

Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure

Exhibit 300: Part I: Summary Information and Justification (All Capital Assets)

I.A. Overview

1. Date of Submission:	
2. Agency:	Department of Justice
3. Bureau:	Justice Management Division
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	011-03-02-00-01-3168-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	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:

This consolidated business case addresses the provisioning of DOJ's IT infrastructure, including Telecom/Network, Office Automation, & Computing/Processing investments. DOJ operates numerous loosely associated applications & systems that either use or provide organizational specific infrastructures to transact DOJ business. These infrastructures independently evolved prior to general acceptance & appreciation of enterprise architecture & planning. In most cases, existing infrastructure services duplicate, within the various organizations, services that today would be engineered for enterprise-wide use. DOJ recognizes the inefficiencies of that legacy approach & this business case represents the strategy & plans to modernize not only the physical infrastructure components but also associated planning, deployment, operations & maintenance practices. DOJ is an active participant in and supporter of the IOI and will review target performance metrics when published to evaluate impact on DOJ programs. Based on that evaluation, DOJ will determine how to best address optimization objectives & related efforts. DOJ intends to evolve to a centrally architected, consolidated infrastructure (CI) to facilitate improved life-cycle efficiencies, better interoperability, greater security, & more effective business process refinement & integration. ISE Data Call: The CI provides IT services needed in support of DOJ missions that include law enforcement, litigation, & related activities that include sharing of criminal record information with state/local/other federal agencies. DOJ participates in numerous interagency initiatives supporting intelligence & counterterrorism activities. The CI provides connectivity & hosting services for fusion centers & criminal databases supporting DOJ involvement with these activities, and provides networking services needed to access & deliver suspicious activity reports & watch lists. The CI supports the Law Enforcement Information Sharing Program, specifically intended to facilitate the flow of SBU investigative information to state, local, & federal agencies. DOJ exchanges EDS white page equivalent directory information with some other federal agencies using the CI. DOJ disseminates Violent Gang & Terrorist Organization File & criminal background & investigative information to subscribers, & operates

searchable systems to provide criminal background & watch list information to these organizations, as appropriate, using the CI.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?	
Name	
Carr, Michael	
Phone Number	202-514-9960
Email	Michael.Carr@usdoj.gov
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)?	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?	No
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	No
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all that apply:	Human Capital, Budget Performance Integration, Financial Performance, Expanded E-Government, Competitive Sourcing
13a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	Identifies and consolidates similar technology functions enabling a more competitive environment for acquisitions. Reduces redundant systems, applications, and spending. Simplifies/unifies by migrating systems, data, and processes to common solutions. Enables improved deployment economics. Frees individuals to perform core business duties.

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 the PART review?	No
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?	
c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes
If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-section.	
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 identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?	No
19. Is this a financial management system?	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMI A compliance area?	No
1. If "yes," which compliance area:	N/A
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 FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)	
Hardware	25
Software	9
Services	66

Budgetary Resources	863.1	147.27492	166.060843	186.252018					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	996.836	157.745267	178.470689	199.716959					
Operations & Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	2073.603	524.967984	539.498472	560.490378					
TOTAL									
Budgetary Resources	3070.439	682.713251	717.969161	760.207337					
Government FTE Costs									
Budgetary Resources	296.33641	1.077525	1.296274	1.36829					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	161	909.65	904.85	885.55					

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

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No

a. If "yes," How many and in what year?

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

Differences between the figures for BY 2008 and the previous figures for the project are due to lower appropriations and bureau allocations than those previously expected.

I.C. Acquisition/Contract Strategy

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table:

[Contracts/Task Orders Table](#)

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:

DOJ Project Managers (PMs) and/or Program Management Offices apply EVM principles to project efforts tailored to balance the costs of data gathering with the value of the management information being gathered. Use of ANSI 748 compliant EVM is required for major programs (e.g., large DME contracts exceeding threshold values of \$10M annually or \$25M lifecycle). Where earned value is not required in a contract, the PM or PMO performs EVM calculations. For the

contracts listed in the above Contracts/Task Orders Table where EVM is not in the contract, the following explanations apply: Row (Contract #) - Explanation: 1 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 2 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 3 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 10 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 16 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 19 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 21 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 23 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 24 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 25 - Work is steady state or "level of effort" support. The PM and/or PMO manages EVM aspects of the engagement. 28 - The contract is for outsourced managed network services (e.g., largely steady-state operational telecommunications and connectivity services).

