

**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:   | 8/24/2007                              |
| 2. Agency:   | Department of Justice                  |
| 3. Bureau:   | Agency-Wide (Doj)                      |
| 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.)  | 011-00-02-00-01-3168-00                |
| 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:

This consolidated business case addresses the provisioning of DOJ's IT infrastructure, including Telecom/Network, Office Automation, and Computing/Processing investments. DOJ operates numerous loosely associated applications and systems that either use or provide organizational specific infrastructures to transact DOJ business. These infrastructures independently evolved prior to general acceptance and appreciation of enterprise architecture and 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 and this business case represents the strategy and plans to modernize not only the physical infrastructure components but also associated planning, deployment, operations and maintenance practices. DOJ intends to evolve to a centrally architected, consolidated infrastructure to facilitate improved life-cycle efficiencies, better interoperability, greater security, and more effective business process refinement and integration.

DOJ is an active participant in and supporter of the IT Infrastructure LoB. In FY08, DOJ will collect and provide information on baseline performance for (1) Mainframes and Servers Services and Support, and (2) Telecommunications Systems and Support; and will report information on costs and service levels for (3) End User Systems and Support, using performance metrics developed by the ITI LoB. In FY09, DOJ will report information on costs and service levels in all three infrastructure areas. Once targets are established, DOJ will develop and submit a 5-year optimization plan and annual progress reports to meet or exceed the performance targets.

- |   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| 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 |
| a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?   | TBD                    |
| 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                     |

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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:

- Human Capital
- Budget Performance Integration
- Financial Performance
- Expanded E-Government
- Competitive Sourcing

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?)

Human Capital: Helps organize and coordinate tech & mgmt focus and core competencies.  
 Budget Perf Integration: metrics for service level performance and cost efficiency drive performance.  
 Financial Performance: aggregated buys leverage economies of scale. Expand Egov: provides common infrastructure to enable mission success through electronic government solutions. Competitive Sourcing: Consolidating infrastructure services enables a more competitive environment for acquisitions.

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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part).) No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? No

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) No

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA 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	31
Software	12
Services	55
Other	2

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the N/A

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?

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

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

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	<b>PY-1 and earlier</b>	<b>PY 2007</b>	<b>CY 2008</b>	<b>BY 2009</b>	<b>BY+1 2010</b>	<b>BY+2 2011</b>	<b>BY+3 2012</b>	<b>BY+4 and beyond</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning:	142.049734	17.834995	19.315137	17.045505					
Acquisition:	983.016243	193.018771	170.18301	163.657666					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	1125.065977	210.853766	189.498147	180.703171					
Operations & Maintenance:	2178.203103	562.029001	592.003779	619.784211					
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>3303.269080</b>	<b>772.882767</b>	<b>781.501926</b>	<b>800.487382</b>					
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	371.99811	14.76	15.068	16.505					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	406	102	102	107					

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?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: Differences between the figures for BY 2009 and the previous figures for the investment are due to lower appropriations and bureau allocations than those previously expected.

The consolidated business case has also been updated to include additions to the investment portfolio.

**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: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)
[JUTNet] DJJ 04F0896	T&M	Yes	5/1/2007	5/1/2007	10/31/2009		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Simmons, Connie	202-307-1995 / Connie.H.Simmons@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[JUTNet] GS00T01AHD002	IDIQ	Yes	11/1/2004	11/1/2004	2/1/2009	125	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	FTS2001, GSA	/ FTS2001@GSA.GOV	Level N/A	Yes
[DEA Firebird] DJDEA-05-C-0009	FITS (T&M, Fixed Price)	Yes	11/1/2004	11/1/2004	10/30/2009		No	Yes		NA	Yes	Yes	Paul Osterhaus	/ Paul.t.osterhaus@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[DEA Firebird] DEA-02-C-0036	Fixed Price	Yes	9/29/2002	9/29/2002	9/29/2007	4.705	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Paul Osterhaus	/ Paul.t.osterhaus@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[DEA Firebird] DJDEA-06-C-0040	Fixed Price	Yes	9/26/2005	9/26/2005	9/25/2010		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Paul Osterhaus	/ Paul.t.osterhaus@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[DEA Firebird] DEA-04-C-0031	Fixed Price	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2011		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Paul Osterhaus	/ Paul.t.osterhaus@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[DEA Firebird] DJDEA-06-C-0003	Mix (T&M, Fixed Price)	Yes	10/1/2005	10/1/2005	9/30/2010		No	Yes		NA	Yes	Yes	Paul Osterhaus	/ Paul.t.osterhaus@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[DEA Firebird] DJDEA-05-C-0044	Fixed Price	Yes	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	9/29/2010		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Paul Osterhaus	/ Paul.t.osterhaus@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[DEA Firebird] DEA-03-C-0042	Fixed Price	Yes	3/1/2003	3/1/2003	9/14/2008	8.278	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Paul Osterhaus	/ Paul.t.osterhaus@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[DEA Merlin] DJDEA-06-C-0014	Contract Plus Fixed Fee	Yes	3/28/2006	4/1/2006	3/31/2011		No	No		NA	Yes	Yes	Didaleuski, Linda	/ Linda.Didaleuski@usdoj.gov	Level 3	

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)
[SIMC] HSPD-12 PMO	T&M	Yes	8/16/2006	8/16/2006	2/15/2009	13	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Bowles, Bettie	/	Level 3	
[SIMC] HSPD-12 Support Services		No	9/1/2007	9/15/2007												
[CITP] PMO Support	T&M	Yes	12/21/2004	12/21/2004	9/30/2008	5.734	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Simmons, Connie	202-307-1995 / Connie.H.Simmons@usdoj.gov	Level 3	
[JCON] DJJ03F0802 D007	T&M	Yes	4/23/2004	4/23/2004	9/30/2007	12.03417	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James A	/ James.A.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ03F0802 D015	T&M	Yes	12/21/2004	1/1/2005	9/30/2008	4.1064	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James A	/ James.A.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[CJIS] NETWORKX		No	8/1/2007	8/1/2007												
[CJIS] FBI-0712CiscoV2	Firm Fixed Price	Yes	3/1/2007	3/1/2007	2/29/2012		Yes	Yes		NA	Yes	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5061 brogers5@leo.gov /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] J-FBI-99021	Telephone System for the Miami Field Office	Yes	1/1/1999	4/1/1999	3/1/2009	0.989	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] S6G605486	Telephone System Las Vegas Field Office	Yes	4/1/2006	9/1/2006	8/1/2016		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAU99031N	Telephone System Indianapolis Field Office	Yes	6/1/1999	10/1/1999	9/1/2009	0.503	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] J-FBI-98-075	Telephone System for the Albany Field Office	Yes	7/14/1998	10/1/1998	9/1/2008	0.566	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM401	Telephone System Albuquerque Field Office	Yes	3/1/2004	7/1/2004	6/1/2014		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAU9905TS	Telephone System for the Tucson Field Office	Yes	11/1/1999	4/1/2000	3/1/2010		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] S5G504788	Telephone System Springfield Field Office	Yes	4/1/2005	10/1/2005	10/1/2015		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM507	Telephone System San Francisco Field Office	Yes	8/6/2005	8/6/2005	8/18/2016		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAU9903SA	Telephone System San Antonio Field Office	Yes	7/1/1999	11/1/1999	10/1/2009		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM102 PG	Telephone System for the Pittsburgh Field Office	Yes	7/1/2004	12/1/2001	1/1/2010		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAU99-06PX	Telephone System for the Phoenix Field Office	Yes	11/1/1999	1/1/2000	12/1/2009		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] S4G4706728	Telephone System for the Milwaukee Field Office	Yes	9/1/2004	12/1/2004	2/28/2014		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] J-FBI-97-026	Telephone System for the Washington Field Office	Yes	4/1/1997	8/1/1997	7/1/2007	3.856	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM002 RH	Telephone System for the	Yes	9/1/2000	2/1/2001	1/1/2011		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)
	Richmond Field Office															
[Ent Tel] S6G605970	Telephone System for the Jackson Field Office	Yes	9/19/2006	10/1/2006	2/1/2007	0.041	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM103	Telephone System for the Omaha Field Office	Yes	9/1/2001	6/1/2002	5/1/2012		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAU99003	Telephone System for the Newark Field Office	Yes	1/7/1999	10/1/1999	11/1/2009		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAU9904	Telephone System for the Ft. Monmouth Computer	Yes	9/1/1999	11/1/1999	11/1/2009		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM400	Telephone System for the Denver Field Office	Yes	1/1/2004	7/1/2004	6/1/2014		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM293	Telephone System for the Dallas Field Office	Yes	9/1/2002	11/1/2002	10/1/2012		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM506	Telephone System for the Chicago Field Office	Yes	11/1/2005	4/1/2006	4/1/2016		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM405 BO	Telephone System for the Boston Field Office	Yes	9/1/2004	12/1/2004	12/1/2014		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM505 AK	Telephone System for the Anchorage Field Office	Yes	9/1/2005	12/1/2005	12/1/2016		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] TCAU9906PO	Telephone System for	Yes	10/1/1999	12/1/1999	11/1/2009		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	



Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)	
	the Portland Field Office																
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM311	Telephone System for the 1001 Pa Ave- HQ Expansion	Yes	3/1/2004	5/1/2004	4/1/2014		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		
[Ent Tel] LFMM3-101	Telephone System for the TSC Crystal City	Yes	9/1/2003	10/1/2003	9/1/2013		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM504	Telephone System for the WFO annex (China)	Yes	7/1/2005	12/1/2005	11/1/2015		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM302	Telephone System for the Chantilly Office	Yes	6/1/2003	12/1/2003	11/1/2013		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM03SD	Telephone System for the San Diego Field Office	Yes	9/1/2000	11/1/2000	11/1/2010		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		
[Ent Tel] J-FBI-98-065	Telephone System for the Quantico, VA Office	Yes	6/1/1998	1/1/1999	12/1/2008	3.2	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		
[Ent Tel] S6G603399	Telephone System for the New Orleans Field Office	Yes	11/1/2005	5/1/2006	5/1/2016		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		
[Ent Tel] TCAUMM101JK	Telephone System for the Jacksonville Field Office	Yes	10/1/2001	11/1/2001	11/1/2011		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		
[Ent Tel] TCAU9906H	Telephone System for	Yes	10/1/1999	1/1/2000	1/1/2010		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2		

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)
O	the Honolulu Field Office															
[Ent Tel] J-FBI-98-056	Telephone System for the El Paso Field Office	Yes	4/1/1998	6/1/1998	6/1/2008	0.536	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] S6G605971	Telephone System San Juan Field Office	Yes	10/15/2006	3/1/2007	2/28/2017		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] S6G607698	Telephone system for the San Jose RA	Yes	10/15/2006	2/1/2007	1/31/2017		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[Ent Tel] S6G607739	Telephone System for the Kansas City Field Office	Yes	9/13/2006	10/1/2006	2/28/2017		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Harry Perkins	202-324-8538 /	Level 2	
[LEO] A7A705664	T&M	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2007	8.631	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Mike Konchesky	304-625-4031 /	Level 1	
[LEO] Z7G700786	FFP	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2007	0.264	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Mike Konchesky	304-625-4031 /	Level 1	
[LEO] A7D705729	T&M	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2007	2.602	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5061 /	Level 1	
[LEO] A71700790	CPFF	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2007	0.132	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5061 /	Level 1	
[LEO] M7D701300	CPFF	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2007	0.787	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Kathrina Sliger	304-625-4142 /	Level 1	
[LEO] A7D0503505	GWAC	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2007	0.06	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Mike Konchesky	304-625-4031 /	Level 1	
[LEO] A7M0402303	CPFF	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2007	0.185	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Mike Konchesky	304-625-4031 /	Level 1	
[LEO] A7D0619610	GWAC	Yes	10/1/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2007	0.413	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Kathrina Sliger	304-625-4142 /	Level 1	
[Net Srvs] 2(Dell)	BPA	Yes	6/9/2005	9/5/2006	9/30/2008	43.46	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5725 / brogers@leo.gov	Level 2	
[Net Srvs]	FFP	Yes	10/28/2004	10/28/2004	10/28/2009		No	No		NA	No	Yes	Susan Smith	304-625-	Level 1	

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)
GS-35FF-0070R														2441 /		
[Net Srvs] GS00T99NR D2001	GWAC	Yes	12/18/1998	1/11/1999	12/31/2008	318.8	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Sybill E. Seltmann	703-610-2836 /	Level 1	
[Net Srvs] FBI-0712CISCOV 2	FFP	Yes	3/1/2007	3/1/2007	2/29/2012		No	No		NA	Yes	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5061 / brogers5@le o.gov	Level 2	
[Net Srvs] A51602070-A61604665	Interagency Agreement	Yes	12/15/2004	12/15/2004	12/15/2009		Yes	Yes		NA	No	No	Deanna D. Davis	202-324-5552 /	Level 1	
[Net Srvs] 1007HP	BPA	Yes	10/27/2006	3/31/2007	9/30/2008	4	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5725 / brogers5@le o.gov	Level 2	
[Net Srvs] A6167687	Interagency Agreement	Yes	9/15/2006	9/15/2006	9/30/2007	1.852	Yes	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Francine Hemphill	202-324-2192 /	Level 1	
[Net Srvs] A61604306	Interagency Agreement	Yes	12/2/2005	12/2/2005	9/30/2007	1	Yes	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Francine Hemphill	202-324-2192 /	Level 1	
[Net Srvs] A71706616	Interagency Agreement	Yes	2/12/2007	2/12/2007	2/11/2008	3.1	Yes	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Francine Hemphill	202-324-2192 /	Level 2	
[Tech Refr] 1007HP	BPA	Yes	10/27/2006	3/31/2007	9/30/2008	4	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5061 brogers5@le o.gov /	Level 2	
[Tech Refr] 2 (Dell)	BPA	Yes	6/9/2005	6/9/2005	9/30/2008	43.46	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5061 brogers5@le o.gov /	Level 2	
[Tech Refr] 1007LPTPS	BPA	Yes	11/9/2006	11/9/2006	3/31/2008	4	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Barbara Rogers	304-625-5061 brogers5@le o.gov /	Level 2	
[Tech Refr] TBD		No	9/14/2007	11/1/2007												
[SCION] GS35F0161K (ManTech))	FFP	Yes	9/26/2003	9/26/2003	9/30/2008	28.6	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Green, Luwanna	202-324-3319 / Luwanna.Gre ene@ic.fbi.g ov	Level 2	

