agency data to be used by all applications, specifying logical and physical meanings.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Meta Data Management	Meta Data Management	016-00-03-00-02-2133-00	Internal	0
eCAT	Electronic Claims Analysis Tool (eCAT) is a web-based tool to guide the adjudicator and Medical/Psychological Consultant through the process of the 5 step sequential evaluation to . This guides the examiner to make a decision at the earliest possible point.	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning	Decision Support and Planning	016-00-01-02-02-2130-00	Internal	0
MI Central	MI Central is a web-based application that facilitates access to management informatin and workload control reports by providing a central location to obtain workload counts, workload control listings, processing time reports, performance measurement reports, and managerial cost analysis data/reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned	Standardized / Canned	016-00-03-00-02-2133-00	Internal	0
DMA	The Document Management Architecture (DMA) is the part of the Electronic Folder (EF) that provides the capability to hold images, documents, and forms that were previously housed in paper folders. This data consists of	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Library / Storage	Library / Storage	016-00-02-00-01-2210-00	Internal	0

Exhibit 300: DCPS - Disability Case Processing System (Revision 1)

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	images associated with disability case information and documents that have been scanned or faxed into a centralized or local repository. This information will be accessed, viewed, and shared electronically by all processing components.							
CFRMS	The Claims File Records Management System (CFRMS) provides a consolidated view of the electronic claims file for the purpose of records and content management.	Digital Asset Services	Records Management	Document Retirement	Document Retirement	016-00-01-02-02-2130-00	Internal	0
iESI	iESI is Internet/Intranet Enterprise Security Interface.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control	Access Control	016-00-03-00-02-2133-00	Internal	0
ACU	The Access Control Utility (ACU) provides authentication (using SSA-issued PIN/PSWD, SSA Knowledge Based Authentication (KBA), and third-party authentication credentials through the E-Authentication federated architecture) and access control for all public-facing electronic applications at SSA.	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication	Identification and Authentication	016-00-02-00-01-2210-00	Internal	0

- a. Use existing 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 percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) 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)
Meta Data Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Database 2 (DB2)
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	SUMS

Exhibit 300: DCPS - Disability Case Processing System (Revision 1)

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)
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Access Control Utility
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Mainframe
Document Retirement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Mainframe
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	Websphere Studio

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.

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

No

a. If "yes," please describe.

Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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. 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?

8/15/2008

b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results:

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

* Costs in millions

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Alternative 1: Legacy Systems with Screen Scraper	Continuing with the current status quo Legacy Systems and add a Screen Scraper System that will mimic a Windows program structure, which is more attractive and familiar to users	231.524	157.459
Alternative 2: Modernize Legacy Systems	Move each of the five Legacy Systems to web based solutions. Build new applications for common functions using best new technology.	173.301	20.735
Alternative 3: common Disability Case Processing System	Develop system that fully supports the ability to process all tasks performed by all components through the entire business process cycle. Potentially consolidate functions performed by Legacy Systems into a common system across the disability case processing organizations.	102.16	141.199
Status quo: DDS Automation plus maintenance of State Legacy systems	Continue development for existing systems by synching legacy system rollouts with HQ system modifications on a regional basis	207.364	157.459

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

Alternative 3 was selected because it is part of a coordinated effort across SSA to develop and implement the common Disability Case Processing System (DCPS) that will provide common functionality and consistently support the business processes of all Disability Determination Services (DDS) across the country. In order to ensure that the Agency's immediate and ongoing case processing requirements are met, the Agency's DDS Automation initiative (separate Exhibit 300) will continue until DCPS is fully implemented in approximately FY14.

Moving from the current distributed, multi-vendor environment to a common case processing system will ultimately simplify the process of DDS systems maintenance and reduce the rate of growth of overall infrastructure costs. Additionally, having a common system that provides intelligent analysis functionality, integrates Health IT, and better supports other efforts to improve

Exhibit 300: DCPS - Disability Case Processing System (Revision 1)

disability case processing (such as rapid distribution of policy changes) will positively impact processing times and the accuracy of disability decisions. Finally, this initiative provides the DDSs with more effective case processing software in a uniform, cost-effective manner and allows SSA to meet workload goals and improve processing time.

Consolidating to the common Disability Case Processing System will reduce operational risk and increase efficiencies, allowing for more effective case processing software in a uniform, cost-effective manner as well as a baseline for functionality. During the Planning & Analysis efforts in FY09, DPCS will identify these operational savings, which are expected to be significant, on an enterprise-wide basis. Thus the benefits estimate for DCPS in next year's Exhibit 300 will be updated and increased accordingly. These cost savings and increased efficiencies will ultimately result in improved quality allowing SSA to better meet workload goals and improve processing time. This system will also help to decrease allowance rate variances between DDSs and enable more consistent case processing among the DDSs.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

Beyond 2021

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

There are several qualitative benefits that will be realized due to the implementation of Alternative 3. The consolidation of 49 applications into 1 will further the electronic processing of cases, in-line with the "Expanding E-Government" PMA Initiative., as well as ensure that policy will be consistent across all DDSs. Additionally, having one set of code will improve SSA's ability to maintain records electronically and will improve the quality and timeliness of cases processed. This consolidated system will also allow SSA to take advantage of cutting edge technology and position ourselves for future electronic process integration (e.g., health information, expert systems, etc.).

