

USPTO Trademark Automation Program

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

I.A. Overview

1. Date of Submission:	12/29/2006
2. Agency:	Department of Commerce
3. Bureau:	US Patent and Trademark Office
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	USPTO Trademark Automation Program
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	006-51-01-04-01-8005-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Mixed Life Cycle

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

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) initiated the Trademark Automation program to enable the USPTO to migrate to a more efficient operating environment that supports the business goal of providing quality services and products in a timely manner to customers and stakeholders. Implementing the Trademark Automation program allows USPTO to achieve and go well beyond its 21st Century Strategic Plan objective. The increased use of automation contributes directly to Commerce's Strategic Goal number 2: "Foster science and technological leadership by protecting intellectual property, enhancing technical standards, and advancing measurement science." Trademark Automation supports the expansion of electronic government by promoting the sharing of information more quickly and conveniently with the public, businesses, and other intellectual property offices. In addition, Trademark Automation supports the goal of a citizen-centric e-Gov for Trademarks by providing for more efficient communication with the public and USPTO customers by providing a single point of access for trademark application information. Furthermore, this program will help improve the integration of electronic communications to offer market-based services and improve the availability of trademark information to more effectively serve an increasingly larger, global client base. The Trademark Automation Program enhances the current manual trademark application processes with electronic processing and improves the maintenance of all the records associated with Trademark applications. By implementing the Trademark Automation Program, USPTO reduces operations costs, improves efficiency and quality through workload and process management, reduces pendency, increases visibility and control through improved management reporting capabilities, and supports the expansion of the Trademark Work-at-Home program. Trademark Automation enables improved access to USPTO information by internal users and the public and facilitates the international exchange of information and protection of intellectual property. The Trademark Automation program will improve the processing of trademark applications and registrations and provide improved support for the staff. Trademark Automation includes an electronic workflow system to route work items through well-defined processes and provides prompt and efficient communication with internal and external customers.

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
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?	No
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	No
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all that apply:	Expanded E-Government
13a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	The Trademark Systems Exhibit 300 investment portfolio supports the President's goal of expanded e-government by allowing USPTO to share information more quickly and conveniently with the public, businesses, and other intellectual property offices. In addition, this investment will support the strategic goal of a citizen-centric e-Gov for Trademarks by providing for more efficient communication with the public and USPTO customers.
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 the PART review?	No
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office - Trademarks
c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	Moderately Effective
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes

If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-

section.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? Level 2
(per CIO Council PM Guidance)

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance): (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)? No

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMI A compliance area? No

1. If "yes," which compliance area: N/A

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

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

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	0
Software	49.40
Services	9.60
Other	41

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? Yes

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

Title Privacy Officer

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

I.B. Summary of Funding

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 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 and Beyond	Total
Planning									
Budgetary Resources	0	0	0	0					
Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	19.2166	1.02868	5.39936	5.0807					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	19.2166	1.02868	5.39936	5.0807					
Operations & Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	33.03146	16.40394	9.5108	10.44816					
TOTAL									
Budgetary Resources	52.24806	17.43262	14.91016	15.52886					
Government FTE Costs									
Budgetary Resources	11.86971	2.6003	3.35179	3.85677					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	0	22	28	32					

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

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?	No
a. If "yes," How many and in what year?	2 in FY08
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:	
Not Applicable	

I.C. Acquisition/Contract Strategy

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table:

Row Number	Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order	Has the contract been awarded?	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	Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	Is it performance based?	Competitively awarded?	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	Is EVM in the contract?	Does the contract include the required security and privacy clauses?	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/e mail)	Contracting Officer Certification Level	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?
1	DOC50PAPT201025	Time and Materials	Yes	7/3/2002	7/2/2002	6/30/2012	160.28	Yes	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Etzel, Page A.	page.etzel@uspto.gov	Level 3	Yes
2	DOC50PAPT0501004	Cost Plus Fixed Fee	Yes	12/17/2004	12/17/2004	12/31/2012	251.18	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Weibel, Richard	richard.weibel@uspto.gov	Level 3	Yes
3	DOC50PAPT0501005	Cost Plus Fixed Fee	Yes	12/17/2004	12/17/2004	12/31/2012	280.95	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Brown, Marva	marva.brown@uspto.gov	Level 2	Yes
4	DOC50PAPT201006	Cost Plus Award Fee	Yes	9/27/2002	10/1/2002	9/30/2007	72.21	Yes	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Smith, Hope	hope.smith@uspto.gov	Level 2	Yes
5	DOC50PAPT201026	Cost Plus Award Fee	Yes	9/27/2002	10/1/2002	9/30/2007	56.43	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Van Dyke, Sylvia	sylvia.vandyke@uspto.gov	Level 3	Yes
6	DOC50PAPT0401006	Cost Plus Fixed Fee	Yes	4/29/2004	7/1/2004	6/30/2009	45.6	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Hannah, Chris	chris.hannah@uspto.gov	Level 3	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:

A proposed amendment to the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR Case 2004-019) to standardize EVM contract policy across the government was published in the Federal Register on April 8, 2005. The rule proposes standard EVMS provisions, a standard clause, and a requirement for acquisition plans to include the planning for conducting compliance reviews and Integrated Baseline Reviews. The current USPTO IT contracts listed in the previous table were negotiated in 2004 or earlier and do not include language requiring Earned Value. However, USPTO will make an attempt to renegotiate the existing contracts to build in an EVM reporting requirement. In addition, going forward USPTO will require Earned Value in all of its new or extended contracts.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why:

All applicable COTS software procured under this project and all software developed by USPTO contractors are required to be 508 compliant. In accordance with our LCM methodology, all software is tested for 508 compliance prior to release for production use.

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

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

10/1/2003

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

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

I.D. Performance Information

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

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

Performance Information Table 1:					
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous)	Planned Performance	Performance Metric Results

			Year)	Metric (Target)	(Actual)
--	--	--	-------	-----------------	----------

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

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2005	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	% of USPTO Contact Center calls (external customers) resolved without transfer	35%	32%	na
2005	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory basis for which the Office refuses marks for registration for Final Office	5.8%	5.00%	5.90%
2005	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for First Office Action	7.90%	7.50%	4.70%
2005	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or	17.5	17.5	17.2

				abandonment excluding suspended and inter partes proceedings			
2005	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment including suspended and inter partes proceedings	20	20	19.6
2005	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Improve the efficiency of the trademark process as measured by the average cost of a trademark disposal compared to total trademark direct and indirect costs. Actual results are based on total expenditures and office disposals	\$701	\$701	\$677
2005	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Increase the use of electronic filing as measured by the percent of initial applications for the registration of a trademark filed electronically	80%	80%	88%
2005	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Manage trademark applications electronically as measured by the percent of pending applications that are available as electronic records through TICRS	100%	100%	100%
2005	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	% of projects on dashboard with approved green sheet	85%	85%	80%
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% of internal IT	48%	60%	50%

				customer requests that can be resolved on first contact			
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% , on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of performance targets (requirements met at PRR vs. specified at RR)	60%	60%	50%
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Actual % of internal IT customer requests resolved on first contact	48%	60%	50%
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Average number of critical and major defects per Trademark AIS during FQT and Beta	8	8	9.5
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Maintain a 95% customer satisfaction rating as measured through Customer Quality Checks	95%	95%	98%
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Answer internal calls within a daily weekday average of 1 minute for a call volume of 500 contacts or less, measured by ECC reports	95%	95%	100%
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Public calls must be answered within 1 minute for 300 calls or less.	95%	95%	95%
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Resolve or circumvent problem records within 4 hour from the time the ticket is created	95%	95%	95%
2005	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Provide 24 x 7 Network Operations Center (NOC)	95%	97%	95%

				monitoring and reporting of network and AIS outages within 10 minutes of a failure			
2005	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Install network cable drops within 15 days of receipt of request	95%	95%	100%
2006	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency reat determined through an in-process review evalutaion of the statury basis for which the Office refuses marks for registration for Final Office	6.5%	5.5%	3.4
2006	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency reat determined through an in-process review evalutaion of the statury basis for which the Office refuses marks for registration for First Office Action	7.9%	4.5%	4.9%
2006	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment excluding suspended and inter partes proceedings	17.5	16.3	16.2
2006	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or	18.8	18.8	18.6