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)
[SCION] A21205670( SPAWAR)	IA	Yes	9/10/2002	10/1/2002	9/30/2008	27.9	Yes	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Hemphill, Francine	202-324-2192 / need_email@doj.gov	Level 2	
[SCION] DJJ05C1114 D3A (KEANE)	IDIQ	Yes	3/1/2006	3/16/2006	9/30/2008	0.5	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Holman, Melissa	202-324-3287 / mholman@fb.i.gov	Level 2	
[JCON] 01-F-0465	T&M	Yes	9/27/2001	10/1/2001	9/30/2007	8.865	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ03F0802 D007	T&M	Yes	4/23/2004	4/23/2004	9/30/2007	10.906	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ03F0802 D015	T&M	Yes	12/21/2004	1/1/2005	9/30/2008	4.778	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ06F1333	T&M	Yes	11/9/2005	1/3/2006		0.659	No	No		NA	No	Yes	Freeman, Kenneth H	/ Kenneth.H.Freeman@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ03F0802 D022	FP / T&M	Yes	5/24/2006	5/24/2006	9/30/2007	2.647	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ06F1462	T&M	Yes	8/22/2006	9/1/2006	9/30/2009	3.624	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Newsom, Gregory L	202-307-1962 / Gregory.L.Newsom@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ03F0801 D018	T&M	Yes	9/28/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2009	1.315	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ03F0802 D023	T&M	Yes	9/28/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2009	1.349	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ03F0803 D013	T&M	Yes	9/28/2006	10/1/2006	9/30/2009	1.128	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] DJJ03F0801 D020	FP / T&M	Yes	6/7/2007	6/7/2007	12/13/2007	0.115	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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)
[JCON] DJJ03F0803 D014	T&M	Yes	6/11/2007	6/11/2007	1/10/2008	0.893	No	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Stefan, James	/ james.Stefan@usdoj.gov	Level N/A	Yes
[JCON] TBD under BPA DJJ03F0803		No	8/27/2007	9/3/2007												

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:

For the contracts listed in the above Contracts/Task Orders Table where EVM is not in the contract, the following explanations apply:

Rows 1, 11-13, 79, 82, 84 - The contract is for PMO "level of effort" support.

Rows 2, 5-6, 8-9, 18-62, 64-65, 67, 69-75 - The contract is for steady state and/or O&M services.

Rows 76-78 - EVM is not a contractual requirement. However, to meet ANSI-748 compliance, contractors report costs, completion methods, and variances to DOJ on a monthly basis, and the PM/PMO manages and reports on earned value.

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? 9/17/2007

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](http://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
2005	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	Response time to service calls	Less than 2 hours	Less than one hour	TBD
2005	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[JN01] Number and % of CONUS and OCONUS sites that have been migrated to JUTNet.	First year of migration to JUTNet: 0 of estimated 2200 JUTNet Sites	Install 175 of 2000 sites - 175/2000 = 8%	Installed 175 of 2200 sites.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[DM01] The time it takes in minutes to refer the ticket to project staff appropriate for the problem when 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. Unresolved Tier-3 tickets refer 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 course of a month.	Help Desk Escalation Time. Unresolved Tier-3 tickets refer to project staff appropriate 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.	Tickets assigned to appropriate staff within 75 minutes for 90% of all tickets.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	[DM02] The time it will take in minutes to review the trouble ticket entry, respond	The Help Desk staff will review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the	The Help Desk staff will review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the	Resolution process initiated within 24 minutes for 95% of all tickets.

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					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.	resolution process within 25 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets generated over the course of a month.	resolution process within 23 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets generated over the course of a month.	
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	[DM03] 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.	Average resolution time for tickets resolved by Help Desk was 76 minutes.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Dissemination	[DM04] 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%	58,833 products were disseminated.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Criminal Investigation and Surveillance	[DF01] The percentage of known DEA offices that have direct access to Firebird.	2005 results.	Enable the DEA Law Enforcement-related IT systems by increasing the total number of DEA field offices that have in-office access to Firebird by 3%.	There were 374 offices with Direct access in FY 05. That total has increased to 389 for an increase of nearly 4%.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[DF03] The number of sites in which network servers in the field were migrated from Windows NT to Windows 2000.	2005 results of the Windows 2000 server migration.	Migrate 90 sites to Windows NT servers	In FY06, 96 sites were completed
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DF02] Productivity. The number and percentage of XP workstations that were replaced with the latest generation of desktop hardware.	2005 results of the 4-year Technology Refreshment cycle to replace 3,750 (25%) of Firebird workstations per year.	Replace 3,750 Firebird workstations.	For FY 06, over 7400 workstations were received a Technology Refresh.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM05] 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%	42 additional offices have been tech refreshed.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM06] 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%	10 additional sites have been tech refreshed.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM07] Number and percentage of domestic sites that have been installed	119/136 domestic sites = 88%	Install 10 additional sites - 129/136 = 95%	9 additional sites have been installed.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM08] Number and percentage of foreign sites that have been installed	40/52 foreign sites = 77%	Install 4 additional sites - 44/52 = 85%	1 additional foreign site has been installed

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[JN02] Number and % of CONUS and OCONUS sites that have been migrated to JUTNet.	175/2200 sites = 8%	Install 1475 additional sites for a total of 1650 / 2200 Sites = 75%	Installed 1149 of 1910** sites. # of Sites to be migrated restated to 1910
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	[DF04] Complaints. The number of service tickets received by Tier 1 support.	2005 Results of the total number of service tickets were 52,334.	Reduce the number of service tickets by 20%	Number of tickets increased from 52,334 in FY05 to 55,318 in FY06
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	[DM09] 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.	95% of Merlin users reported satisfaction with the system.
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DF05] Availability. Percentage of network uptime.	2005 Firebird results	Improve system availability to 99.9%	As of June 2007, The percentage of Firebird uptime was 99.3%
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DF06] Availability. The number of days the Firebird network is taken down at the field office in order to migrate the server from Windows NT to Windows 2000. Server downtime is necessary but is inconvenient to the users at that site.	Scheduled Firebird downtime = 2.5 business days per Windows 2000 server migration.	Decrease IT scheduled downtime by 20% to 2 business days per office.	2.5 days/site
2006	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DM11] Percentage of time system is available	The Merlin enterprise-level servers will have an 'up-time' during operational hours of at least 99.5% of the time over the course of a month. (Note: A correctly handled automatic server fail-over is considered 'up').	The Merlin enterprise-level servers will have an 'up-time' during operational hours of at least 99.6% of the time over the course of a month. (Note: A correctly handled automatic server fail-over is considered 'up').	Server up-time over the course of a month was 99%.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	[FC02] 100% minus percentage of unscheduled downtime	N/A	Maintain operational availability of Main Frame Components at 100%	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Integration	[JP01] Number of cards deployed	0 Cards	20 Cards	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	[FL02] System Transactions (Contents Posted)	35000	Increase by 15%	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	[JC01] CITP sites deployed	360 sites deployed	120 additional sites deployed	120 sites
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	[JC04] CITP workstations deployed	1000 workstations deployed	350 additional workstations deployed	350 workstations



Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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 Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[DM12] The time it takes in minutes to refer the ticket to project staff appropriate for the problem when 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. Unresolved Tier-3 tickets refer to project staff appropriate 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.	Help Desk Escalation Time. Unresolved Tier-3 tickets refer to project staff appropriate 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.	So far in FY07, tickets assigned to appropriate staff within 75 minutes for 95% of all tickets.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[FR04] # of helpdesk calls closed	2193	10% decrease	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	[JN05] Length of time to respond to repair tickets	For FY06, met metric	S Ty1 2 hrs rep w/o St vst/4 hrs rep w/St vst; St Ty2 2 hrs rep w/o St vst/4 hrs to rep w/St vst; St Ty3 4 hrs rep w/o St vst/4 hrs rep w/St vst; St Ty4 4 hrs rep w/o St vst/5 hrs rep w/St vst; St Ty5 4 hrs rep w/o St vst/5 hrs rep w/St vst	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	[FR05] # of hours to close each Legacy problem ticket	4	20% reduction	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	[DM13] 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 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 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 22 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets generated over the course of a month.	So far in FY07, resolution process initiated within 22 minutes for 95% of all tickets.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	[DM14] 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.	So far in FY07, average resolution time for tickets resolved by Help Desk was 70 minutes.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR01] % of technology refresh	20% refresh of existing inventory	9.2% decrease	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR02] Number of Helpdesk calls received by the Enterprise Operations Center (EOC)	7920	10% Reduction	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR03] # of Critical Problem	109	15% Reduction	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Operation of the Federal Justice System		Management		Tickets			
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Lifecycle/Change Management	[FC04] Total components per total end of life total	N/A	Percentage of end of life components	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Dissemination	[DM15] 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%	So far in FY07, 60,229 products have been disseminated.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	[FL01] System User Increase	50000	Increase by 75%	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Crime Prevention	[FC01] 100% minus percentage of time unavailable	N/A	Maintain Operational Availability of Main Frame Components at 100%	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Criminal Investigation and Surveillance	[DF07] Extent to which outcomes related to Law Enforcement are achieved. The percentage of known DEA offices that have direct access to Firebird.	2006 results.	Enable the DEA Law Enforcement-related IT systems by increasing the total number of DEA field offices that have Firebird installed by 3%	To Be Determined
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Management Improvement	[FT01] Number of phone units replaced through Technology Program	Replace 8,000 units	10% of all units to be replaced	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	[FC03] Workload totals per quarter averaged per baseline totals	N/A	Percentage meeting baseline per CTBR Tracking Statistics	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Timeliness	[FT02] Response time to service calls	Less than 2 hours	Less than one hour	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[DF09] The number of network servers in the field that have been migrated from Windows NT to Windows 2000.	2006 results of the Windows 2000 server migration.	Replace 97 Windows NT servers.	To Be Determined
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FL03] Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	0.97	99% or greater	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FR07] Network Availability	0.98	99% availability	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DF08] The number of XP workstations that were replaced with the latest generation of desktop hardware.	2006 results of the 4-year Technology Refreshment cycle to replace 3,750 Firebird workstations per year	Replace 3,750 Firebird workstations	To Be Determined
2007	Ensure the Fair	Processes and	Productivity and	Productivity	[DM16] Number	69/148 domestic	Tech Refresh on	So far in FY07,

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Activities	Efficiency		and percentage of domestic sites that have gone through tech refresh	sites = 46%	24 additional sites -- 93/148 = 63%	29 offices have been tech refreshed.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM17] Number and percentage of foreign sites that have gone through tech refresh	34/57 foreign sites = 60%	Tech Refresh on 11 additional sites -- 45/57 = 79%	So far in FY07, 3 offices have been tech refreshed.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM18] Number and percentage of domestic sites that have been installed.	128/148 domestic sites = 86%	Install 7 additional sites - 135/148 = 91%	So far in FY07, 4 sites have been installed.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM19] Number and percentage of foreign sites that have been installed.	41/57 foreign sites = 72%	Install 8 additional sites - 49/57 = 86%	So far in FY07, 6 sites have been installed.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[JN03] Number and % of CONUS and OCONUS sites that have been migrated to JUTNet	1149/1911 = 60%	Install 712 additional sites -- 1861/1911 = 97%	To date, installed 664 of 712 planned sites.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FT03] Dial tone availability	Maintain dial tone availability of 97% or better	Less than 3% of all call attempts receive a busy signal	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FR06] Number of Legacy Network Problems Resolved	42	10% reduction	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	[DF10] Complaints. The number of service tickets received by Tier 1 support.	2006 results of the total number of service tickets.	Reduce the number of service tickets by 20%.	To Be Determined
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	[DM20] 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.	So far in FY07, 96% of Merlin users reported satisfaction with the system.
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	[FR08] # of hours to close each Trilogy problem ticket	4	5% Reduction	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DF11] Availability. Percentage of time the system is available to users.	2006 Firebird results.	Maintain 99.9% system availability.	To Be Determined
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DM21] Percentage of time system is available	The Merlin enterprise-level servers will have an 'up-time' during operational hours of at least 99.6% of the time over the course of a month. (Note: A correctly handled automatic server fail-over is considered 'up').	The Merlin enterprise-level servers will have an 'up-time' during operational hours of at least 99.6% of the time over the course of a month. (Note: A correctly handled automatic server fail-over is considered 'up').	So far in FY07, server up-time over the course of a month was 99.8%
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FL04] System Availability	0.99	99% or greater	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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 Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FR09] Network uptime, desktop servers	0.98	99% availability	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	[JN04] Availability of WAN network and WAN facing equipment, at each site, measured by the average availability across all nodes on the network.	Site Type 1 ≥ 100% availability; Site Type 2 ≥ 99.999% ; Site Type 3 - 99.996% with diversity; 99.991% without diversity ; Site Type 4 ≥ 100% with diversity; 99.991% without diversity; Site Type 5 ≥ 100% with diversity; 99.995 without diversity	Cumu. mnth JUTNet aval; Site Type 1- 100%aval; (div req); Site Type2 99.999%aval w/ div-99.8%aval w/o div; Site Type3 99.99%aval w/div- 99.80%aval w/o div- Site Type4 99.99%aval w/div /99.8%aval w/o div- Site Type5 99.99%aval w/div/99.8%aval w/o div	TBD
2007	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	[FT04] Downtime	Less than 1 hour per year	Less than 50 minutes per year	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	[FC06] 100% minus percentage of time unavailable	N/A	Maintain operational availability of Main Frame Components at 100%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	[FL06] System Transactions (Contents Posted)	40000	Increase by 15%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	[JP02] Number of cards deployed	20 cards	75,000 cards	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	[JC02] CITP sites deployed	480 sites deployed	135 additional sites deployed	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	[JC05] CITP workstations deployed	1350 workstations deployed	400 additional workstations deployed	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[DM22] The time it takes in minutes to refer the ticket to project staff appropriate for the problem when 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. Unresolved Tier-3 tickets refer to project staff appropriate 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.	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 an average of 70 minutes or less over the course of a month.	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	[FR14] # of hours to close each legacy problem ticket	4	20% reduction	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	[DM23] The time it will take in minutes to 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 staff will review the trouble ticket entry, respond to the user, and initiate the resolution	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					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 22 minutes of receipt or generation of a Tier-3 ticket for at least 95% of the tickets generated over the course of a month.	process within an average of 20 minutes or less over the course of a month.	
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	[DM24] 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	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR10] % of technology refresh	20% refresh of existing inventory	8.3% decrease	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR11] # of Helpdesk calls received by the EOC	7920	5% reduction	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR12] # of Critical Problem Tickets	109	7.5% Reduction	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR13] # Helpdesk calls closed	2193	5% Increase	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Lifecycle/Change Management	[FC08] Total components per total end of life cycle	N/A	Maintain operational availability of Main Frame Components at 100%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	System Development	[FN01] Order Equipment for IPv6	None Ordered	Order \$7.88M in IPv6 Equipment	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Dissemination	[DM25] 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	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	[FL05] System User Increase	100000	Increase by 10%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Crime Prevention	[FC05] 100% minus percentage of time unavailable	N/A	Maintain operational availability of Main Frame Components at 100%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Criminal Investigation and Surveillance	[DF12] The percentage of known DEA offices that have direct access to Firebird.	2007 results.	Enable the DEA Law Enforcement-related IT systems by increasing the total number of DEA field offices that have	To Be Determined