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
a. Explain why:	Contractors will be required to certify that products and solutions will comply with Section 508 rules/guidance. The Department will ensure Section 508 compliance via contractual requirements, by decreasing the number of duplicative products needing to support Section 508, and by OCIO oversight of infrastructure initiatives.
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date?	6/30/2005
b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	
1. If "no," briefly explain why:	

I.D. Performance Information

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

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

Performance Information Table 1:

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2005	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Improve Project Management"; DOJ Strategic Plan Goal: "Ensure IT investments are Cost Effective"	Increase by 15% the share of JCON DME projects delivered within 10% of planned cost over the FY 2004 level.	70% JCON DME projects (component requirements analysis, system design, or system implementation) delivered within 10% of planned cost.	In FY 2005, 85% of JCON DME projects will be delivered within 10% of planned cost.	92%
2005	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Develop and Implement Common IT Solutions"	Increase by 75% the number of users in the Department covered by a consolidated, common office automation solution (JCON) over the FY 2004 level.	5,114 users in the JCON Program migrated to the JCON IIA standard architecture.	In FY 2005, 19,698 total users in participating components will be migrated to the JCON IIA standard architecture.	19276 users
2005	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Improve Project Management"; DOJ Strategic Plan Goal: "Ensure IT investments are Cost Effective"	Increase by 27% the share of JCON DME projects delivered within 10% of planned schedule over the FY 2004 level	58% JCON DME projects (component requirements analysis, system design, or system implementation) delivered within 10% of planned schedule	In FY 2005, 85% of JCON DME projects will be delivered within 10% of planned schedule	87%
2006	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Develop and Implement Common IT Solutions"	Increase by 44% the number of users in the Department covered by a consolidated, common office automation solution (JCON) over the FY 2005 level.	19,276 total users in the JCON Program migrated to the JCON IIA standard architecture.	In FY 2006, 35,000 total users in participating components will be migrated to the JCON IIA standard architecture.	
2006	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Develop and Implement Common IT Solutions"	Increase the number of components in the shared services infrastructure.	This is a new performance measure and there is no existing baseline in FY2006.	In FY 2006, 4 participating JCON components will migrate into the new shared services infrastructure.	
2007	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Develop and Implement Common IT Solutions"	Increase by 51% the number of users in the Department covered by a consolidated, common office automation solution (JCON) over the FY 2006 level.	35,000 total users in the JCON Program migrated to the JCON IIA standard architecture	In FY 2007, 71,000 total users in participating components will be migrated to the JCON IIA standard architecture.	
2007	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Develop and Implement Common IT Solutions"	Increase the number of components in the shared services infrastructure over the FY 2006 level by 100%.	Four components are migrated to the shared services infrastructure.	In FY 2007, a total of 8 participating JCON components will be migrated to the shared services	

				infrastructure.	
2007	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Develop and Implement Common IT Solutions"	Deploy new workstations to modernize participating JCON component desktops.	This is a new performance measure and there is no existing baseline in FY207.	In FY 2007, 17,000 new workstations will be deployed to modernize participating JCON component desktops.	
2008	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Develop and Implement Common IT Solutions"	Increase the number of components in the shared services infrastructure over the FY 2007 level by 62%.	8 components are migrated to the shared services infrastructure.	In FY 2008, a total of 13 participating JCON components will be migrated to the shared services infrastructure.	
2008	DOJ IT Strategic Plan Goal: "Develop and Implement Common IT Solutions"	Increase the number of new workstations deployed to modernize participating JCON components by 100%	Increase the number of new JCON workstations deployed by 1/3rd of the total JCON workstations to modernize participating JCON component desktops.	In FY 2008, 17,000 new workstations will be deployed to modernize participating JCON component desktops.	