In addition Alternative 3 will:

- Provide significantly more Management Information (MI) than is currently available
- Provide more consistent MI since the data source will be a common Disability Case Processing System (DCPS)
- Provide consistent, longitudinal MI for research and evaluation, case studies, trend analyses and statistical reports
- Include an analysis tool that will improve the complex decision-making process and result in improved accuracy
- Allow for the roll-out of release specific changes and new features to all 54 DDSs nationwide in a more timely and efficient manner
- Create significant reductions in time spent preparing for training since nationwide modules would be possible
- Allow for the implementation of a single disaster recovery plan that would protect critical case processing data and could be supported by SSA systems
- Create more opportunity for users to request systems enhancements
- Enable national testing of the system, which will provide stability, fewer resources from each DDS for acceptance testing and reduced risk of production down time for individual DDS
- Facilitate the use of medical consultants between DDSs
- Allow for software certification by the Agency, thus improving the quality of software delivered
- Provide modernized, user-friendly code for DDS case processing
- Ensure that the system is built to support current electronic business process
- Provide a convenient single access point (though multiple logins may be necessary) and provide potential to access data remotely
- Enable user-friendly design of system interfaces
- Ensure flexibility and scalability due to modular development approach

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits

What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2007 & Prior	0	0	N/A	
PY 2008	0	0	N/A	
CY 2009	0	0	N/A	
BY 2010	0	0	N/A	N/A
BY + 1 2011	0		N/A	N/A
BY + 2 2012	0		N/A	Avoided maintenance costs of State Legacy systems Reduced annual Release cost

Exhibit 300: DCPS - Disability Case Processing System (Revision 1)

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
				savings Reduced annual SSA development labor Reduced annual contractor development labor
BY + 3 2013	0		N/A	Avoided maintenance costs of State Legacy systems Reduced annual Release cost savings Reduced annual SSA development labor Reduced annual contractor development labor
BY + 4 2014 & Beyond	0		N/A	Avoided maintenance costs of State Legacy systems Reduced annual Release cost savings Reduced annual SSA development labor Reduced annual contractor development labor
Total LCC Benefit	0		LCC = Life-cycle Cost	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole?

Yes

a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment?

This Investment

b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

5b. List of Legacy Investment or Systems

Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
iLevy		12/31/2013
Moderized Integrated Disability Adjudicative System (MIDAS)		12/31/2013
Nebraska- Cornhusker		12/31/2013
New York- Analyst Case Processing System (ACPS)		12/31/2013
Versa		12/31/2013

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

8/15/2008

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?

a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?

b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

SSA's baselines are risk adjusted in terms of both life cycle schedule and resource estimates. Factors considered in determining baseline risk adjustments include: identification of known and types of unknown program and technology risks, the likelihood of occurrence, the impact in the event the risk occurs, and the mitigation strategy adopted to manage each risk. Since SSA performs IT work in-house program cost and schedule estimates are developed internally. SSA estimators have at their disposal parametric data and numerous sizing and estimating tools which offer an excellent basis to assess and account for risk.

The intent of adopting this strategy is for the program to be able to absorb inevitable risk occurrences and still achieve end cost and schedule objectives. This practice (along with our risk management policies and procedures) has to date been a successful one at SSA. Small management reserves are held at the Deputy Commissioner level in the event they are required.

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%? (CV% = CV/EV x 100; SV% = SV/PV x 100)

No

a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?

b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year?

No

a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

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.

Milestone Number	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)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
1	DCPS FY09	9/30/2009	\$11.838611	9/30/2009		\$11.838611		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
1.1	Planning and Analysis - identify stakeholders/SME/workgroups, visioning of to-be model, document business needs.	11/30/2008	\$0.380410	11/30/2008		\$0.380410		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
1.2	Requirements - develop business process model, document user/stakeholder requirements, develop detailed functional requirements, select design alternative, document architecture design.	6/30/2009	\$1.046128	6/30/2009		\$1.046128		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
1.3	Acquisition Planning - determine purchases, analyze build or buy, determine build or buy for services, prepare acquisition plans and documents.	9/30/2009	\$0.190205	9/30/2009		\$0.190205		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
1.4	User-Centered Design - determine usability/UCD approach, determine high-level design, determine service level agreements, usability testing.	9/30/2009	\$0.285308	9/30/2009		\$0.285308		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
1.5	ITS Costs FY09	9/30/2009	\$9.936560	9/30/2009		\$9.936560		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
2	DCPS FY10	9/30/2010	\$32.758848	9/30/2010		\$32.758848		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
2.1	DCPS Construction - develop common system, perform unit testing, perform usability testing, develop migration plan, develop implementation plan.	9/30/2010	\$5.399584	9/30/2010		\$5.399584		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
2.2	DCPS Validation and Tesing - perform functional validation,	9/30/2010	\$2.508070	9/30/2010		\$2.508070		0	\$0.000000	0.00%

Exhibit 300: DCPS - Disability Case Processing System (Revision 1)

Milestone Number	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)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	perform user testing, develop pilot evaluation criteria.									
2.3	DCPS ITS costs FY10	9/30/2010	\$24.851194	9/30/2010		\$24.851194		0	\$0.000000	0.00%
3	DCPS FY11	9/30/2011		9/30/2011				0	\$0.000000	0.00%
4	DCPS FY12	9/30/2012		9/30/2012				0	\$0.000000	0.00%
5	DCPS FY13	9/30/2013		9/30/2013				0	\$0.000000	0.00%
6	DCPS FY14	9/30/2014		9/30/2014				0	\$0.000000	0.00%
7	DCPS FY15	9/30/2015		9/30/2015				0	\$0.000000	0.00%
8	DCPS FY16	9/30/2016		9/30/2016				0	\$0.000000	0.00%
Project Totals		9/30/2016		9/30/2016						0.00%