

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: | 8/31/2007 |
| 2. Agency: | Department of Justice |
| 3. Bureau: | Justice Management Division |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | 011-03-01-10-01-1526-24 |
| 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) | Mixed Life Cycle |
| 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? | FY2004 |
| 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: | |
- The Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) is focused on developing and implementing a common case management solution for the 7 major DOJ litigating divisions.

As part of the OMB Lines of Business (LoB) Program to develop business-driven, common solutions across agencies, the Department of Justice is leading the Case Management Common Solutions Program. LoB solutions address distinct business improvements to enhance the government's performance and services for citizens. The objective of all LoB efforts is to save taxpayer dollars, reduce administrative burden, and significantly improve service delivery to citizens.

DOJ and OMB seek to provide an enterprise infrastructure for the sharing of case-related information within and between the United States Attorneys' offices, DOJ components, partner agencies, and the public by developing an enterprise case management system that will effectively store the information once, manage it centrally, and make it available to all authorized users.

Using common solutions and data standards, case management information is easily and appropriately shared within and between federal and other government agencies and with citizens. This investment is focused on DOJ's litigation case management needs, in particular Phase 1 of the Litigation Case Management System.

The current litigation case management environment at DOJ does not support efficient, automated information sharing or streamlined reporting abilities. Currently, each DOJ litigating division maintains its own duplicative case management system, which is not able to share information. This hampers the ability of the litigating divisions to collaborate and limits the timeliness of quality of decision support information available to Dept. leadership.

In November 2006, when negative Earned Value cost and schedule variances exceeded 5%, the DOJ program management team (PMO) re-assessed the development and implementation schedule, saw that it was a risky unrealistic approach, and directed the contractor to develop a replanned schedule for Stage 1. DOJ briefed and received approval from OMB in April 2007 for the new performance baseline. The resulting program cost increase is detailed in sections I B Summary of Spending and II C Cost and Schedule Performance.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 4/17/2006 |
| 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | Yes |
| 11. Contact information of Project Manager? | |
| Name | Carey, Christopher M |
| Phone Number | 202-353-1900 |
| Email | christopher.m.carey@usdoj.gov |
| a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? | TBD |

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?	No
a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	No
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
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?)	This initiative supports the President's Management Agenda goal of expanding electronic government. By integrating DOJ litigation case management data into a common system solution and developing data and interface standards, LCMS directly supports the President's Management Agenda's call to "share information more quickly and conveniently between federal and state, local and tribal governments."
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 .)	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?	
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	
c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	
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. 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 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)	Yes
19. Is this a financial management system?	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMI 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 FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)	
Hardware	7
Software	18
Services	70
Other	5

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? No

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

Name Hitch, Vance
 Phone Number 202-514-0507
 Title Chief Information Officer
 E-mail Vance.Hitch@smojmd.usdoj.gov

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)

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:	3.5	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	5.683	24.247	12.959	12.7					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	9.183	24.247	12.959	12.7					
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	0	6					
TOTAL:	9.183	24.247	12.959	18.7					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.141	0.3	0.3	0.3					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	1	2	2	2					

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

a. If "yes," How many and in what year? One additional FTE was added in 2007 to the existing 1 FTE in 2006 and will remain on the project through FY11.

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: As a result of the LCMS re-plan, total program cost in Summary of Spending has increased from the FY08 submission of \$99.6m to the FY09 submission of \$112.4m . DOJ briefed and received approval from OMB on the LCMS re-plan in April 2007. In Section II C Cost and Schedule Performance, Milestones 1 - 11 have been replaced by Milestones 12 - 24 as a result of the re-plan. A brief summary of the re-plan follows.

Beginning in November 2006, the DOJ program management team (PMO) detected the need to re-plan LCMS. Cost and schedule variances of > 5% indicated the beginning of a negative trend, which continued in December, January and February. In December, the LCMS PMO began working with the integration contractor (CSC) to determine the root causes of the variances in order to address problems early and preclude further schedule slippage and cost overruns.

There were four primary outcomes of the re-plan. A deeper understanding of scope and complexity was obtained on requirements, training, reports and interfaces. A modified deployment approach was adopted through a phased (initial, full) implementation by eliminating the pilot sites and going live with the first deployment site. More review cycles and time for testing was added. Finally, schedule and cost risks were mitigated by adding contingency and reserve.