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

Performance Information Table 2:							
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2005	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	The time it will take in minutes to refer the ticket to the project staff appropriate for the specific problem if the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly for a percentage of the tickets submitted over the course of a month.	Help Desk Escalation Time. If the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly, they will refer the ticket to project staff appropriate for the specific problem within 90 minutes of submission of the ticket for at least 90% of the time.	If the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly, they will refer the ticket to project staff appropriate for the specific problem within 80 minutes of submission of the ticket for at least 90% of the tickets submitted over the time.	Tickets were staffed within 80 minutes of at least 92% of the tickets.
2005	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	The time it will take in minutes to review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and	The Help Desk staff will review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution	The Help Desk staff will review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution	The Help Desk responded to 95% of the tickets in 24 minutes.

				initiate the resolution process of a Tier-3 ticket for a percentage of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month.	process within 30 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets received/ generated over the course of a month.	process within 25 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets received/ generated over the course of a month.	
2005	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	The average resolution time in minutes for tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly	For tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly, the average resolution time over the course of a month will be 90 minutes or less from the time of receipt or generation of the ticket	For tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly, the average resolution time over the course of a month will be 80 minutes or less from the time of receipt or generation of the ticket.	Staff addressed help desk tickets in 75 minutes or less.
2005	Mission and Business Results	Controls and Oversight	Program Monitoring	Program Monitoring - Investment Management	Management and oversight of EIBC investment not optimally aligned with infrastructure architecture delivery line of business.	Align oversight with infrastructure architecture delivery line of business.	Executive sponsorship and management moved to OCIO/ESS & DOJ Infrastructure Architecture Integrated Project Team (IA IPT) January 2005.
2005	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Dissemination	Number of products disseminated to SOD using Merlin as the classified delivery mechanism	Anticipating 40,000 products disseminated to SOD using Merlin	Increase number of products disseminated to SOD using Merlin by 20%	52,238 products were disseminated in FY05
2005	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of domestic sites that have gone through tech refresh	9/136 domestic sites = 7%	Tech refresh on 12 additional sites -- 21/136 = 15%	27 sites tech refreshed - - 27/136 = 20% 27vs.21 offices
2005	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of domestic sites that have been installed	104/136 domestic sites = 76%	Install 17 additional domestic sites -- 121/136 = 89%	15 domestic sites installed -- 119/136 = 88% 15vs.17 offices
2005	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of foreign sites that have been installed	39/52 foreign sites = 75%	Install 2 additional foreign sites -- 41/52 = 79%	1 foreign site installed -- 40/52 = 77% 1vs.2
2005	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of foreign sites that have	7/52 foreign sites = 13%	Tech Refresh on 12 additional sites -- 19/52 =	17 foreign sites tech refreshed --

				gone through tech refresh		37%	24/52 = 46% 17vs.12
2005	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	Percentage of users that are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability	90% of Merlin users report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	95%	95% of Merlin users are satisfied
2006	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	The time it will take in minutes to refer the ticket to project staff appropriate for the specific problem if the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly for a percentage of the tickets submitted over the course of a month	If the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly, they will refer the ticket for the specific problem within 80 minutes of submission of the ticket for at least 90% of the tickets submitted over the course of a month.	If the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly, they will refer the ticket to the specific problem within 75 minutes of submission of the ticket for at least 92% of the tickets submitted over the course of a month.	So far in FY06, tickets assigned to appropriate staff within 75 minutes for 90% of all tickets
2006	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	The time it will take in minutes to review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution process of a Tier-3 ticket for a percentage of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month.	Help Desk staff will review trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution process within 25 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month.	.Help Desk staff will review trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution process within 23 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month.	So far in FY06, resolution process initiated within 24 minutes for 95% of all tickets.
2006	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	The average resolution time in minutes for tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly	For tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly, the average resolution time over the course of a month will be 80 minutes or less from the time of receipt or generation of the ticket.	For tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly, the average resolution time over the course of a month will be 75 minutes or less from the time of receipt or generation of the ticket.	So far in FY06, average resolution time for tickets resolved by Help Desk was 76 minutes
2006	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Dissemination	Number of products disseminated to SOD using Merlin as the classified delivery mechanism	Anticipating 56,000 products disseminated to SOD using Merlin	Increase number of products disseminated to SOD using Merlin by 8%	So far in FY06, 48,108 products have been disseminated.
2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of domestic sites that have gone through tech refresh	27/136 domestic sites = 20%	Tech Refresh on 30 additional sites -- 57/136 = 42%	So far in FY06, 22 offices have been tech refreshed