				abandonment including suspended and inter partes proceedings.			
2006	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Increase the use of electronic filing as measured by the percent of initial applications for the registration of a trademark filed electronically	80%	90%	93%
2006	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Manage trademark applications electronically as measured by the percent of pending applications that are available as electronic records through TICRS	100%	99%	100%
2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	% of projects on dashboard with approved green sheet	85%	90%	tbd
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% of internal IT customer requests that can be resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of performance targets (requirements met at PRR vs. specified at RR)	60%	64%	tbd
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of schedule (PTO interpretation, within 2 weeks of schedule)	79%	90%	tbd
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Actual % of internal IT customer requests	48%	60%	tbd

				resolved on first contact			
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Average number of critical and major defects per Trademark AIS during FQT and Beta	8	5	tbd
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Maintain a 95% customer satisfaction rating as measured through Customer Quality Checks.	95%	95%	tbd
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Answer internal calls within a daily weekday average of 1 minute for a call volume of 500 contacts or less, measured by ECC reports.	95%	95%	tbd
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Public calls must be answered within 1 minute for 300 calls or less.	95%	95%	tbd
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Resolve or circumvent problem records within 4 hour from the time the ticket is created.	95%	95%	tbd
2006	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Provide 24 x 7 Network Operations Center (NOC) monitoring and reporting of network and AIS outages within 10 minutes of a failure.	95%	97%	tbd
2006	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Install network cable drops within 15 days of receipt of request	95%	97%	tbd
2007	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	% of USPTO Contact Center calls (external customers) resolved without transfer	35%	40%	tbd
2007	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or	Improve examination	6.5%	6.0%	tbd

			Product Delivered	quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for Final Office Action			
2007	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for First Office Action	6.5%	6.0%	tbd
2007	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment excluding suspended and inter partes proceedings.	16.3	14.9	tbd
2007	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment including suspended and inter partes proceedings.	18.8	17.3	tbd
2007	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Improve the efficiency of the trademark process as measured by the average cost of a trademark	\$701	\$626	tbd

				disposal compared to total trademark direct and indirect costs. Actual results are based on total expenditures and office disposals			
2007	Mission and Business Results	Human Resource Management	Organization and Position Management	Trademark employees working from home with the same access to USPTO systems they would have working in the Office	260	280	tbd
2007	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Increase the use of electronic filing as measured by the percent of initial applications for the registration of a trademark filed electronically	80%	90%	tbd
2007	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Manage trademark applications electronically as measured by the percent of pending applications that are available as electronic records through TICRS	100%	100%	tbd
2007	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	% of projects on dashboard with approved green sheet	85%	95%	tbd
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% of internal IT customer requests that can be resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of performance targets (requirements met at PRR vs. specified at RR)	65%	70%	tbd

2007	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of schedule (PTO interpretation, within 2 weeks of schedule)	79%	90%	tbd
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Actual % of internal IT customer requests resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Average number of critical and major defects per Trademark AIS during FQT and Beta	5	5	tbd
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Maintain a 95% customer satisfaction rating as measured through Customer Quality Checks.	95%	95%	tbd
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Answer internal calls within a daily weekday average of 1 minute for a call volume of 500 contacts or less, measured by ECC reports	95%	95%	tbd
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Public calls must be answered within 1 minute for 300 calls or less.	95%	95%	tbd
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Resolve or circumvent problem records within 4 hour from the time the ticket is created.	95%	95%	tbd
2007	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Provide 24 x 7 Network Operations Center (NOC) monitoring and reporting of network and AIS outages within 10 minutes of a	95%	97.2%	tbd

				failure.			
2007	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Install network cable drops within 15 days of receipt of request	95%	97.5%	tbd
2008	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	% of USPTO Contact Center calls (external customers) resolved without transfer	35%	???	tbd
2008	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for Final Office Action	6.5%	5.5%	tbd
2008	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for First Office Action	6.5%	5.5%	tbd
2008	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment excluding suspended and inter partes proceedings.	16.3	14.1	tbd
2008	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance,	18.8	16.6	tbd