Each of the changes to the functional areas had an impact on the cost and/or schedule with some of the schedule changes overlapping. To complete the EOUSA implementation through November 2008, the cumulative effect of the

changes was both a schedule slip and a cost increase.

The revised Summary of Spending is a result of these changes.

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.

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or 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 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 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)
Contract: 263-01-D-0049 Task No.: DJJ-06-G-1412 CSC	Time & Materials with Performance Incentive Feature	Yes	5/31/2006	6/1/2006	12/20/2010		Yes	Yes		NA	Yes	Yes	Bowles, Bettie	202-307-1955 / Bettie.Bowles@usdoj.gov	Level 3	Yes
ITSS-3 DJJL-05-C-1117 Purchase Order #6 Pragmatics	Time and Materials with Performance Incentives	Yes	9/7/2006	10/2/2006	5/31/2011		No	No		NA	Yes	Yes	Simmons, Connie	202-307-1995 / Connie.H.Simmons@usdoj.gov	Level 3	Yes
DJJ-05-F-1175 D001 Excella	Firm Fixed Price	Yes	4/25/2006	4/25/2006	5/31/2011		No	No		NA	Yes	Yes	Bowles, Bettie	202-307-1955 / Bettie.Bowles@usdoj.gov	Level 3	Yes

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 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:

Contracts # 2 and 3, Pragmatics and Excella respectively, are being modified to include an EVM clause. Contract #1, for the software integrator, accounts for approximately 88% of annual program costs and is performance based.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why:

The products and services purchased under these contracts comply with the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Final Rule for Section 508 (Accessibility). Contractual requirements are in the Statement of Work stating the contractor must comply with this regulation. If compliance is not applicable, a written notification must be submitted, by the contractor explaining why Section 508 does not pertain to the related task.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 9/1/2005

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 FY 2009.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Complaints	Customer Satisfaction Surveys	85% satisfactory rating	86% satisfactory rating	Available Q1 FY09
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Judicial Hearings	Judicial Hearings (Judicial Trials): Percent of Criminal Cases Favorably Resolved	92% of Criminal Cases Favorably Resolved in FY2005.	Favorably Resolve 90% of Criminal Cases	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Judicial Hearings	Judicial Hearings (Judicial Trials): Percent of Civil Cases Favorably Resolved	83% of Civil Cases Favorably Resolved in FY2005.	Favorably Resolve 80% of Civil Cases	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Resolution Facilitation	Resolution Facilitation: Percentage of successful matters resolved through mediation (Civil Rights Division)	Resolve 82% of matters successfully through mediation.	75% of matters successfully resolved through mediation.	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Number of Criminal and civil active investigations and HSR (Hart-Scott-Rodino Improvements Act of 1976) transactions reviewed per	17 Criminal and Civil active investigations and HSR transactions reviewed per FTE	Review 17 Criminal and Civil active investigations and HSR transactions reviewed per FTE	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					FTE [Anti Trust Division]			
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Average number of significant civil litigation activities to civil attorney FTE [Tax Division]	Ratio of 124 significant civil litigation activities to civil attorney	Average ratio of 124 significant civil litigation activities to civil attorney	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Ratio of dollars defeated and recovered to dollars obligated for Litigation (Civil Division)	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for the ratio of dollars defeated and recovered to dollars obligated for Litigation [Civil Division]	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Ratio of administrative support costs to program costs (Criminal Division)	Ratio of 70% administrative support costs to program costs	Ratio of 70% administrative support costs to program costs	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Total Dollars Saved the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (Defensive) [Environmental Resources Division]	\$14 Total Dollars saved the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (Defensive)	\$17 Total Dollars saved the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (Defensive)	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Total Dollars Awarded the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (Affirmative) [Environmental Resources Division]	\$75 Total Dollars Awarded the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (Affirmative)	\$76 Total Dollars Awarded the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (Affirmative)	Results for FY07 will be available Q1 FY08.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Internal Data Sharing: the number of different case management products within DOJ.	Seven different case management products are currently deployed within the DOJ litigating divisions in FY07.	The total number of case management products will be reduced from seven to four upon final deployment of LCMS in EOUSA, CIV, CRT and ENRD in FY09 and four to one upon final deployment in CRM, TAX, and ATR in FY11.	Results will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Complaints	Customer Satisfaction Surveys	85% Customer Satisfaction	86% Customer Satisfaction	Available Q1 FY09
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Judicial Hearings	Judicial Hearings (Judicial Trials): Percent of Criminal Cases Favorably Resolved	91% of Criminal Cases Favorably Resolved in FY2005	Favorably Resolve 90% of Criminal Cases	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Judicial Hearings	Judicial Hearings (Judicial Trials): Percent of Civil Cases Favorably Resolved	84% of Civil Cases Favorably Resolved in FY2005	Favorably Resolve 80% of Civil Cases	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Judicial Hearings	Resolution Facilitation: Percentage of successful matters resolved through mediation (Civil Rights Division)	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for the percentage of successful matters resolved through mediation (CRT Division).	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair	Processes and	Productivity and	Efficiency	Efficiency:	Baseline will be	Achieve the	Results for FY08