2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of foreign sites that have gone through tech refresh	24/52 foreign sites = 46%	Tech Refresh on 6 additional sites -- 30/52 = 58%	So far in FY06, 3 sites have been tech refreshed
2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of domestic sites that have been installed	119/136 domestic sites = 88%	Install 10 additional sites - 129/136 = 95%	So far in FY06, 8 sites have been installed.
2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of foreign sites that have been installed	40/52 foreign sites = 77%	Install 4 additional sites -- 44/52 = 85%	So far in FY06, 1 foreign site has been installed
2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of domestic sites that have gone through tech refresh	57/136 domestic sites = 42%	Tech Refresh on 24 additional sites -- 81/136 = 60%	TBD
2006	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Security - Certification and Accreditation	New infrastructure services currently being developed and deployed, such as PKI, JUTNet, HSPD-12 are the focus of the Infrastructure Architecture IPT to ensure proper C&A.	Maintain 100% Certification and Accreditation for all Enterprise Infrastructure Services.	PKI and JUTNet programs have been certified and accredited. HSPD-12 is still in development.
2006	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	Percentage of users that are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability	95% of Merlin users report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	96% of Merlin users report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	So far in FY06, 95% of Merlin users reported satisfaction with the system.
2006	Technology	Information and Data	Data Standardization or Tagging	External Information Sharing	Currently, no common identity / credential exists with which to authenticate between agencies and business partners.	Implementation of the Department's public key infrastructure and distribution of credentials for use in email encryption and digital signatures currently being defined.	To Be Determined pending production deployment PKI services.
2007	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	The time it will take in minutes to refer the ticket to project staff appropriate for the specific problem if the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly for a percentage of the tickets submitted over the course of a month.	If the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly, they will refer the ticket for the specific problem within 75 minutes of submission of the ticket for at least 92% of the tickets submitted over the course of a month.	If the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly, they will refer the ticket for the specific problem within 75 minutes of submission of the ticket for at least 95% of the tickets submitted over the course of a month.	TBD

2007	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	The time it will take in minutes to review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution process of a Tier-3 ticket for a percentage of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month	The Help Desk staff will review the trouble ticket, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution process within 23 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month.	The Help Desk staff will review the trouble ticket, respond to the user, and initiate resolution process within 22 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month.	TBD
2007	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	The average resolution time in minutes for tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly	For tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly, the average resolution time over the course of a month will be 75 minutes or less from the time of receipt or generation of the ticket.	For tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly, the average resolution time over the course of a month will be 70 minutes or less from the time of receipt or generation of the ticket.	TBD
2007	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Dissemination	Number of products disseminated to SOD ASAC POC's in the field using Merlin as the classified delivery mechanism	Anticipating 67,200 products disseminated to SOD using Merlin	Increase number of products disseminated to SOD using Merlin by 20%	TBD
2007	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of foreign sites that have gone through tech refresh	30/52 foreign sites = 58%	Tech Refresh on 11 additional sites -- 41/52 = 79%	TBD
2007	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of domestic sites that have been installed.	129/136 domestic sites = 95%	Install 7 additional sites -- 136/136 = 100%	TBD
2007	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of foreign sites that have been installed.	44/52 foreign sites = 85%	Install 8 additional sites -- 52/52 = 100%	TBD
2007	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	Percentage of users that are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability	96% of Merlin users report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	96% of Merlin users report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	TBD
2008	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of components using shared services infrastructure	FY2006 baseline: 4	100%	
2008	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	The time it will take in minutes to refer the ticket	If the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3	If the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3	TBD

