

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: | 6/6/2008 |
| 2. Agency: | Department of Justice |
| 3. Bureau: | Federal Bureau Of Investigation |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | 011-10-01-02-01-3373-00 |
| 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) | Mixed Life Cycle |
| 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? | FY2006 |
| 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: | |
| <p>The Guardian Program, which includes both Guardian and eGuardian systems, is a national program designed to record and share threat-related, suspicious activity information to better protect and defend our nation's citizens. The advent of global terror networks in the 21st Century spurred the creation of multiple suspicious activity reporting and threat information sharing systems operating among the intelligence community and law enforcement (LE) agencies. Although useful within themselves, these systems are not connected in any network and are unavailable to LE officers in other jurisdictions. Linking the various systems to provide true interagency, cross-jurisdictional interoperability has been slow to materialize. Terrorists routinely use jurisdictional boundaries to their advantage and to escape prosecution. It is critical that information about possible terrorist activities of these groups and individuals is available to LE in all relevant jurisdictions. The Guardian Program is filling that critical gap.</p> | |
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 5/16/2008 |
| 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | Yes |
| 11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager? | |
| Name | |
| Phone Number | |
| Email | |
| a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager? | Waiver Issued |
| b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned? | 6/2/2008 |
| c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification? | 12/31/2008 |
| 12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? | Yes |
| a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? | Yes |
| b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) | No |
| 1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? | |
| 2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? | |

Exhibit 300: FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) (Revision 3)

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

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

If "yes," check all that apply:

Expanded E-Government
Budget Performance Integration

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?)

Guardian and eGuardian support expanded e-Government and budget performance integration. The systems operate in a paperless environment requiring information sharing and collaboration. Government executives have the Guardian Program performance aligned to their pay and performance.

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

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

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? 10003802 - FBI Counterterrorism Program

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

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 3

17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No

19. Is this a financial management system? No

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

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

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

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

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

Hardware	15
Software	10
Services	75
Other	0

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? N/A

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

Name

Phone Number

Title

Deputy General Counsel and FBI Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer

E-mail

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Yes

Records Administration's approval?

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

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

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	1.131	1.032	0	0					
Acquisition:	5.368	3.436	2.751	7.14					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	6.499	4.468	2.751	7.14					
Operations & Maintenance:	3.99	1.24	2.7	1.7					
TOTAL:	10.489	5.708	5.451	8.84					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	2.83	0.83	2.7	0.1					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	11	2	7	1					

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? Yes

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

The number has been increased to 18 FTEs in FY 2009 which includes the need to have and staff a 24/7 help desk and accounts management team to set-up and service eGuardian customers.

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:
The scope and requirements for The Guardian Program, including both Guardian and eGuardian, have changed in several ways. First, The Guardian Program has been separated from FTTTF reporting requirements which means the budget for The Guardian Program is no longer embedded in the FTTTF budget. Next, The Guardian Program has been modified to incorporate continuing enhancements and upgrades to include: geospatial capability, indexing, updated storage technologies and improved network and security technology.

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: FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) (Revision 3)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
A07S15T0058	Time-and-Materials	Yes	2/7/2007	2/7/2007	2/6/2009	14.501	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				
9T82JAIS58RO	Time-and-Materials	Yes	2/15/2008	2/15/2008	2/14/2009	4.328	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes				

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:

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? The contracts adhere to the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) standards and guidelines for web content accessibility. The standards provide guidelines for creating web content usable by people of all abilities and disabilities including visual, motor, auditory, seizures and developmental disabilities. W3C standards are Section 508 compliant.

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

a. If "yes," what is the date? 5/21/2007

1. Is it Current? Yes

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

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percentage of growth of annual growth of Guardian database	New Measure for 2007	Baseline established for new measure.	20% Improvement
2007	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production	Percentage of incident completion according to policy guidelines	75%	15% Improvement	90% Target Met
2007	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production	Percentage of Guardian / eGuardian incidents that led to investigations.	New Measure for 2007	Baseline established for new measure	3% Incidents Escalated
2007	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity	Percentage of Guardian/eGuardian incidents addressed in compliance with AG Guidelines on timelines for resolution of Assessments	No measure for 2007	No measure for 2007	No measure for 2007
2007	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity	Percentage of threats resolved as a result of Guardian/eGuardian entries.	80%	10% Improvement	90% Target Met
2007	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage of records received from Intelligence Community and OGAs including state, local and	10%	10% improvement	baseline established for new measure