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	and Efficient Administration of Justice	Activities	Efficiency		Number of Criminal and Civil active investigations and HSR (Hart-Scott-Rodino Improvements Act of 1976) transactions reviewed per FTE (ATR Division).	established in 2007.	initial baseline target set for Criminal and Civil active investigations and HSR transactions reviewed per FTE (ATR Division).	will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Average number of significant civil litigation activities to civil attorney FTE (TAX Division).	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for the average of significant civil litigation activities to civil attorney FTE (TAX Division).	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Ratio of dollars defeated and recovered to dollars obligated for litigation (CIV) Division.	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for Ratio of dollars defeated and recovered to dollars obligated for litigation (CIV) Division.	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Ratio of administrative support costs to program costs (CRM Division).	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for Ratio of administrative support costs to program costs (CRM Division).	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Total dollars saved the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (ENRD Division).	2007 baseline will be established in Q1 2008.	Exceed the 2007 baseline target set for total dollars saved the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (ENRD Division).	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Total dollars awarded the Government per \$1 of expenditures (Affirmative) (ENRD Division).	2007 baseline will be established in Q1 2008.	Exceed the 2007 baseline target set for total dollars awarded the Government per \$1 of expenditures (Affirmative) (ENRD Division).	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Ratio of dollars defeated and recovered to dollars obligated for litigation (CIV) Division.	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for Ratio of dollars defeated and recovered to dollars obligated for litigation (CIV) Division.	Results for FY08 will be available Q1 FY09.
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Internal Data Sharing: the number of different case management products within DOJ.	Seven different case management products are operational within DOJ litigating divisions in FY08.	The total number of case management products will be reduced from seven to four upon final deployment of LCMS in EOUSA, CIV, CRT and ENRD in FY09 and four to one upon final deployment in CRM, TAX, and ATR in FY11.	Results will be available Q1 FY09.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction				

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Judicial Hearings	Judicial Hearings (Judicial Trials): Percent of Criminal Cases Favorably Resolved	91% of Criminal Cases Favorably Resolved in FY2005	Favorably Resolve 90% of Criminal Cases	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Judicial Hearings	Judicial Hearings (Judicial Trials): Percent of Civil Cases Favorably Resolved	84% of Criminal Cases Favorably Resolved in FY2005	Favorably Resolve 80% of Criminal Cases	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Mission and Business Results	Litigation and Judicial Activities	Judicial Hearings	Resolution Facilitation: Percentage of successful matters resolved through mediation (Civil Rights Division)	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for the percentage of successful matters resolved through mediation (CRT Division).	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Number of Criminal and Civil active investigations and HSR (Hart-Scott-Rodino Improvements Act of 1976) transactions reviewed per FTE (ATR Division).	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for Criminal and Civil active investigations and HSR transactions reviewed per FTE (ATR Division).	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Average number of significant civil litigation activities to civil attorney FTE (TAX Division)	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for Average number of significant civil litigation activities to civil attorney FTE (TAX Division).	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Ratio of dollars defeated and recovered to dollars obligated for litigation (CIV Division).	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for ratio of dollars defeated and recovered to dollars obligated for litigation (CIV Division).	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Ratio of administrative support costs to program costs (CRM Division).	Baseline will be established in 2007.	Achieve the initial baseline target set for the ratio of administrative support costs to program costs (CRM Division).	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Total dollars saved the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (ENRD Division).	2008 baseline will be established in Q1 2009.	Exceed the 2008 baseline target set for total dollars saved the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (ENRD Division).	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Efficiency: Total dollars awarded the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (ENRD Division).	2008 baseline will be established in Q1 2009.	Exceed the 2008 baseline target set for total dollars awarded the Government per \$1 of Expenditures (ENRD Division).	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Technology	Information and Data	Data Reliability and Quality	Internal Data Sharing: the number of different case management products within DOJ.	Seven different case management products are operational within DOJ litigating divisions in FY08.	The total number of case management products will be reduced from seven to four upon final deployment of LCMS in EOUSA.	Results for FY09 will be available Q1 FY10.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							CIV, CRT and ENRD in FY09 and four to one upon final deployment in CRM, TAX, and ATR in FY11.	