				to project staff appropriate for the specific problem if the Help Desk staff is not able to resolve a Tier-3 ticket directly for a percentage of the tickets submitted over the course of a month	ticket directly, they will refer the ticket for the specific problem within 75 minutes of submission of the ticket for at least 95% of the tickets submitted over the course of a month.	ticket directly, they will refer the ticket for the specific problem within an average of 70 minutes or less over the course of a month.	
2008	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	The time it will take in minutes to review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution process of a Tier-3 ticket for a percentage of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month	The Help Desk staff will review the trouble ticket, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution process within 22 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets received/generated over the course of a month.	The Help Desk staff will review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution process within an average of 20 minutes or less over the course of a month.	TBD
2008	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	The average resolution time in minutes for tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly	For tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly, the average resolution time over the course of a month will be 70 minutes or less from the time of receipt or generation of the ticket	For tickets that can be resolved by the Help Desk staff directly, the average resolution time over the course of a month will be 65 minutes or less from the time of receipt or generation of the ticket.	TBD
2008	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Dissemination	Number of products disseminated to SOD ASAC POCs in the field using Merlin as the classified delivery mechanism	Anticipating (56,600 x 20%) products disseminated to SOD using Merlin	Increase number of products disseminated to SOD using Merlin by 15%	TBD
2008	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Number and percentage of foreign sites that have gone through tech refresh	41/52 foreign sites = 79%	Tech Refresh on 11 additional sites -- 52/52 = 100% plus 13 more to refresh back through again.	TBD
2008	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Number and percentage of foreign sites that have gone through tech refresh	41/52 = 79%	Tech Refresh on 11 additional sites -- 52/52 = 100% plus 13 more to refresh back through again.	TBD
2008	Technology	Effectiveness	User	Percentage of users that	96% of Merlin users report	XX% of Merlin users report	TBD

			Satisfaction	are satisfied with the system capability and reliability	they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	
2008	Technology	Financial (Technology)	Support Costs	Align with Federal Infrastructure Optimization Initiative by establishing baseline, goals, and transition plan for Desktop and Support Services in FY2008.	This is a new measurement indicator and no baseline exists for FY08.		TBD
2008	Technology	Quality	Compliance and Deviations	Complete transition of network backbone to IPv6 by June 30, 2008.	This is a new measurement indicator and there is no existing baseline for FY08.		TBD

I.E. Security and Privacy

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

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

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

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: | Yes |
| a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: | 6.8990 |
| 2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment. | Yes |

3. Systems in Planning - Security Table:			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date

Enterprise Directory and Messaging	Government Only	12/31/2006	12/31/2006
FBI - Rebuilding the Infrastructure	Government Only	6/15/2007	9/30/2007
Live Communications Server	Government Only	9/30/2006	9/30/2006
Reporting and Analysis Center	Government Only	2/28/2007	2/28/2007
Video Teleconference System	Government Only	9/30/2006	9/30/2006

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
ATR GPSS	Government Only		Yes	7/19/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	7/26/2006	4/4/2006
CIV-JCON	Government Only		Yes	8/27/2004	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	5/26/2006	4/4/2006
CRM-JCON IIA	Government Only		Yes	6/30/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/15/2006	4/24/2006
CRS-JCON IIA	Government Only		Yes	11/2/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	1/6/2006	4/5/2006
CRT-JCON II	Government Only		Yes	2/21/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	2/20/2006	4/5/2006
DEA Firebird	Contractor and Government		Yes	10/6/2004	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/2/2006	5/11/2006
DEA Merlin	Contractor and Government		Yes	1/14/2004	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	5/26/2006	8/3/2005
ENRD-JCON	Government Only		Yes	8/22/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	2/10/2006	3/20/2006
EOIR JCON II/CASE	Government Only		Yes	4/28/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	4/17/2006	12/10/2005
FBI CJIS WAN	Government Only		Yes	3/30/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	3/17/2006	2/8/2006
FBI Law Enforcement Online	Contractor and Government		Yes	7/26/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	7/1/2006	5/31/2006
FBI SCION	Government Only		Yes	1/7/2004	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	5/25/2006	2/8/2006
JMD Consolidated Enterprise Security / PKI	Contractor and Government		Yes	6/13/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	7/3/2006	6/28/2006

JMD JUTNet	Contractor Only		Yes	6/16/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	7/14/2006	9/12/2005
OJP ENS	Government Only		Yes	2/2/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	2/20/2006	4/3/2006
SMO/JMD JCON	Government Only		Yes	4/12/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/12/2006	5/5/2006
USAO JCON IIA	Government Only		Yes	7/6/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	1/30/2006	3/21/2006
USMS IT	Government Only		Yes	4/27/2004	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	9/20/2005	4/4/2006
USMS MNET	Government Only		Yes	5/15/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	7/7/2006	4/4/2006
USTP JCON	Government Only		Yes	3/29/2004	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	8/11/2006	5/16/2006

5. Have any weaknesses related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

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

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is 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.