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							Firebird installed by 3%	
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Management Improvement	[FT05] Number of phone units replaced through the Technology Program	Replace 8,000 units	10% of all units to be replaced	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	[FC07] Workload totals per quarter averaged per baseline totals	N/A	Percentage meeting baseline per CTRB tracking statistics	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Timeliness	[FT06] Response time to service calls	Less than 2 hours	Less than one hour	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[DF14] The number of network servers in the field that have been migrated from Windows NT to Windows 2000.	2007 results of the Windows 2000 server migration.	Replace 44 Windows NT servers.	To Be Determined
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FL07] Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	0.97	99% or greater	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FR16] Network availability	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DF13] The number of XP workstations that were replaced with the latest generation of desktop hardware.	2007 results of the 4-year Technology Refreshment cycle to replace 3,750 Firebird workstations per year	Replace 3,750 Firebird workstations	To Be Determined
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM26] Number and percentage of domestic sites that have gone through tech refresh	93/148 domestic sites = 63%	Tech Refresh on 36 additional sites -- 129/148= 87%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM27] Number and percentage of foreign sites that have gone through tech refresh	45/57 foreign sites = 79%	Tech Refresh on 12 additional sites -- 57/57 = 100% plus 2 more to refresh back through again	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM28] Number and percentage of domestic sites that have been installed.	135/148 domestic sites = 91%	Install 10 additional sites - 145/148 = 98%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM29] Number and percentage of foreign sites that have been installed.	49/57 foreign sites = 86%	Install 6 additional sites - 55/57 = 96%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[JN06] Number and % of CONUS and OCONUS sites that have been migrated to JUTNet	Expected value: 1861/1911 = 97%	Cut an additional 50 sites 1911/1911 = 100%	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FT09] Dial tone availability	Maintain dial tone availability of 97% or better	Less than 3% of all call attempts receive the busy signal	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FR15] # of legacy Network problems resolved	42	5% reduction	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	System							
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	[DF15] Complaints. The number of service tickets received by Tier 1 support.	2007 results of the total number of service tickets.	Reduce the number of service tickets by 20%.	To Be Determined
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	[DF16] User Satisfaction. The percentage of users who are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	2007 results. Increase (or maintain) the percentage of Firebird users who report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability to 95%.	Increase (or maintain) the percentage of Firebird users who report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability to 95%.	To Be Determined
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	[DM30] 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.	96.5% of Merlin users report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	[FR17] # of hours to close each Trilogy problem ticket	4	5% Reduction	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DF17] Availability. Percentage of time the system is available to users.	2007 Firebird results.	Maintain 99.9% system availability.	To Be Determined
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DM31] Percentage of time system is available	The Merlin enterprise-level servers will have an 'up-time' during operational hours of at least 99.6% of the time over the course of a month. (Note: A correctly handled automatic server fail-over is considered 'up').	The Merlin enterprise-level servers will have an 'up-time' during operational hours of at least 99.65% of the time over the course of a month. (Note: A correctly handled automatic server fail-over is considered 'up').	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FL08] System Availability	0.99	99% or greater	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FR18] Network Uptime, Desktops, Servers	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2008	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	[FT10] Downtime	Less than 1 hour per year	Less than 50 minutes per year	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	[FC10] 100% minus percentage of time unavailable	NA	Maintain operational availability of Main Frame Components at 100%	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	[FL10] System Transactions (Contents Posted)	45000	Increase by 15%	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	[JP04] Number of cards deployed	75,000 Cards	75,000 Cards	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	System							
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	[JC03] CITP sites deployed	615 sites deployed	80 additional sites deployed	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	[JC06] CITP workstations deployed	1750 workstations deployed	400 additional workstations deployed	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[DM32] The time it takes in minutes to refer the ticket to project staff appropriate for the problem when 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. Unresolved Tier-3 tickets refer to project staff appropriate 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.	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 an average of 70 minutes or less over the course of a month.	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[FR22] # of Helpdesk calls closed	2193	10% Increase	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	[FR23] # of hours to close each legacy problem ticket	4	20% Reduction	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	[DM33] 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 entry, 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 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
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	[DM34] 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
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR19] % of technology refresh	20% of existing inventory	4.5% decrease	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR20] Number of Helpdesk calls received by the EOC	7920	10% Reduction	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR21] # of Critical Problem Tickets	109	15 % Reduction	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair	Mission and	Information and	Lifecycle/Change	[FC12] Total	N/A	Percentage of	TBD



Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Business Results	Technology Management	Management	components per total end of life cycle		total end of life components	
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Dissemination	[DM35] 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
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	[FL09] System User Increase	110000	Increase by 15%	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Criminal Investigation and Surveillance	[DF18] The percentage of known DEA offices that have direct access to Firebird.	2007 results.	Enable the DEA Law Enforcement-related IT systems by increasing the total number of DEA field offices that have Firebird installed by 3%	To Be Determined
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Management Improvement	[FT11] Number of units replaced through the Technology Program	Replace 8,000 units	10% of all units to be replaced	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	[FC11] Workload totals per quarter averaged per baseline totals	N/A	Percentage meeting baseline per CTBR tracking statistics	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Timeliness	[FT12] Response time to service calls	Less than 2 hours	Less than one hour	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[DF20] The number of network servers in the field that have been migrated from Windows NT to Windows 2000.	2007 results of the Windows 2000 server migration.	Replace 44 Windows NT servers.	To Be Determined
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FL11] Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	0.97	99% or greater	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FR25] Network Availability	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DF19] The number of XP workstations that were replaced with the latest generation of desktop hardware.	2007 results of the 4-year Technology Refreshment cycle to replace 3,750 Firebird workstations per year	Replace 3,750 Firebird workstations	To Be Determined
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM36] Number and percentage of domestic sites that have gone through tech refresh	129/148 domestic sites = 87%	Tech Refresh on 36 additional sites -- 148/148= 100% plus 17 more to refresh back through again	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM37] Number and percentage of foreign sites that have gone through another	2/57 foreign sites = 4%	Tech Refresh on 14 additional sites -- 16/57 = 28%	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					tech refresh cycle			
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM38] Number and percentage of domestic sites that have been installed.	145/148 domestic sites = 98%	Install 3 additional sites - 148/148 = 100%	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[DM39] Number and percentage of foreign sites that have been installed.	55/57 foreign sites = 96%	Install 2 additional sites - 55/57 = 100%	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FT13] Dial tone availability	Maintain dial tone availability of 97% or better	Less than 3% of all call attempts receive a busy signal	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FR24] # of Legacy network Problems Resolved	42	10% increase	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	[DF21] Complaints. The number of service tickets received by Tier 1 support.	2007 results of the total number of service tickets.	Reduce the number of service tickets by 20%.	To Be Determined
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	[DM40] Percentage of users that are satisfied with the system capability and reliability	96.5% of Merlin users report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	97% of Merlin users report they are satisfied with the system's capability and reliability.	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	[FR26] # of hours to close each Trilogy problem ticket	4	10% Reduction	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Information and Data	Internal Data Sharing	[JP03] Number of card readers deployed	0 HSPD-12 Card Readers	5,000 card readers and install middleware	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DF22] 2007 Firebird results.	Maintain 99.9% system availability.	To Be Determined	To Be Determined
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[DM41] Percentage of time system is available	The Merlin enterprise-level servers will have an 'up-time' during operational hours of at least 99.6% of the time over the course of a month. (Note: A correctly handled automatic server fail-over is considered 'up').	The Merlin enterprise-level servers will have an 'up-time' during operational hours of at least 99.65% of the time over the course of a month. (Note: A correctly handled automatic server fail-over is considered 'up').	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FL12] System Availability	0.99	99% or greater	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FR27] Network Uptime, Desktops, Servers	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2009	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	[FT14] Downtime	Less than 1 hour per year	Less than 50 minutes per year	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	[FC14] 100% minus percentage of time unavailable	N/A	Maintain operational availability of Main Frame components at 100%	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	[FL14] System Transactions (Contents Posted)	50000	Increase by 15%	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[FR31] # of Helpdesk calls closed	2193	10% Increase	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	[FR32] # of hours to close each legacy problem ticket	4	20% Reduction	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR28] % of technology refresh	20% of existing inventory	6.1% increase	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR29] Number of Helpdesk calls received by the EOC	7920	20% equipment replacement will produce 10% Reduction	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR30] # of Critical Problem Tickets	109	15 % Reduction	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Lifecycle/Change Management	[FC16] Total components per end of life total	N/A	Percentage of end of life components	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	[FL13] System User Increase	125000	Increase by 30%	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Crime Prevention	[FC13] 100% minus percentage of time unavailable	N/A	Maintain operational availability of Main Frame Components at 100%	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Management Improvement	[FT15] Number of units to be replaced through Technology Program	Replace 8,000 units	10% of all units to be replaced	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	[FC15] Total components per total end of life cycle	N/A	Percentage of end of life components	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Timeliness	[FT16] Response time to service calls	Less than 2 hours	Less than one hour	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FL15] Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	0.97	99% or greater	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FR34] Network Availability	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FT17] Dial tone availability	Maintain dial tone availability of 97% or better	Less than 3% of all call attempts receive a busy signal	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FR33] # of Legacy Network Problems Resolved	42	10% Reduction	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	[FR35] # of hours to close each trilogy ticket	0.04	10% reduction	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FL16] System Availability	0.99	99% or greater	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FR36] Network Uptime, Desktops, Servers	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2010	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	[FT18] Downtime	Less than 1 hour per year	Less than 50 minutes per year	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	[FC18] 100% minus percentage of time unavailable	N/A	Maintain operational availability of Main Frame components	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	[FL19] ystem Transactions (Contents Posted)	55000	Increase by 15%	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[FR40] # of Helpdesk calls closed	2193	10% Increase	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[FR41] # of Helpdesk calls closed	2193	10% Increase	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR37] % of technology refresh	20% refresh of existing inventory	1.0 % increase	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR38] Number of Helpdesk calls received by the EOC	7920	10% Reduction	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR39] # of Critical Problem Tickets	109	15 % Reduction	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Lifecycle/Change Management	[FC20] Total components per end of life total	N/A	Percentage of end of life components	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	[FL17] System User Increase	150000	Increase by 25%	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Crime Prevention	[FC17] 100% minus percentage of time unavailable	N/A	Percentage of shared communication services	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Management Improvement	[FT19] Number of units to be replaced through the Technology Program	Replace 8,000 units	10% of all units to be replaced	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair	Processes and	Cycle Time and	Cycle Time	[FC19] Workload	N/A	Percentage	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Activities	Resource Time		totals per quarter averaged per baseline totals		meeting baseline per CTRB tracking statistics	
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Timeliness	[FT20] Response time to service calls	Less than 2 hours	Less than one hour	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FL20] Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	0.97	99% or greater	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FR43] Network Availability	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FT21] Dial tone availability	Maintain dial tone availability of 97% or better	Less than 3% of all call attempts receive a busy signal	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FR42] # of Legacy Network Problems Resolved	42	10% Increase	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	[FR44] # of hours to close each trilogy trilogy ticket	0.04	10% reduction	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FL21] System Availability	0.99	99% or greater	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FR45] Network Uptime, Desktops, Servers	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2011	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	[FT22] Downtime	Less than 1 hour per year	Less than 50 minutes per year	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	[FL23] System Transactions (Contents Posted)	60000	Increase by 15%	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[FR49] # of Helpdesk calls closed	2193	10% Increase	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	[FR50] # of hours to close each legacy problem ticket	4	20% Reduction	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR46] % of technology refresh	20% refresh of existing inventory	1.9% decrease	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR47] # of helpdesk calls closed by the EOC	7920	10% reduction	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR48] # of Critical Problem Tickets	109	15 % Reduction	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	[FL22] System User Increase	200000	Increase by \$25%	TBD

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Operation of the Federal Justice System							
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FL24] Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	0.97	99% or greater	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FR52] Network Availability	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FR51] # of Legacy Network Problems Resolved	42	10% Increase	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	[FR53] # of hours to close each Trilogy problem ticket	4	10% Reduction	TBD
2012	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FL25] System Availability	0.99	99% or greater	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	[FL27] System Transactions (Contents Posted)	65000	Increase by 15%	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	[FR58] # of Helpdesk calls closed	2193	10% Increase	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	[FR59] # of hours to close each legacy problem ticket	4	20% Reduction	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR55] % of technology refresh	20% of existing inventory	same as baseline (20% refresh)	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR56] # of helpdesk calls closed by the EOC	7920	10% reduction	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	[FR57] # of Critical Problem Tickets	109	15% Reduction	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	[FL26] System User Increase	250000	Increase by 25%	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FL28] Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	0.97	99% or greater	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	[FR61] Network Availability	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	[FR60] # of Legacy Network Problems Resolved	42	10 Increase	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	[FR62] # of hours to close each Trilogy	4	10% Reduction	TBD

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Federal Justice System				problem ticket			
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FL29] System Availability	0.99	99% or greater	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FR54] Network Uptime, Desktops, Servers	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD
2013	Ensure the Fair and Efficient Operation of the Federal Justice System	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	[FR63] Network Uptime Desktops Servers	0.98	99.9% availability	TBD

**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 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)
ATR GPSS	Government Only	7/19/2008	7/19/2008
DEA Firebird	Contractor and Government	10/4/2009	10/4/2009
DEA Merlin	Contractor and Government	2/23/2010	2/23/2010
DOJ Enterprise PKI SBU	Government Only	6/12/2008	6/12/2008
ESS Infrastructure Development Labs	Contractor and Government	6/30/2008	6/30/2008
FBI LEO	Contractor and Government	7/25/2008	7/25/2008
JCON-Common Office Automation Resources	Contractor and Government	6/30/2008	6/30/2008

