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:

2. Agency: Department of Transportation

3. Bureau: Federal Aviation Administration

4. Name of this Capital Asset: FAAXX456: ASR-9 Transmitter Modifications

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 021-12-01-20-01-1010-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Mixed Life Cycle

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2005

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:

ASR-9 systems provide aircraft detection and weather information to air traffic controllers at the highest activity airports. The ASR-9 tracks all aircraft within its range and provides those tracks, as well as six-level weather intensity information. This data is provided to terminal automation systems and utilized by air traffic controllers to safely and efficiently separate aircraft in the terminal environment. The ASR-9 provides data to AMASS and ASDE-X, for the prevention of accidents resulting from runway incursions. The purpose of the investment is to address the most troublesome components within the ASR-9 transmitter - the modulator pulse assembly, trigger amplifier, and post charge regulator - in order to ensure that we maintain the current level of system availability and reliability. The Modulator Pulse Assembly (MPA) and related components are responsible for up to 50% of the failures associated with the transmitter, and thus this subassembly is considered the greatest single risk to system reliability and availability. Without these modifications to the ASR-9 transmitter, the ASR-9 will continue to experience decreasing reliability and availability over time. The cost of technology refresh has been deemed more cost-effective than acquiring full replacement systems, because the current performance is effective in meeting both the safety and capacity needs of the nation's air traffic system at major airports. The proposed investment assumes the solution has an economic service life of 20 years. This investment encompasses a mixed life cycle in both the solution development and operations and maintenance phases of the FAA's Acquisition Management System (equivalent to the Control and Evaluate Phases of CPIC), based on the June 2005 JRC decision approving the investment. The baseline approved by the JRC reflects the activities necessary to perform the design, development, production and installation of the MPA modification to the ASR-9 transmitter. Based on a successful Critical Design Review a production decision was obtained in December 2005. Currently, the system has successfully completed testing and production authorization has been granted. Implementation wil begin in December 2007 and is scheduled to completed in 2010.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes

    a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 6/30/2005

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes

11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name Huffman, Michael

Phone Number Redacted

Email michael.huffman@faa.gov

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

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? 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?

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? No

   If "yes," check all that apply:

   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?)

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

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

   b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? FAA Air Traffic Services

   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 Level 3
Guidance)

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

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this No
investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)

19. Is this a financial management system? No

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

      1. If "yes," which compliance area:

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

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

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	0.000000
Software	0.000000
Services	100.000000
Other	0.000000

21. If this project produces information dissemination N/A
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?

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

Name	Mauney, Carla
Phone Number	Redacted
Title	Privacy Officer
E-mail	carla.mauney@faa.gov

23. Are the records produced by this investment No
appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

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

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 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0	0	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Acquisition:	33.721	14.76	4.64	3.32	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	33.721	14.76	4.64	3.32	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0.01	0.19	0.38	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
TOTAL:	33.721	14.77	4.83	3.70	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.								
Government FTE Costs	3.358	1.688	1.321	1.372	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	13	13	13	11	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

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

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

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

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

Redacted

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.

Contracts/Task Orders Table:															* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
Redacted																

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

For the prime contract, which comprises approximately 80% of the investment, EVM is required by contract. The prime contractor reports EVM by cost account to the program office on a monthly basis. All requirements are developed according to the program work breakdown structure and vendors are required to submit monthly reports to include actual cost and schedule for work performed and planned work. The program requires all support contracts to provide data necessary to perform EVM at the program level.

Currently, all contracts are in place. No future contracts are required to complete the DME portion of this investment.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?   N/A

    a. Explain why: In accordance with FAA's Section 508 Procurement Standard Operating Procedures, ASR-9 Transmitter Modifications has determined that none of the Section 508 standards apply to the program due to the type of modifications being performed under this investment for the legacy system.

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

    a. If "yes," what is the date?   6/30/2007

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

        1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce Flight Delays Due to ASR-9 MPA-related Outages	13.7 delay hours per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 3.15) based on transmitter mod	First actual results expected in January 2009
2005	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to ASR-9 MPA-related outages	18 delayed aircraft per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 4.14) based on transmitter mod	First actual results expected in January 2009
2005	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Reduced SMO/site logistics and maintenance costs	$11K per site technician and logistics support costs	Transmitter demonstarted Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (decrease in maintenance costs)	First actual results expected January 2009
2005	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Availability Reduce Mean Time To Repair	Repair time of 18.5 hours per transmitter failure	Transmitter demonstarted Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (repair time reduced to 1.3 hours)	First actual results expected in January 2009
2005	Mobility	Technology	Reliability and	Availability	Reduce hours of	25.6 annual	Reliability	First actual