Exhibit 300: FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) (Revision 3)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					tribal LE partners			
2008	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percentage of growth of annual growth of Guardian database	20%	10% Maintain	10% Target met
2008	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production	Percentage of incident completion according to policy guidelines	95%	90% Maintain	90% Target Met
2008	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production	Percentage of Guardian / eGuardian incidents that led to investigations.	3%	2% Improvement	4% Incidents Escalated
2008	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity	Percentage of Guardian/eGuardian incidents addressed in compliance with AG Guidelines on timelines for resolution of Assessments	No Measure for 2008	No Measure for 2008	No Measure for 2008
2008	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity	Percentage of threats resolved as a result of Guardian/eGuardian entries.	90%	90% Maintain	Target met
2008	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage of records received from Intelligence Community and OGAs including state, local and tribal LE partners	20%	10% improvement	TBD
2009	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percentage of growth of annual growth of Guardian database	10%	10% Maintain	TBD
2009	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production	Percentage of incident completion according to policy guidelines	90%	90% Maintain	TBD
2009	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production	Percentage of Guardian / eGuardian incidents that led to investigations.	3%	3% Maintain	TBD
2009	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity	Percentage of Guardian/eGuardian incidents addressed in compliance with AG Guidelines on timelines for resolution of Assessments	New Measure for 2009	Baseline established for new measure	TBD
2009	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity	Percentage of threats resolved as a result of Guardian/eGuardian entries.	90%	90% Maintain	TBD
2009	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage of records received from Intelligence Community and OGAs including state, local and tribal LE partners	30%	10% improvement	TBD
2010	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percentage of growth of annual growth of Guardian	10%	10% Maintain	TBD

Exhibit 300: FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) (Revision 3)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					database			
2010	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production	Percentage of incident completion according to policy guidelines	90%	90% Maintain	TBD
2010	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production	Percentage of Guardian / eGuardian incidents that led to investigations.	3%	3% Maintain	TBD
2010	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity	Percentage of Guardian/eGuardian incidents addressed in compliance with AG Guidelines on timelines for resolution of Assessments	60%	10% Improvement	TBD
2010	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity	Percentage of threats resolved as a result of Guardian/eGuardian entries.	90%	90% Maintain	TBD
2010	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage of records received from Intelligence Community and OGAs including state, local and tribal LE partners	40%	10% improvement	TBD
2011	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered				
2011	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production				
2011	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production				
2011	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity				
2011	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity				
2011	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability				
2012	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered				
2012	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production				
2012	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production				
2012	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity				
2012	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity				
2012	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability				

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Nation s Security							
2013	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered				
2013	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production				
2013	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production				
2013	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity				
2013	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity				
2013	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability				
2014	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered				
2014	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production				
2014	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Mission and Business Results	Intelligence Operations	Intelligence Analysis and Production				
2014	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity				
2014	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Productivity				
2014	Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation s Security	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability				

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.

Exhibit 300: FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) (Revision 3)

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment? Yes

3. Systems in Planning 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)
eGuardian	Government Only	7/1/2009	6/30/2009

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Guardian	Government Only		Yes	10/19/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	4/28/2008	4/10/2008

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

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?
N/A - All of the systems in this investment are government-controlled, and not contractor-controlled.

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
eGuardian	Yes	Yes	.	Yes	http://frwebgate.access.gpo/egi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=1998register&docid=98-4206-filed
Guardian	No	Yes	.	Yes	http://frwebgate.access.gpo/egi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=1998register&docid=98-4206-filed

Details for Text Options:
 Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system(s) 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. The Guardian Program

b. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. 113-000

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Information Exchange	Defines the set of capabilities that support the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	6
Metadata Management	Defines the set of capabilities that provide metadata management. Metadata management is the control and administration of the information that relates to data (e.g., data attribute names).	Back Office Services	Data Management	Meta Data Management			No Reuse	6
Resource Planning and Allocation	Defines the set of capabilities that support the determination of strategic direction, the identification and establishment of programs and processes, and the allocation of resources (capital and labor) among those programs and processes.	Back Office Services	Human Capital / Workforce Management	Resource Planning and Allocation			No Reuse	6
Balanced Scorecard	Defines the set of capabilities that support the listing and analyzing of both positive and negative impacts associated with a decision.	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Balanced Scorecard			No Reuse	6
OLAP	Defines the set of capabilities that support the analysis of information that	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	OLAP			No Reuse	6

