

DOE DGWG XP Status Follow-Up Findings and Results

Of the 75 organizations contacted, 31 responded which represents a terrific 41 percent. So some organizations provided more than one answer because of separate situations that exist for operating system and office suite. This draft findings and results paper presents major findings from the responses. Much more detail exists in a related worksheet, which captured and consolidated all responses verbatim.

0 A responses - *We have implemented XP at the site level.*

4 B responses - *We have implemented XP in a limited/test environment.*

9 C responses - *We anticipate implementing XP in the current funding cycle.*

18 D responses - *We will address XP implementation beyond the current funding cycle.*

Most users have a mixed environment of Windows 95, 98, NT, and 2000, running Office 97 and Office 2000.

A.

None

B.

Environmental Measurements Lab

LLNL Computations

ORO/NOLA

EM HQ

Moved to XP in a limited/test environment because:

Reason	Org	Windows	Office
1. Regular replacement of PCs	EML	*	
2. Upgrade to reduce problems with Win ME	EML	*	
3. To address long-term support issues brought on by the phasing out of Windows2000 bug fixes	LLNL	*	
4. To meet user demand	LLNL	*	*
5. Added features	ORO/NOLA	*	
6. DOE enterprise agreement with Microsoft	ORO/NOLA	*	
7. New desktop machines	ORO/NOLA	*	

C.

BWXT Y-12

ORAU/ORISE

RL/Hanford: Office of Site Services

WSRC Information Technology Dept

FE-5, 173 desktops (Patricia Dickinson)

Chicago Operations Office

USDOE/Carlsbad Field Office

LANL

EM-HQ

**DOE DGWG XP Status Follow-Up
Findings and Results**

SPRPMO

Moving to XP in current funding cycle comes from:

Reason	Org	Windows	Office
1. Market forces	BWXT Y-12	*	*
2. Reduce the need for WordPerfect (hoping Office XP will facilitate the WordPerfect/Word conversion).	BWXT Y-12		*
3. Office Upgrade Advantage Maintenance contract	ORAU/ORISE	*	*
4. Active Directory	Office of Site Services	*	
5. Workstation management and control	Office of Site Services	*	
6. Security	Office of Site Services	*	
7. User demand	FE-5	*	*
8. Goal of maintaining a standardized application environment	FE-5		*
9. Desire to support Department-wide standards	Chicago Ops Office	*	*
10. Vendors are shipping it pre-installed	Chicago Ops Office	*	*
	LANL	*	*
11. Stay Current on our OS	SPRPMO		*
	EM-HQ	*	
12. Office 97 no longer supported by Microsoft	WSRC Information Technology Dept	*	*
13. Increased functionality and performance over 2000, especially in infrastructure areas	EM-HQ		

Barriers to move XP more quickly comes from:

Reason	Org	Windows	Office
1. Existing hardware base	BWXT-Y12	*	
2. Cost and interface changes too significant	ORAU-ORISE	*	
3. Use of XP is not permitted at this time except in the test bed	Carlsbad	*	*

D

WT-1

SEPA

Office of Science

IM-1

NNSA – NA66

ED

Office of Counterintelligence (CN-1)

Office of Hearings and Appeals (HG)

NE

**DOE DGWG XP Status Follow-Up
Findings and Results**

Environment, Safety and Health (EH-72)
 FE-5
 EIA
 AL/CTSD
 Sandia - Dept. 09624 CSU Technology Development
 BWXT Pantex Plant
 EM HQ
 DOE-ID
 DOE-ID

Reluctance/barriers to move to XP comes from:

Reason	Org	Windows	Office
1. Want to complete upgrading to Win 2000	IM-43	*	
	NNSA	*	
	ED	*	
	HG	*	
	EH-72		
	FE-5	*	
	EIA	*	
	AL/CTSD	*	
	CSU/Sandia	*	
	BWXT/Pantex	*	
	EM/HQ	*	
2. Upgrades are labor intensive	FE-5	*	
3. Perceived security vulnerabilities and bugs	FE-5	*	
	ID	*	
4. Feeling that XP is untested/unstable	SEPA	*	
	NE	*	
	EH-72	*	
	EIA	*	
	ID	*	
5. Lack of business need	WT-1	*	*
	SC	*	
	FE-5	*	
6. No value added/not cost-effective.	WT-1	*	
7. Funds in short supply/better spent elsewhere	WT-1	*	*
	NE	*	
8. Support Desktop Standardization	NNSA	*	
9. Licensing issues	CN-1	*	