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, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. 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 listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

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:
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part Yes of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.

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)
LCMS	Government Only	11/7/2008	3/31/2008

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, NIST 800-26, Other, N/A)	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of No the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

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

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is No

requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

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?

NA

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
LCMS	No	No	The PIA is in the process of being finalized and will be completed and approved prior to system going operational 3/31/08.	Yes	The SORN is in the process of being finalized and will be completed and approved prior to system going operational 3/31/08.
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? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Litigation Case Management System (LCMS)

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Litigation and Judicial Activities Segment Architecture

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)
Automated data exchanges	Support for automated data exchanges between case management activities is needed to facilitate the timely exchange of case related information with other entities.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	0

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

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)
	An example of an external (i.e., with respect to a litigation Component) automated data exchange is the electronic transfer of case related data from a DOJ investigative Component (such as the FBI) to a U.S. Attorney.							
Data Management Services	Data management services determine what data elements should be captured and how data should be used and stored. These services facilitate the storage, processing, exchange, and general administration of case-related data. The functions provided by a data management include controlling, protecting, and facilitating timely, authorized access to data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Recovery			No Reuse	0
Data Management Services	Data management services determine what data elements should be captured and how data should be used and stored. These services facilitate the storage, processing, exchange, and general administration of case-related data. The functions provided by a data management include controlling, protecting, and facilitating timely, authorized access to data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation			No Reuse	0
Development and Integration Support	These services concern the operation and maintenance of development and integration (including testing)	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	0

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

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)
	environments that are used to prepare and stage enhancements (or upgrades) that are scheduled to be added to LCMS at some future date. Development and Integration Support services cover special purpose development environments and those used to enable communication between hardware/software applications, such as interfaces to the Victim Notification System (VNS) and debt collection systems.							
Development and Integration Support	These services concern the operation and maintenance of development and integration (including testing) environments that are used to prepare and stage enhancements (or upgrades) that are scheduled to be added to LCMS at some future date. Development and Integration Support services cover special purpose development environments and those used to enable communication between hardware/software applications, such as interfaces to the Victim Notification System (VNS) and debt collection systems.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			No Reuse	0
Graphics Presentation	These services, limited to matter or case management support needs, provide for the automated conversion of data into graphical or picture form to include	Business Analytical Services	Visualization	Graphing / Charting			No Reuse	0

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

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)
	presentation of information in the form of diagrams or tables; electronic images from pictures, paper forms, or graphics for static or dynamic use; or the representation of information in more than one form (e.g., text, graphics, and animated graphics).							
Knowledge Management Support	Limited to case management support needs, these services facilitate the handling of case-related documents and information in a multi-user operating environment. Knowledge management tools are needed to provide the ability to scan the content of all case files to glean data points that, when put together with data points from other files, form a pattern of information that informs an altogether different objective, such as Conflicts Checking (described in subsection 3.2.8).	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	0
Search Capabilities	Internal search capabilities enable the querying, lookup, and retrieval of specific data from the LCMS matter- or case-file database. A LCMS user also can browse through the internal database to find records entered by a certain attorney, cases decided in a particular jurisdiction, or records that contain a particular term. LCMS search support services also provide an ability to request the retrieval of matter- or case-	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	0