				registration, or abandonment including suspended and inter partes proceedings.			
2008	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Improve the efficiency of the trademark process as measured by the average cost of a trademark disposal compared to total trademark direct and indirect costs. Actual results are based on total expenditures and office disposals	\$701	\$621	tbd
2008	Mission and Business Results	Human Resource Management	Organization and Position Management	Trademark employees working from home with the same access to USPTO systems they would have working in the Office	260	300	tbd
2008	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Increase the use of electronic filing as measured by the percent of initial applications for the registration of a trademark filed electronically	80%	90%	tbd
2008	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Manage trademark applications electronically as measured by the percent of pending applications that are available as electronic records through TICRS	100%	100%	tbd
2008	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	% of projects on dashboard with approved green sheet	85%	95%	tbd
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% of internal IT customer requests that	48%	60%	tbd

				can be resolved on first contact			
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% , on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of performance targets (requirements met at PRR vs. specified at RR)	70%	75%	tbd
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% , on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of schedule (PTO interpretation, within 2 weeks of schedule)	79%	90%	tbd
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Actual % of internal IT customer requests resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Average number of critical and major defects per Trademark AIS during FQT and Beta	5	5	tbd
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Maintain a 95% customer satisfaction rating as measured through Customer Quality Checks	95%	95%	tbd
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Answer internal calls within a daily weekday average of 1 minute for a call volume of 500 contacts or less, measured by ECC reports.	95%	95%	tbd
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Public calls must be answered within 1 minute for 300 calls or less.	95%	95%	tbd
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Resolve or circumvent	95%	95%	tbd

				problem records within 4 hour from the time the ticket is created.			
2008	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Provide 24 x 7 Network Operations Center (NOC) monitoring and reporting of network and AIS outages within 10 minutes of a failure.	95%	97.4%	tbd
2008	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Install network cable drops within 15 days of receipt of request	95%	98%	tbd
2009	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	% of USPTO Contact Center calls (external customers) resolved without transfer	35%	???	tbd
2009	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for Final Office Action	6.5%	5.0%	tbd
2009	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for First Office Action	6.5%	5.0%	tbd
2009	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to	16.3	13.4	tbd

				issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment excluding suspended and inter partes proceedings.			
2009	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment including suspended and inter partes proceedings.	18.8	15.9	tbd
2009	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Improve the efficiency of the trademark process as measured by the average cost of a trademark disposal compared to total trademark direct and indirect costs. Actual results are based on total expenditures and office disposals	\$701	tbd	tbd
2009	Mission and Business Results	Human Resource Management	Organization and Position Management	Trademark employees working from home with the same access to USPTO systems they would have working in the Office	260	320	tbd
2009	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Increase the use of electronic filing as measured by the percent of initial applications for the registration of a trademark filed electronically	80%	90%	tbd
2009	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Manage trademark applications electronically as	100%	100%	tbd

				measured by the percent of pending applications that are available as electronic records through TICRS			
2009	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	% of projects on dashboard with approved green sheet	85%	95%	tbd
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% of internal IT customer requests that can be resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of performance targets (requirements met at PRR vs. specified at RR)	75%	80%	tbd
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of schedule (PTO interpretation, within 2 weeks of schedule)	79%	90%	tbd
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Actual % of internal IT customer requests resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Average number of critical and major defects per Trademark AIS during FQT and Beta	5	4.5	tbd
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Maintain a 95% customer satisfaction rating as measured through Customer Quality Checks.	95%	95%	tbd
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Answer internal calls within a	95%	95%	tbd

				daily weekday average of 1 minute for a call volume of 500 contacts or less, measured by ECC reports.			
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Public calls must be answered within 1 minute for 300 calls or less.	95%	95%	tbd
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Resolve or circumvent problem records within 4 hour from the time the ticket is created.	95%	95%	tbd
2009	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Provide 24 x 7 Network Operations Center (NOC) monitoring and reporting of network and AIS outages within 10 minutes of a failure.	95%	97.6%	tbd
2009	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Install network cable drops within 15 days of receipt of request	95%	98.5%	tbd
2010	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	% of USPTO Contact Center calls (external customers) resolved without transfer	35%	tbd	tbd
2010	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for Final Office Action	6.5%	4.5%	tbd
2010	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the	6.5%	4.5%	tbd

				deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for First Office Action			
2010	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment excluding suspended and inter partes proceedings.	16.3	12.8	tbd
2010	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment including suspended and inter partes proceedings.	18.8	15.3	tbd
2010	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Improve the efficiency of the trademark process as measured by the average cost of a trademark disposal compared to total trademark direct and indirect costs. Actual results are based on total expenditures and office disposals	\$701	tbd	tbd
2010	Mission and Business Results	Human Resource Management	Organization and Position Management	Trademark employees working from home with the same access to USPTO systems they would have working in the Office	260	340	tbd

2010	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Increase the use of electronic filing as measured by the percent of initial applications for the registration of a trademark filed electronically	80%	90%	tbd
2010	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Manage trademark applications electronically as measured by the percent of pending applications that are available as electronic records through TICRS	100%	100%	tbd
2010	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	% of projects on dashboard with approved green sheet	85%	95%	tbd
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% of internal IT customer requests that can be resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of performance targets (requirements met at PRR vs. specified at RR)	80%	85%	tbd
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of schedule (PTO interpretation, within 2 weeks of schedule)	79%	90%	tbd
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Actual % of internal IT customer requests resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Average number of critical and	4.5	4.0	tbd

				major defects per Trademark AIS during FQT and Beta			
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Maintain a 95% customer satisfaction rating as measured through Customer Quality Checks.	95%	95%	tbd
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Answer internal calls within a daily weekday average of 1 minute for a call volume of 500 contacts or less, measured by ECC reports.	95%	95%	tbd
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Public calls must be answered within 1 minute for 300 calls or less.	95%	95%	tbd
2010	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Resolve or circumvent problem records within 4 hour from the time the ticket is created.	95%	95%	tbd
2010	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Provide 24 x 7 Network Operations Center (NOC) monitoring and reporting of network and AIS outages within 10 minutes of a failure.	95%	97.8%	tbd
2010	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Install network cable drops within 15 days of receipt of request	95%	99%	tbd
2011	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	% of USPTO Contact Center calls (external customers) resolved without transfer	35%	tbd	tbd
2011	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined	6.5%	4.0%	tbd

				through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for Final Office Action			
2011	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Improve examination quality of Trademarks as indicated by the deficiency rate determined through an in-process review evaluation of the statutory bases for which the Office refuses marks for registration for First Office Action	6.5%	4.0%	tbd
2011	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment excluding suspended and inter partes proceedings.	16.3	12.0	tbd
2011	Mission and Business Results	Community and Social Services	Social Services	Disposal pendency from date of filing to issuance of a notice of allowance, registration, or abandonment including suspended and inter partes proceedings.	18.8	14.6	tbd
2011	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Improve the efficiency of the trademark process as measured by the average cost of a trademark disposal compared to total trademark direct and indirect costs.	\$701	tbd	tbd

				Actual results are based on total expenditures and office disposals			
2011	Mission and Business Results	Human Resource Management	Organization and Position Management	Trademark employees working from home with the same access to USPTO systems they would have working in the Office	260	360	tbd
2011	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Increase the use of electronic filing as measured by the percent of initial applications for the registration of a trademark filed electronically	80%	90%	tbd
2011	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Manage trademark applications electronically as measured by the percent of pending applications that are available as electronic records through TICRS	100%	100%	tbd
2011	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	% of projects on dashboard with approved green sheet	85%	95%	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	% of internal IT customer requests that can be resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which operate within 90% of performance targets (requirements met at PRR vs. specified at RR)	85%	90%	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	%, on average, of all major IT projects (those required to have a PRR) which	79%	90%	tbd