The "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year for the investments included as part of this Consolidated Business Case is 10.917%. Department of Justice has allocated \$55,574,966.00 for IT security for the investments listed below: ATF Communications Engineering Branch - \$3,061,700. ATF Enterprise Standard Architecture III (Seat Management) - \$4,113,600. FBI LEO - \$4,649,490. FBI SCION - \$785,196. FBI CJIS WAN - \$2,644,190. DEA MERLIN - \$941,900. DEA FIREBIRD - \$7,991,400. JMD Consolidated Enterprise Security/PKI - \$11,026,000. JMD JCON PMO - \$16,777,440. JMD Classified Information Technology Program (CITP) - \$969,800. USA Telecom - \$2,614,250. Weaknesses are routinely identified in operating systems requiring patches by the software companies. These patches necessitate the updating of systems in order to protect the systems from identified threats. Costs involved include the ongoing delivery and management of the patch management process. The security budget increase will also cover the ongoing costs associated with meeting the increased security requirements mandated in the President's Management Agenda and the Federal Information Security Management Act and defined in the Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) Publication 200.

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

Contractor systems undergo the same security assessment as Department of Justice (DOJ) Government systems, and in many cases, additional controls are reviewed and validated yearly, or when there is a major change to the system. In addition contractor systems must use the same security tools such as (vulnerability assessment scans and minimum security baseline policy) as DOJ. Contractor systems are tracked in the DOJ inventory, all systems undergo Certification and Accreditation (C&A) and all plans of actions and milestones (POA&Ms) are tracked in the DOJ agency wide POA&Ms.

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Is the PIA available to the public?	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?
DEA Firebird	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
DEA Merlin	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
FBI CJIS WAN	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
FBI Infrastructure Rebuild	Yes	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
FBI Law Enforcement Online	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
FBI SCION	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
JCON	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
JMD Consolidated Enterprise Security / PKI	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
JMD JUTNet	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
USMS MNET	No	No.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

I.F. Enterprise Architecture (EA)

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

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes

a. If "no," please explain why?

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.

Common Network Infrastructure (CNI) (JCON, JUTNet), Infrastructure & Technical Security Services.

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Service 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.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
IT Resource Management	Management of the relationships/processes, aggregating needs and negotiating for favorable discounts from suppliers who provide the necessary products and services required for the infrastructure to deliver services to consumers for the lowest unit costs.	Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Computers / Automation Management			No Reuse	7
Monitoring	Defines the set of capabilities that monitor a communications network in order to gather statistics on general usage.	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Network Management			No Reuse	7

Email Service	Defines the set of capabilities that support the transmission of memos and messages across the network.	Support Services	Collaboration	Email			No Reuse	20
Shared Calendaring	Defines the set of capabilities that allow an entire team as well as individuals to view, add and modify each others schedules, meetings and activities.	Support Services	Collaboration	Shared Calendaring			No Reuse	5
Task Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support a specific undertaking or function assigned to an employee.	Support Services	Collaboration	Task Management			No Reuse	5
Threaded Discussions	Defines the set of capabilities that support the running log of remarks and opinions about a given topic or subject.	Support Services	Collaboration	Threaded Discussions			No Reuse	1
Instant Messaging	Defines the capabilities that support keyboard conferencing over a Local Area Network or the internet between two or more people.	Support Services	Communication	Instant Messaging			No Reuse	1
Real Time / Chat	Defines the capabilities that support the conferencing capability between two or more users on a local area network or the internet.	Support Services	Communication	Real Time / Chat			No Reuse	1
Authorization	Defines the set of capabilities that grant/determine what access a user may have to a particular resource or piece of data.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	5
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Defines the set of capabilities that support the identification and monitoring of activities within an application, system, or network.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	5
Access Provisioning / Deprovisioning	Defines the set of capabilities that support the lifecycle process through which access and authorization policies are managed.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	5
Identity Authentication	Defines the set of capabilities to support validation of a user's claim of identity	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	5
Intrusion Prevention	Defines the set of capabilities that support the detection of unauthorized	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Detection			No Reuse	5