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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
ATR GPSS	Government Only		Yes	7/19/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/26/2007	3/20/2007
CRM-JCON IIA	Government Only		Yes	6/30/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/15/2007	3/30/2007
CRS-JCON IIA	Government Only		Yes	11/2/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	4/27/2007	4/27/2007
CRT-JCON II	Government Only		Yes	2/21/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	1/15/2007	3/20/2007
DEA Firebird	Contractor and Government		Yes	10/4/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	4/12/2007	5/11/2007
DEA Merlin	Contractor and Government		Yes	2/23/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	11/30/2006	8/31/2007
DOJ Enterprise PKI SBU	Contractor and Government		Yes	6/13/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/21/2007	3/20/2007
ENRD-JCON	Government Only		Yes	8/22/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	1/30/2007	3/20/2007
EOIR JCON II/CASE	Government Only		Yes	4/28/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	2/20/2007	3/20/2007
FBI CJIS WAN	Government Only		Yes	10/30/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	10/30/2006	3/22/2007
FBI Law Enforcement Online (LEO)	Contractor and Government		Yes	7/18/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	7/1/2007	6/1/2007
FBI SCION	Government Only		Yes	6/9/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	6/20/2007	5/31/2007
Justice Unified Telecommunications Network	Contractor Only		Yes	6/16/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	4/20/2007	3/20/2007
Marshals Information Technology (Office Automation)	Government Only		Yes	8/31/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	11/30/2006	3/20/2007
OJP ENS	Government Only		Yes	2/2/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	1/12/2007	3/20/2007
SMO/JMD JCON IIA	Government Only		Yes	4/12/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	3/20/2007	3/19/2007
Tax Office Automation System	Government Only		Yes	6/6/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	3/27/2007	3/20/2007
USAO JCON IIA	Government Only		Yes	7/6/2005	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	1/31/2007	3/21/2007
USTP Justice Consolidated Office Network	Government Only		Yes	3/22/2007	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	2/21/2007	5/1/2007

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

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 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?

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



Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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
ATR GPSS	No	Yes	<a href="http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/foia/224557.htm">http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/foia/224557.htm</a>	Yes	<a href="http://usdoj.gov/jmd/privacyact.html">http://usdoj.gov/jmd/privacyact.html</a>
CRM-JCON IIA	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
CRS-JCON IIA	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
CRT-JCON II	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
DEA Firebird	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
DEA Merlin	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
DOJ Enterprise PKI SBU	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
ENRD-JCON	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
EOIR JCON II/CASE	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
FBI CJIS WAN	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
FBI Law Enforcement Online	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	Yes	<a href="http://usdoj.gov/jmd/privacyact.html">http://usdoj.gov/jmd/privacyact.html</a>
FBI SCION	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
Justice Unified Telecommunications Network	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
Marshals Information Technology (Office Automation)	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
OJP ENS	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
SMO/JMD JCON IIa	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
USAO JCON IIA	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the

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
			by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.		Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.
USTP Justice Consolidated Office Network	No	No	No Privacy Impact Assessment is required by the E-Government Act at this time for this system.	No	No System of Records Notice is required by the Privacy Act of 1974 for this system.

**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. JUTNet, JMD JCON PMO, JMD Classified Information Technology Program (CITP), FBI Technical Refresh Program (TRP), FBI Law Enforcement Online (LEO).
  - b. If "no," please explain why?
  
3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? No
  - a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
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)
IT Resource Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the determination and specification of IT assets, and management of the relationships/processes. (Includes the aggregation of needs and negotiation for favorable discounts from suppliers who provide the necessary resources.	Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Computers / Automation Management			No Reuse	10
Email	Defines the set of capabilities to support	Support Services	Collaboration	Email			No Reuse	20

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
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)
	electronic mail, its computer based storage and common set of network communication standards to forward electronic messages from one user to another.							
Shared Calendaring	Defines the set of capabilities that allow an entire team as well as individuals to view, add and modify each other's schedules, meetings and activities.	Support Services	Collaboration	Shared Calendaring			No Reuse	7
Activity / Task Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the monitoring and control of activities and tasks within the business cycle through timelines, resource equations, and electronic scheduling.	Support Services	Collaboration	Task Management			No Reuse	7
Threaded Discussions	Defines the set of capabilities that support the persistent record of remarks and opinions about a given topic or subject matter.	Support Services	Collaboration	Threaded Discussions			No Reuse	1
Access Provisioning and Authorization	Defines the set of capabilities that support the administration and management of the access rights/privileges.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	5
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Support the identification and monitoring of activities within an application, system, or network.	Support Services	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis			No Reuse	1
Access Authentication	Defines the set of capabilities that support the validation of a user's credential used to gain access to facilities or systems.	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	7
User Identity	Defines the set of capabilities that provide user identification. Identification is the process taken where a user claims their identity (as distinct from "authentication" where this	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	4

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

<b>4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:</b> 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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
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)
	identification is confirmed as authentic).							
Intrusion Detection	Define the capabilities that support the detection of unauthorized access to a government information system.	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Detection			No Reuse	4
Intrusion Prevention	Defines the capabilities that include penetration testing and other measures to prevent unauthorized access to a government information system.	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Prevention			No Reuse	4
Service Desk	Minimization of the disruption to business through faulty IT services by detecting incidents, recording them and coordinating the activity required to restore them, while recording information that will result in the timely resolution and future prevention.	Support Services	Systems Management	Issue Tracking			No Reuse	4
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
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

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%.

Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b>				
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.				
<b>FEA SRM Component (a)</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Area</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Category</b>	<b>FEA TRM Service Standard</b>	<b>Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)</b>
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Log file analysis and control
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	PKI, HSPD-12, Active Directory
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	WS-Security, SAML
Email	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	IMAP, POP3, X.500, SMTP, Microsoft Exchange
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	SharePoint
Intrusion Prevention	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Firewall
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
Issue Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Remedy
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

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?      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: <span style="float: right;">* Costs in millions</span>			
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
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	211.28

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 as well as a centralized leadership, funding and IT management coordination structure that provides acquisition support to the 16 Department components and OA project management support. It provides consolidated and centralized technical support, a common architecture specific to office automation, maximum technical interoperability, and enhanced system security and compliance.

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.

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 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 contractor efforts. The JCON Standard Architecture facilitates work process improvements within each JCON component and 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 additional benefits of (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?

The primary qualitative benefits realized for this investment include: (1) maximum technical interoperability and architectural standardization between component office automation 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.

The benefits also include: 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 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 expects that the Department will realize system operations and maintenance cost savings among the Components that are consolidated under JCON.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part No or in-whole?

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.

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

**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? 6/30/2005
  - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
- 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:

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

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

- 1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748? Yes
- 2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No
  - a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
  - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
  - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:
- 3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? No
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate 'O' 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			
1.1	FY06	9/21/2006	\$27.250556	9/21/2006	7/7/2006	\$27.250556	\$22.966627	76	\$0.547878	86.29%
1.1.1	CRT JCON IIA Deployment	1/31/2006	\$4.516885	1/31/2006	5/31/2006	\$4.516885	\$4.532132	-120	\$-0.015247	100%
1.1.2	JMD JCON IIA Deployment	9/21/2006	\$10.551165	9/21/2006		\$10.551165	\$8.148638		\$0.693238	83.8%
1.1.3	UST JCON IIA Deployment	3/31/2006	\$7.301865	3/31/2006	7/7/2006	\$7.301865	\$7.399675	-98	\$-0.09781	100%
1.1.4	EOIR JCON IIA Deployment	3/31/2006	\$4.880641	3/31/2006		\$4.880641	\$2.886182		\$-0.031983	58.48%
1.2	FY07	3/31/2007	\$22.996698	9/15/2007	10/31/2006	\$22.996698	\$15.182119	319	\$0.025597	66.13%
1.2.1	USA JCON IIA Deployment	10/31/2006	\$15.208119	10/31/2006	10/31/2006	\$15.208119	\$15.182119	0	\$0.026	100%
1.2.2	ATR JCON IIA Deployment	3/1/2007	\$2.388579	6/11/2007		\$2.388579				0%
1.2.3	USPC JCON IIA Deployment	3/31/2007	\$2.6	9/15/2007		\$2.6				0%
1.2.4	USNCB JCON IIA Deployment	3/31/2007	\$2.8	3/31/2007		\$2.8				0%
1.3	FY08	2/28/2008	\$30	2/28/2008		\$30				0%
1.3.1	BOP JCON IIA Deployment	2/28/2008	\$30	2/28/2008		\$30				0%