				operate within 90% of schedule (PTO interpretation, within 2 weeks of schedule)			
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Actual % of internal IT customer requests resolved on first contact	48%	60%	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Average number of critical and major defects per Trademark AIS during FQT and Beta	4	4	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Maintain a 95% customer satisfaction rating as measured through Customer Quality Checks.	95%	95%	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Answer internal calls within a daily weekday average of 1 minute for a call volume of 500 contacts or less, measured by ECC reports.	95%	95%	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Public calls must be answered within 1 minute for 300 calls or less.	95%	95%	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Resolve or circumvent problem records within 4 hour from the time the ticket is created.	95%	95%	tbd
2011	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Provide 24 x 7 Network Operations Center (NOC) monitoring and reporting of network and AIS outages within 10 minutes of a failure.	95%	98%	tbd
2011	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Install network cable drops within 15 days	95%	99.5%	tbd

				of receipt of request			
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Average number of critical and major defects per Trademark AIS during FOT and Beta	4	4	tbd
2011	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Maintain a 95% customer satisfaction rating as measured through Customer Quality Checks.	95%	95%	tbd

I.E. Security and Privacy

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

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

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:	2
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
5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?	Yes
a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated agency's plan of action and milestone process?	Yes
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?	No

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

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Is the PIA available to the public?	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?
USPTO Trademark Automated System (TAS) - PTOT-001-00	No	No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

I.F. Enterprise Architecture (EA)

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

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

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? No

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

b. If "no," please explain why?

The USPTO is taking action to formalize its USPTO Enterprise Architecture (UEA) and to move forward with the implementation of the UEA program consistent with the Federal Enterprise Architecture Guidance. The following activities have already occurred: Resources have been secured for this effort: - Chief Architect has been designated - UEA lead has been assigned - UEA team has been established - Key OCIO and business area POC have been identified - Working-level UEA repository has been created - Contract has been awarded to MITRE, a FFRDC, for support in implementing the UEA program The immediate UEA goal is to establish, consistent with FEA guidance, a level of maturity in the Completion and Use capability areas to support a level 3 assessments, i.e. attain green status, by the end of FY06. The consensus of the UEA team is that that the USPTO is well positioned to achieve this goal. Many of the supporting artifacts and processes are already in place. These artifacts and processes are being reviewed to determine if any changes are needed or if new processes and/or artifacts need to be created/implemented. A UEA framework will be formalized and existing business area processes and activity costs models are being analyzed as data sources for the definition of the business and performance architectures. Existing OCIO IT Application, Technical, and Standards Roadmaps are being reviewed as source data to instantiate the needed sequencing strategy/transition plans. Many of the governance process are already in place. Major IT investments currently go through a CPIC process and the existing SDLC is being modified. Both of these established processes are being reviewed to ensure that their relation to the UEA is clear and that UEA is position to inform those processes and influence near and long term IT investments. During FY07, the goal is to build on the successes of the established architectures and processes and to continue to build out the architectures across the USPTO businesses areas, and to ensure that the defined UEA governance processes and institutionalized across the USPTO and that we have robust UEA that truly informs and influences IT investment decisions and provides measurable evidence of efficiencies and results.

3. Service Reference Model (SRM) Table:

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
Trademark Application and Registration Retrieval System (TARR)	Provides customers with access to trademark status information via the Internet	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Reservations / Registration			No Reuse	0
TESS - Trademark Electronic Search System	Provides the general public users trademark text and image database that is updated daily	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service			No Reuse	8
Trademark E-Commerce Law Office	Communication tool that update transaction status and announcements of incoming and outgoing event notices	Customer Services	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications			No Reuse	0
Trademark In-House Photocomposition System (TIPS)	Takes data extracted from the trademark database and transforms the data into printed materials for proofing and publication to the GPO	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Conversion			No Reuse	2
Trademark Image Capture and Retrieval System (TICRS)	Captures, stores, retrieves, and prints digital images of Trademark application documents	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Imaging and OCR			No Reuse	11
Trademark Cropped Image Manager	Stores and catalogs cropped images from TEAS, TRADEUPS, and the Data Management Branch of the OSNM	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Library / Storage			No Reuse	2
Trademark Document	Provides PTO staff and the	Digital Asset	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	0