Exhibit 300: FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) (Revision 3)

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table: Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	has been summarized into multidimensional views and hierarchies.							
Standardized/Canned	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	6
Customer Feedback	Defines the set of capabilities that are used to collect, analyze and handle comments and feedback from an organization's customers.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Customer Feedback			No Reuse	6
Content Review and Approval	Defines the capabilities that allow for the approval of interactive programs.	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Content Review and Approval			No Reuse	6
Tagging and Aggregation	Defines the set of capabilities that support the identification of specific content within a larger set of content for collection and summarization.	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Tagging and Aggregation			No Reuse	6
Document Sharing	Defines a set of capabilities that support simultaneous document viewing and editing.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	12
Knowledge Capture	Defines a set of capabilities that facilitate collection of data and information	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture			No Reuse	6
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Defines the set of capabilities that support the transfer of knowledge to the end customer.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery			No Reuse	6
Workflow	Defines the set of capabilities that support Workflow services. These services pertain to the movement of documents and/or tasks, how they are structured, who performs them, their sequence, synchronization, and resolution of contention points, etc.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	6
Security Auditing	Defines the set of capabilities that support logging/summarizing significant authentication and authorization events and changes to	Support Services	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis			No Reuse	6

Exhibit 300: FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) (Revision 3)

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table: Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	identity objects.							
Certification and Accreditation	Defines the set of capabilities that support the Certification and Accreditation (C&A) of federal systems, as described in NIST SP800-37.	Support Services	Security Management	Certification and Accreditation			No Reuse	5
User Identification	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 identification is confirmed as authentic).	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	5

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

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table: To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.				
FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Certification and Accreditation	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Resource Planning and Allocation	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Balanced Scorecard	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Customer Feedback	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Content Review and Approval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
OLAP	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	

Exhibit 300: FBI Guardian (Formerly FTTS) (Revision 3)

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.				
FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Tagging and Aggregation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Portal Servers	

a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

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

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? 2/20/2007
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results: * Costs in millions			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
3- Separate software baseline	Develop Guardian 2.X and eGuardian as separate software baselines because of the constraints imposed by many different hardware configurations used by state, local and tribal LE partners. Separate baselines will permit development of robust code to support Guardian 2.X requirements for a database application that supports workflow. This alternative will require duplication of hardware, development and O & M.		

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

Alternative 3 addresses the unique user requirements and security regulations for state, local and tribal LE information sharing. This alternative provides the most cost effective path to operate and maintain the Guardian 2.0 and eGuardian baseline architectures. It provides necessary resources to develop, modernize and enhance future versions. It maximizes current expertise and minimizes the learning curve for development by utilizing the in-place contract support staff. This alternative will allow for faster production, less expensive and more robust follow on versions of both products.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, 2008 when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

The Guardian Program, which includes both Guardian and eGuardian applications, is filling a threat information-sharing gap; its primary qualitative benefits realized include: 1) Web-based systems are easier to use than earlier systems and do not require additional personnel to operate. The training does not rely solely on human trainers and consists of Computer Based Training (CBT) modules, Online Help, and Quick Start materials. 2) Data are transportable and transformable, which aids in promoting information sharing more easily than previously was the case with other systems. This should help defer additional costs for new equipment and software (i.e., local jurisdictions can use whatever hardware and software they currently own). 3) Operates in a paperless environment, enabling users to view, search and create useful reports derived from threat data, preventing the time-consuming flow of paper from office-to-office or agency-to-agency. This streamlined environment supports activities to complete a suspicious activity notification (from citizen notification to action by local authorities or the FBI) faster than ever before. The processing time may be reduced from hours to 20 minutes per incident?a significant time savings. 4) Enables law enforcement personnel to work multiple SARs concurrently, allowing a greater number of people to collaborate on investigations than before without Guardian. For example, prior to using the system, users might have worked on only 2-3 incidents having multiple sessions for each. Now, a user can work on many more incidents in one session and many different users can work on the same incident.