Exhibit 300: Consolidated Enterprise Infrastructure (Revision 5)

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 'O' 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			
2.3	HSPD-12 PMO O&M FY09	9/30/2009	\$5.01	9/30/2009		\$5.01				0%
2.4	Implementation Phase I	9/30/2007	\$6.77	9/30/2007		\$6.77	\$3.96		\$1.1175	75%
2.5	Implementation Phase II	9/30/2008	\$6	9/30/2008		\$6				0%
2.6	Implementation Phase III	9/30/2009	\$11.8	3/30/2009		\$11.8				0%
3	DEA Firebird	9/30/2009	\$19.509	9/30/2009		\$20.966	\$4.619		\$1.851108	30.86%
3.1	FY 2007	9/30/2007	\$5.943	9/30/2007		\$7.4	\$4.619		\$1.85082	87.43%
3.1.1	Tech Refresh/Installs	9/30/2007	\$2.7	9/30/2007		\$2.7	\$1.967		\$0.058	75%
3.1.2	Desktop Server Mgmt	9/30/2007	\$0.8	9/30/2007		\$0.8	\$0.583		\$0.001	73%
3.1.3	Windows Support Project	6/30/2007	\$0.8	6/30/2007		\$0.8	\$0.74		\$0.052	99%
3.1.4	Windows Deployment	5/14/2007	\$1.643	5/14/2007		\$3.1	\$1.329		\$1.74	99%
3.2	FY 2008	9/30/2008	\$6.616	9/30/2008		\$6.616				0%
3.2.1	Tech Refresh/Installs	8/7/2008	\$2.3	8/7/2008		\$2.3				0%
3.2.2	Desktop Server Mgmt	4/3/2008	\$0.066	4/3/2008		\$0.066				0%
3.2.3	Foreign W2k3 Deployment	9/30/2008	\$0.75	9/30/2008		\$0.75				0%
3.2.4	Server Consolidation	9/30/2008	\$3.5	9/30/2008		\$3.5				0%
3.3	FY 2009	9/30/2009	\$6.95	9/30/2009		\$6.95				0%
3.3.1	Tech Refresh/Installs	11/30/2008	\$0.25	11/30/2008		\$0.25				0%
3.3.2	Server Consolidation	9/30/2009	\$6.7	9/30/2009		\$6.7				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			
4	DEA Merlin	9/30/2009	\$13.4	9/30/2009		\$15.658	\$3.078		\$0.012889	19.74%
4.1	FY 2007	9/30/2007	\$3.8	9/30/2007		\$6.058	\$3.078		\$0.012186	51.01%
4.1.1	Tech Refresh/Installs	9/30/2007	\$1	9/30/2007		\$0.922	\$0.682		\$0.00028	74%
4.1.2	Engineering	9/30/2007	\$1.3	9/30/2007		\$1.336	\$0.996		\$0.006	75%
4.1.3	Hardware/Software	9/30/2007	\$1.5	9/30/2007		\$3.8	\$1.4		\$0.006	37%
4.2	FY 2008	9/30/2008	\$3.8	9/30/2008		\$3.8				0%
4.2.1	Tech Refresh/Installs	9/30/2008	\$1	9/30/2008		\$1				0%
4.2.2	Engineering	9/30/2008	\$1.3	9/30/2008		\$1.3				0%
4.2.3	Hardware/Software	9/30/2008	\$1.5	9/30/2008		\$1.5				0%
4.3	FY 2009	9/30/2009	\$5.8	9/30/2009		\$5.8				0%
4.3.1	Tech Refresh/Installs	9/30/2009	\$1	9/30/2009		\$1				0%
4.3.2	Engineering	9/30/2009	\$1.3	9/30/2009		\$1.3				0%
4.3.3	Hardware/Software	9/30/2009	\$3.5	9/30/2009		\$3.5				0%
5	FBI SCION	9/30/2009	\$102.87	9/30/2009		\$102.87	\$24.25		\$-5.167615	18.55%
5.1	FY07 DME	9/30/2007	\$11.75	9/30/2007		\$11.75	\$11.75		\$-5.17	56%
5.2	FY07 O&M	9/30/2007	\$12.5	9/30/2007		\$12.5	\$12.5		\$0	100%
5.3	FY08 DME	9/30/2008	\$26.81	9/30/2008		\$26.81				0%
5.4	FY08 O&M	9/30/2008	\$12.5	9/30/2008		\$12.5				0%
5.5	FY09 DME	9/30/2009	\$26.81	9/30/2009		\$26.81				0%
5.6	FY09 O&M	9/30/2009	\$12.5	9/30/2009		\$12.5				0%
6	FBI CJIS	9/30/2008	\$19.65	9/30/2008	9/30/2006	\$19.65	\$8.67	731	\$1.57944	52.16%
6.1	FY05 O&M	9/30/2005	\$5.58	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	\$5.58	\$5.58	0	\$0	100%
6.2	FY06 O&M	9/30/2006	\$4.67	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	\$4.67	\$3.09	0	\$1.58	100%

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 'O' 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			
6.3	FY07 O&M	9/30/2007	\$4.7	9/30/2007		\$4.7				0%
6.4	FY08 O&M	9/30/2008	\$4.7	9/30/2008		\$4.7				0%
7	FBI LEO	9/30/2009	\$58.45	9/30/2009		\$58.28	\$2.12		\$-0.02192	3.6%
7.1	FY07 DME	9/30/2007	\$4.37	9/30/2007		\$4.2	\$2.12		\$-0.02	50%
7.2	FY07 O&M	9/30/2007	\$14.59	9/30/2007		\$14.59				0%
7.3	FY08 DME	9/30/2008	\$3.83	9/30/2008		\$3.83				0%
7.4	FY08 O&M	9/30/2008	\$15.07	9/30/2008		\$15.07				0%
7.5	FY09 DME	9/30/2009	\$5.03	9/30/2009		\$5.03				0%
7.6	FY09 O&M	9/30/2009	\$15.56	9/30/2009		\$15.56				0%
8	FBI Network Services	9/30/2009	\$14.83	9/30/2009	9/30/2007	\$14.83	\$3.91	731	\$0.000671	26.37%
8.1	Procure Network Equipment	9/30/2007	\$3.91	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	\$3.91	\$3.91	0	\$0	100%
8.2	Procure Network Equipment	6/30/2008	\$10	6/30/2008		\$10				0%
8.3	Procure Network Equipment	9/30/2009	\$0.92	9/30/2009		\$0.92				0%
9	FBI TRP	9/30/2009	\$96.82	9/30/2009		\$80.26				0%
9.1	FY07 DME	9/30/2007	\$18.4	9/30/2007		\$1.84				0%
9.2	FY07 O&M	9/30/2007	\$7.2	9/30/2007		\$7.2				0%
9.3	FY08 DME	9/30/2008	\$25.59	9/30/2008		\$25.59				0%
9.4	FY08 O&M	9/30/2008	\$6	9/30/2008		\$6				0%
9.5	FY09 DME	9/30/2009	\$30.17	3/30/2009		\$30.17				0%
9.6	FY09 O&M	9/30/2009	\$9.46	9/30/2009		\$9.46				0%
<b>Project Totals</b>										