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

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)
	related information.							
Case File Management Services	This group of user-interfacing LCMS services addresses the need for the management and exchange of case information in the form of data, documents, records, and electronic media across DOJ and the extended case management enterprise. These services should include meaning, relevance, significance, sensitivity-levels, and other contextual indicators in addition to basic case file content.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	0
Security Management and Monitoring	This service addresses the need to control access to the LCMS system and case management related data by supporting the definition and management of user roles/privileges.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	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)
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Case Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Graphing / Charting	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	JSP
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	HTML
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

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)
	Integration			
Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Recovery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	

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., FirstGov, 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? 5/31/2006
 - 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: * Costs in millions			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Migrate to COTS-based Target Architecture and Solution	The existing case management environment will be migrated to a web-based COTS common solutions architecture. The systems integrator/vendor will assume much of the design, development, integration, and IT transition risk (rather than the government), through a performance-based contract, for designing and integrating a COTS-centered solution and for migrating legacy systems and databases to the new COTS-based Target Architecture.		

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

Alternative 4 was selected. The selected alternative is a performance-based contractor solution to implement a software system and provide maintenance for a Department-wide litigation case management system across the seven DOJ litigating components: the Executive Office for US Attorneys (EOUSA), the Antitrust Division (ATR), the Criminal Division (CRM), the Civil Division (CIV), the Civil Rights Division (CRT), the Environment and Natural Resources Division (ENRD), and the Tax Division (TAX).

The COTS solution was based on a leading industry application software suite from Siebel. That solution is best able to satisfy that varied business rules across the many divisions with a robust business rule management plan augmented with other software tools to provide greater flexibility and support for component uniqueness resulting in a system that can be used by non-technical users. The software also meets the LCMS scalability requirements.

The vendor has extensive experience implementing this COTS product. They demonstrated comprehensive change management and requirements management methodologies and tools and an excellent understanding of the data migration challenges. With their solid DOJ experience, they clearly defined specific goals for the development and implementation of LCMS.

The Government has partially mitigated its cost and schedule risk through the use of the performance-based contract under which the contractor will only bill 75% rather than 100% of its labor costs. 25% of labor costs is contributed to an incentive pool which the contractor must earn by meeting specific performance criteria resulting in a true, shared risk partnership with industry.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

The following specific qualitative benefits will be realized from the selected alternative in the LCMS program:

Information Sharing: Efficiently provide accurate and timely case and matter information to necessary DOJ components. Seamlessly share information within and between components and partners, and to DOJ leadership. Enables DOJ to act as a "unified law firm".

Cost Savings: Obtain cost savings through economies of scale and the reduction of duplicative investments. Reduce administrative burden and increase operational efficiencies (e.g., reduce the time to retrieve and validate "non-organic" information and eliminate duplicate data entry). Capitalize on high payoff processes improvements through an effective change management process.

Decision Support: Provide timely and accurate Department level litigation workload and performance reporting. Enables better

performance management and decision making.

Common Data Source: Provide a single data repository for litigation case management information, so data can be entered once and used often. Provides a single source for all DOJ litigation case management information across organizations.

The selected option provides the advantages of Commercial Off-the-shelf Software (COTS) including lower O&M costs and a regular path to technology and functionality upgrades.

5. 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:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
Civil Rights: Integrated Case Management System (ICM)		9/30/2009
Civil: Automated Case Management System (CASES), Automated Record Tracking System (ICM)		9/30/2009
Environment and Natural Resources: Case Management System (CMS), Infomaker, Query Wizard		9/30/2009
EOUSA: Legal Information Online System		11/30/2008

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? 8/4/2006

b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

As mentioned in prior sections, LCMS, with DOJ and OMB approval, underwent a re-plan effective April 2007. As a result, the Risk Management area is in the process of being strengthened by increasing its focus on identifying, defining the root cause of, and mitigating risks. The following changes have been made since last year's submission.