	access to a government information system.							
Credential Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the creation, management, and disposition of credentials. This can include electronic identity data, as well as access cards	Support Services	Security Management	NEW			No Reuse	7
License Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the purchase, upgrade and tracking of legal usage contracts for system software and applications.	Support Services	Systems Management	License Management			No Reuse	3
Maintenance	Defines the set of capabilities that monitor a communications network in order to gather statistics on general usage.	Support Services	Systems Management	NEW			No Reuse	5
Trouble Shooting / Repair	Defines the set of capabilities that diagnose problems and determine and implement solutions.	Support Services	Systems Management	NEW			No Reuse	3
Image Loading	Defines the capabilities that support the propagation and installation of pre-defined image which would include OS, applications and patches.	Support Services	Systems Management	NEW			No Reuse	1
Patch Loading	Defines the capabilities that support the propagation and installation application and component patches	Support Services	Systems Management	NEW			No Reuse	5
Remote Administration	Defines the capabilities that support the monitoring and administration of applications and enterprise systems from locations outside of the immediate system environment.	Support Services	Systems Management	Remote Systems Control			No Reuse	3
License Loading	Defines the capabilities that support the propagation, installation and upgrade of written computer programs, applications and components.	Support Services	Systems Management	Software Distribution			No Reuse	1

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

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.

'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.

Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

4. Technical Reference Model (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	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	PKI, HSPD-12
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	WS-Security, SAML
Email	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Outlook 2003, Exchange 2003
Shared Calendaring	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Outlook 2003, Exchange 2003
Task Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Outlook 2003, Exchange 2003
Threaded Discussions	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	TBD
Instant Messaging	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	TBD
Real Time / Chat	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	TBD
Email	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	IMAP, POP3, X.500, SMTP
Intrusion Prevention	Service Platform and	Hardware /	Network Devices /	Firewall

	Infrastructure	Infrastructure	Standards	
Intrusion Detection	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	IDS, Interasys Dragon
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Enterprise Servers: Dell 2850, 6850; HP DL380; IBM AIX P595, P690
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	HP Openview, Ciscoworks, BMC Patrol
License Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	SMS 2003
Software Distribution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	SMS 2003
Remote Systems Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Windows RDP, Citrix
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Windows Server 2003
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	

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

In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system? No

a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?

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

government information and services).

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

II.A. Alternatives Analysis

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?	7/30/2004
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:

Send to OMB	Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
True	Alternative 1 - Continue office automation (OA) consolidation in 16 DOJ components across the Department.	This alternative consists of centrally funding and coordinating the planning, acquisition and implementation of a standardized COTS product-based office automation architecture across 16 of DOJ's components which is overseen by a dedicated program management office - the Justice Consolidated Office Network (JCON) PMO. The PMO serves as the central OA management, funding, and coordination organization; as well as a center of excellence in office automation systems implementation.	1627.378	0