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits				
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2007 & Prior	0	0.18	not applicable - no cost savings	The Guardian Program limited rollout saving 7 man hours per 400 incidents
PY 2008	0	4.5	not applicable - no cost savings	The Guardian Program limited rollout saving 7 man hours for each of 10,000 incidents

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits				
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
CY 2009	0	19.08	not applicable - no cost savings	The Guardian Program includes Guardian savings of 7 manhours for each of 20,000 incidents and eGuardian limited rollout savings of 7 manhours for each of 200 incidents.
BY 2010	0			

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

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:

5b. 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? 6/26/2008
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No
- c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

- 2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:
 The Guardian Program manages risks for its IT investment by following the FBI's Project Assurance Unit's (PAU) Risk Management Guideline, Version 2.0, dated 09/28/2005. This guideline outlines the designated activities to manage risk throughout the project's life cycle. Each month, or as required by the project Risk Manager, Guardian Program personnel meet to discuss project risks. As each new risk is identified, it is assigned an owner who has the responsibility of developing a mitigation strategy, status and plan of execution. The board members independently vote on the level of impact and the probability of occurrence associated with the newly identified Risk. These votes are tabulated and the Risk is assigned a level of seriousness (i.e. Very High, High, Medium, or Low). In succeeding months, each existing risk in the Risk Register is reviewed and updated. Based on the level of seriousness, additional slack time can be added to the schedule or Management Reserve funds can be allocated to the budget

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 No

100; $SV\% = SV/PV \times 100$)

- a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
- b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

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

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? No

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

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '0' for any milestone no longer active.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
1	Complete Integration for Guardian 2.0	9/30/2007	\$5.00	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	\$5.00	\$5.00	0	\$0.00	100%
2	Begin O & M Support for Guardian 2.0	9/30/2007	\$3.62	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	\$3.62	\$3.62	0	\$0.00	100%
3	O & M Support including bug fixes and patches for Guardian 2.0	2/14/2008	\$1.24	2/14/2008	2/14/2008	\$1.24	\$1.24	0	\$0.00	100%
4	Technology Refresh and O & M Support for Guardian 2.0	2/14/2009	\$2.49	2/14/2009	2/14/2009	\$2.49	\$2.49	0	\$0.00	100%
7	Concept exploration for Guardian 3.0	12/31/2008	\$1.03	12/31/2008		\$1.03	\$1.03		\$0.00	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 '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			
26	Concept Exploration for eGuardian 1.0	2/14/2007	\$0.37	2/14/2007	2/14/2007	\$0.37	\$0.37	0	\$0.00	100%
27	Initial Planning for Guardian 1.0	5/31/2007	\$0.37	5/31/2007	5/31/2007	\$0.37	\$0.37	0	\$0.00	100%
28	Requirements Development for eGuardian 1.0	6/30/2007	\$0.15	6/30/2007	6/30/2007	\$0.15	\$0.15	0	\$0.00	100%
29	Acquisition Planning for eGuardian 1.0	1/4/2007	\$0.15	1/4/2007	1/4/2007	\$0.15	\$0.15	0	\$0.00	100%
30	Source Selection for eGuardian 1.0	2/14/2007	\$0.83	2/14/2007	2/14/2007	\$0.83	\$0.83	0	\$0.00	100%
31	Design eGuardian 1.0	1/31/2008	\$0.96	1/31/2008	1/31/2008	\$0.96	\$0.96	0	\$0.00	100%
32	Develop and Test eGuardian 1.0	8/1/2008	\$1.12	8/1/2008	8/1/2008	\$1.12	\$1.12	0	\$0.00	100%
33	Implement and Integrate eGuardian 1.0	9/30/2008	\$0.86	9/30/2008		\$0.86	\$0.86		\$0.00	100%
34	Provide Training for eGuardian 1.0	12/31/2008	\$0.50	12/31/2008		\$0.50	\$0.50		\$0.00	100%
35	Provide O & M Support for eGuardian 1.0	2/14/2009	\$0.62	2/14/2009	2/14/2009	\$0.62	\$0.62	0	\$0.00	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 '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			