Retrieval	public access to Trademark applications over the internet/intranet	Services							
Trademark Reference Law Library	Access point to reference materials for trademark examiners and lawyers	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	0	
Trademark Electronic Application Submission System (TEAS)	Allows for all Trademarks forms to be received electronically through standardized transactions using XML	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	5	
Trademark Postal System (TPostal)	Generates and sends bulk mail to the USPS Website for printing, stamping, and mailing trademark notices.	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	1	
MI TEAS (Formerly Trademark Madrid System)	Allows for the payment of fees and the completion and submission of applications electronically	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	11	
TRAM	Provides database services and operational support to all systems	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management			No Reuse	29	
First Action System for Trademarks (TIS/FAST 2)	A front-end tool that allows for the electronic examination of applications, performs first action, and provides workflow capabilities	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	27	
X-Search System	Search capabilities support the examination and retrieval of all trademark records including text and image data.	Support Services	Search	Query			No Reuse	4	

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

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

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

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

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Open Text Livelink Search
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Open Text Livelink Search
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Unisys
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Bizflow
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Portal Servers	Dell PowerEdge
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	iPlanet Web Server
Reservations / Registration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	iPlanet Web Server
Document Imaging and OCR	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	Imaging for Windows Professional
Document Conversion	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	Xerox Docuprint
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	MC/Service Guard
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Dell Win2k Server

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

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?

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

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

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

II.A. Alternatives Analysis

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

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

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?	12/19/2005
b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	
c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:	

2. Alternative Analysis Results:

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

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative
Alternative 1	This alternative involves refining and adapting the Trademark Information System (TIS) and its associated components by using an agile approach to support electronic workflow and processing of trademark applications and registrations. Each subsequent phase or iteration will continue to improve support for operations by ultimately providing Trademark employees a common electronic interface, virtual workflow capabilities and more orchestration abilities in support of the USPTO strategic plan.
Alternative 2	This alternative will accelerate the modernization of Trademark Information System (TIS) by reusing existing components where appropriate and systems will be decoupled to enhance system flexibility through a more efficient shared services open architecture and support electronic workflow to process Trademark applications and registrations. This alternative continues to support other USPTO strategic Trademarks initiatives including the external customer e-filing system and the Work@Home program.
Alternative 3	This alternative will deliver an entirely re-engineered solution consisting of an integration of COTS products, that would provide true electronic workflow, content management and orchestration capabilities that would support the processing of trademark applications and registrations. This alternative continues to support other USPTO strategic Trademarks initiatives including the external customer e-filing system and the Work@Home program.

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

The Alternatives Analysis performed assigned a greater weight to risk and cost, in the project selection, than any other criteria. For this reason Alternative 1 has been chosen. While Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 may have additional benefits in the long run, the cost and risk are too aggressive. Alternative 1 is a solution that allows flexibility, and multiple and shorter iterations, so that selected functionality can be tested and then proven in production before proceeding to the next piece of functionality thus benefits are realized sooner. A sound solution should be gradual and executed in phases rather than in one large effort. This will provide the ability to move quickly to meet internal, administration, and customer demands. The selected alternative was chosen using a Cost Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) in lieu of a more traditional Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) with a Return on Investment (ROI). This was done due to the complexity of quantifying benefits. Since each alternative represents a similar benefit or desired outcome, a CEA allows us to compare each alternative to determine the most efficient and cost effective way to reach those desired outcomes or benefits.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

The following qualitative benefits are being considered with the intention to provide direct quantifiable benefits to further assist in the evaluation of each alternative in future iterations of this exhibit: - Eliminate maintenance costs for legacy equipment (Legacy Bar Code Readers) - Eliminate paper processing - Efficiency (bar code transactions are done automatically) - Efficiency (Only those transactions that support the function is presented to the user) - Total electronic environment - Benefits realized sooner - Work at home - expansion Improved Data Quality - Eliminate lost paper routing sheets correspondence - Incremental development - Enhanced Productivity (Minimize steps) - Online Knowledge Paks, Procedures & Guidelines Manuals

II.B. Risk Management

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and

initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?	7/17/2006
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:

II.C. Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748?	No
--	----

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

a. What is the Planned Value (PV)?	1407.31
b. What is the Earned Value (EV)?	1182.84
c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?	1071.39
d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Contractor and Government
e. "As of" date:	8/1/2006
3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)?	0.84
4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?	-224.47
5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?	1.1040