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

Alternative 1 was chosen because it has the lowest lifecycle cost and has a centralized leadership, funding and IT management coordination structure that provides acquisition support to the 16 Department components and OA project management support. Alternative 1 - for which there is a dedicated and centralized Program Management Office that consolidates acquisition and OA project management and technical support to components - institutes a standardized deployment methodology to facilitate knowledge transfer, minimize technical risks, and reduce installation costs across all OA deployments regardless of the participating organization in the Department. The financial benefits and cost savings generated by the PMO structure of Alternative 1 far exceed the annual operating costs of the PMO. Alternative 1 - because of the additional centralized OA deployment project management support - stipulates the steps needed to plan, design, test, and implement initial systems and architecture upgrades. This standardization of system deployments and the standard system documentation templates created and maintained by the JCON PMO are re-used by the different participating DOJ components, resulting in significant cost and time savings by eliminating duplication of effort by engineering/system installation/integration contractors. The JCON Standard Architecture, the cornerstone of Alternative 1, facilitates work process improvements within each JCON component. The JCON Architecture provides the infrastructure upon which components implement a wide range of office automation tools. In summary, Alternative 1 was selected because it had the lowest lifecycle cost, highest return on investment, and will result in (1) maximum technical interoperability and architectural standardization between component systems; (2) maximum levels of system security and effectiveness of security compliance mechanisms; and (3) maximum acquisition efficiencies and savings and consolidated Departmental purchasing power.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Returns for this investment and the comparison of the three alternatives were based on three main criteria: (1) maximum technical interoperability and architectural standardization between component OA systems; (2) maximum levels of system security and effectiveness of security compliance mechanisms; and (3) IT cost savings, acquisition efficiencies and consolidated Departmental purchasing power. This investment continues to deliver quantitative benefits to the Department and is the most favorable alternative with respect to the three ROI criteria described and to the order of magnitude of savings/quantitative benefits that the JCON Program delivers to the Department's participating components. A complete and formal cost-benefit analysis has not yet been completed for this investment/program; however, the JCON Program has done an initial, high-level cost-benefit and alternatives analysis that is summarized in this Exhibit 300. Based on the Program's initial analysis, the most significant quantitative benefits delivered by this investment are: licensing cost savings (resulting from the JCON PMO's acquisition of enterprise site licenses), administrative acquisition cost savings (based on the centralized OA acquisition support and specialized contract vehicles established and managed by the JCON PMO), savings on contractor engineering services (based on negotiated discounted rates from vehicles established and managed by the JCON PMO), and savings on hosting services centrally managed and funded by the JCON PMO for participating components. Annually, this investment (Alternative 1-the JCON Program) delivers approximately \$4 million in savings across the Department (among the 16 participating components) for Microsoft Support services. Savings for contractor engineering services average between 5 to 15% for components, across all phases of their OA deployments - system requirements analysis, system design, and system implementation - with the greatest savings being realized in OA system design projects. Based on industry research in IT infrastructure implementation, as component OA systems and activities are increasingly standardized, the JCON Program also expects that the Department will realize system operations and maintenance cost savings among the components that are consolidated under JCON.

II.B. Risk Management

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?	6/30/2005
b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No
c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:	

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?	
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:

The JCON PMO is in the process of revising their Risk Management Plan to include risk adjustments for both investment schedule and cost estimate.

II.C. Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748?	Yes
--	-----

2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):

a. What is the Planned Value (PV)?	66915
b. What is the Earned Value (EV)?	65064
c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?	61378
d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Contractor and Government

e. "As of" date:	6/30/2006
3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)?	0.97
4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?	-1851
5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?	1.06
6. What is the cost variance (CV=EV-AC)?	3686
7. 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?	
b. If "yes," explain the variance:	
c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?	
d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"?	
8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?	No
8. If "yes," when was it approved by OMB?	No

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (Estimated)	Completion Date		Total Cost		Schedule (# days)	Cost	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
1	National Email and Directory Services	01/29/2010	\$34.180	01/29/2010	01/29/2010	\$34.180	\$2.132	0	\$32.048	6%
2	Completion of JCON IIA Upgrades	02/28/2008	\$108.154	02/28/2008	02/28/2008	\$108.154	\$65.309	0	\$42.846	62.28%
3	USA JCON IIA Deployment	10/31/2006	\$15.208	10/31/2006	10/31/2006	\$15.208	\$15.183	0	\$0.025	100%
4	USMS JCON IIA Deployment	09/30/2005	\$18.093	09/30/2005	09/28/2005	\$18.093	\$16.490	2	\$1.604	100%
5	CIV JCON IIA Deployment	08/26/2005	\$3.509	08/26/2005	10/03/2005	\$3.509	\$3.583	-38	(\$0.074)	100%

39										
40										
41										
42										
43	Merlin FY06	09/30/2006	\$6.742	09/30/2006		\$6.742	\$2.961		\$3.781	44.03%

\$