The software integrator has reviewed its Risk List, which it presents to the DOJ Program Management Office team at the monthly Risk Management Review, and has reviewed its candidate Issues List (issues being realized risks) to ensure that the real project risks and root cause analyses are being captured. Additional risks were identified through a detailed review of the Issues List. It is intended that both risks and issues be presented to the Risk Management Board for review. It was also decided that the actual risk exposure against planned risk exposure over time should be eliminated. It is time consuming to generate and too subjective. The software integrator has recommended that the project focus on what is important, i.e., identifying the risk, the root cause and any plans to have it mitigated, by when and not spending a lot of time tracking whether a particular risk exposure category went up or down. Updates are being proposed to the Risk Management Plan.

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:

Investment Risks are reflected through current contract forecasts and long term planning.

The contract Work Breakdown Structure Dictionary (WBS) establishes the Definition and assumptions associated with each product and element of work on the contract. It sets the basis for determination of risk, for example, there are definite possibilities that events could occur that require investment not covered in the assumptions.

On a monthly basis, a forecast of cost at completion (called the Estimate at Completion) for the contract is prepared. This forecast includes a roll-up through the WBS of expected cost associated with each identified work element. To this roll-up is added the Project Manager's quantified best estimate of risk impact. The Project Manager uses the risk register, which contains the risk list, probability of occurrence and cost impact or cost of mitigation for each risk, to identify those risks worthy of including in the forecast estimate. Typically, risks with probability of occurrence of greater than fifty percent and significant impact are included in the forecast as well as any mitigation activities not already included in the baseline. Cost factors in the risk register are based on technical and schedule impacts to the baseline.

The project's life cycle cost estimate is adjusted based on Estimate at Completion and updates to future cost estimates based on discoveries in current contract period.

Overall, risks are categorized as known or unknown. When known risks occur, they must be evaluated to determine whether mitigation/impact is within the scope of the contract and handled accordingly, either with a formal contract change or through internal replanning. A management reserve account is established to budget for unknown risks.

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

The LCMS contract was awarded May 31, 2006 and the start date of the I&I contractor was June 1, 2006. EVM is as of June 30, 2006. 20% CV of \$177,635 resulted from contractor initial staffing delays during the first month of the project.

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

Staffing should be completed by last week of July. Although August EVM report of July data will show improvement in Cost Variance, September report of August data will reflect full up staffing and current period reconciliation to plan.

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? Yes
 - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? 4/30/2007

Exhibit 300: JMD Litigation Case Management System (LCMS) (Revision 3)

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	Software Development: Critical Design Review	10/4/2006	\$4.968							0%
2	Software Development: Development and Configuration of EOUSA Baseline Complete	3/5/2007	\$8.536							0%
3	Integration Services: U.S. Attorneys' Offices and EOUSA Pilots Complete	6/5/2007	\$5.199							0%
4	EOUSA/USAO Initial Operating Capability	9/21/2007	\$6.094							0%
5	Integration Services: U.S. Attorney Offices and EOUSA Fielding Complete	3/5/2008	\$8.44							0%
6	Integration Services: CIV, ENRD, and CRT Pilots Complete	9/4/2008	\$9.198							0%
7	CIV, ENRD, and CRT Fielding ORR Complete	1/30/2009	\$7.043							0%
8	Integration Services: CIV, ENRD, and CRT	9/14/2009	\$10.855							0%

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			
	Fielding Complete									
9										
10										
11										
12	Planning Complete			6/1/2006	6/1/2006	\$4.744	\$4.767	0	\$-0.023	100%
13	EOUSA System Design			10/4/2006	12/6/2006	\$5.201	\$6.366	-63	\$-1.165	100%
14	Build 1 Design Complete			7/16/2007	8/3/2007	\$9.917	\$9.076	-18	\$0.841	100%
15	EOUSA Software Acceptance & Initial Deployment Decision			4/4/2008		\$15.802				0%
16	EOUSA Final Deployment Decision			8/15/2008		\$5.621				0%
17	End EOUSA Deployment			11/7/2008		\$12.909				0%
18	Task 6 Complete			9/4/2008		\$3.455				0%
19	Task 7 Initial Operating Capability			1/31/2009		\$4.619				0%
20	Task 7 Complete			9/14/2009		\$13.981				0%
21										
22										
23										
24										