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
		Availability			unscheduled ASR-9 equipment outages (codes 60, 65, and 80)	outage hours per system	analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement to transmitter reliability, resulting in 10% decrease to system outages	results expected in January 2009
2006	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce Flight Delays Due to ASR-9 MPA-related Outages	13.7 delay hours per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 3.15) based on transmitter mod	First actual results expected in January 2009
2006	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to ASR-9 MPA-related outages	18 delayed aircraft per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 4.14) based on transmitter mod	First actual results expected in January 2009
2006	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Reduced SMO/site logistics and maintenance costs	$11K per site technician and logistics support costs	Transmitter demonstarted Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (decrease in maintenance costs)	First actual results expected January 2009
2006	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Availability Reduce Mean Time To Repair	Repair time of 18.5 hours per transmitter failure	Transmitter demonstrated Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (repair time reduced to 1.3 hours)	First actual results expected in January 2009
2006	Mobility	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Reduce hours of unscheduled ASR-9 equipment outages (codes 60, 65, and 80)	25.6 annual outage hours per system	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement to transmitter reliability, resulting in 10% decrease to system outages	First actual results expected in January 2009
2007	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce Flight Delays Due to ASR-9 MPA-related Outages	13.7 delay hours per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 3.15) based on transmitter mod	First actual results expected in January 2009
2007	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to ASR-9 MPA-related outages	18 delayed aircraft per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 4.14) based on transmitter mod	First actual results expected in January 2009
2007	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Reduced SMO/site logistics and maintenance costs	$11K per site technician and logistics support costs	Transmitter demonstarted Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (decrease in maintenance costs)	First actual results expected January 2009
2007	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Availability Reduce Mean Time To Repair	Repair time of 18.5 hours per transmitter failure	Transmitter demonstrated Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (repair time reduced to 1.3 hours)	First actual results expected in January 2009
2007	Mobility	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Reduce hours of unscheduled ASR-9	25.6 annual outage hours per system	Reliability analysis and demonstration	First actual results expected in January 2009

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					equipment outages (codes 60, 65, and 80)		indicates a 23% improvement to transmitter reliability, resulting in 10% decrease to system outages	
2008	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce Flight Delays Due to ASR-9 MPA-related Outages	13.7 delay hours per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 3.15) based on transmitter mod	First actual results expected in January 2009
2008	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to ASR-9 MPA-related outages	18 delayed aircraft per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 4.14) based on transmitter mod	First actual results expected in January 2009
2008	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Reduced SMO/site logistics and maintenance costs	$11K per site technician and logistics support costs	Transmitter demonstarted Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (decrease in maintenance costs)	First actual results expected January 2009
2008	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Availability Reduce Mean Time To Repair	Repair time of 18.5 hours per transmitter failure	Transmitter demonstrated Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (repair time reduced to 1.3 hours)	First actual results expected in January 2009
2008	Mobility	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Reduce hours of unscheduled ASR-9 equipment outages (codes 60, 65, and 80)	25.6 annual outage hours per system	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement to transmitter reliability, resulting in 10% decrease to system outages	First actual results expected in January 2009
2009	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce Flight Delays Due to ASR-9 MPA-related Outages	17.5 delay hours per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 3.15) based on transmitter mod	Results expected in January 2010
2009	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to ASR-9 MPA-related outages	22 delayed aircraft per year due to MPA-related outages	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement (decrease of 4.14) based on transmitter mod	Results expected in January 2010
2009	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Reduced SMO/site logistics and maintenance costs	$11K per site technician and logistics support costs	Transmitter demonstarted Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (decrease in maintenance costs)	Results expected January 2010
2009	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Availability Reduce Mean Time To Repair	Repair time of 14.0 hours per transmitter failure	Transmitter demonstrated Mean Time To Repair reduced by 93% (repair time reduced to 1.3 hours)	Results expected in January 2010
2009	Mobility	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Reduce hours of unscheduled ASR-9 equipment outages (codes	24.0 annual outage hours per system	Reliability analysis and demonstration indicates a 23% improvement to	Results expected in January 2010

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					60, 65, and 80)		transmitter reliability, resulting in 10% decrease to system outages	

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

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

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

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

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

    a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the   0.00
budget year:

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

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
Redacted			

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 Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Redacted							

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of   No
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   Redacted
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.

Redacted

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

Redacted

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
ASR-9 Operational Transmitter Modification	No	No	No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information	No	No because this is not a Privacy Act System of Records
ASR-9 Planned Transmitter Modification	No	No	No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	No because this is not a Privacy Act System of Records

Details for Text Options:
Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

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

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?   Yes

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

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture?   No

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table: Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to 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)
Weather Advisories Capability (ATS, ATC Advisory)	Aircraft are separated from other known aircraft in the terminal, en route, and oceanic environments. Separation assurance involves the	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Tagging and Aggregation			No Reuse	30

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)
	application of separation standards to ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance or altitude from other known aircraft. Standards are defined for aircraft based on aircraft type, size, equipment, and for operating in different environments. (NAS/ATS/ATC-SA)							
Aircraft to Aircraft Separation Capability (ATS, ATC-Separation Assurance)	Aircraft are separated from other known aircraft in the terminal, en route, and oceanic environments. Separation assurance involves the application of separation standards to ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance or altitude from other known aircraft. Standards are defined for aircraft based on aircraft type, size, equipment, and for operating in different environments. (NAS/ATS/ATC-SA)	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery			No Reuse	40
Airborne (ATS, TN Synchronization)	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize NAS efficiency and capacity throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS/ATS/TM-S)	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Conflict Resolution			No Reuse	30

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)
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Redacted
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Redacted
Tagging and Aggregation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted

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

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

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

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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

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

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?   Yes

    a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?   6/30/2004

    b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

    c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results: * 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
Redacted			

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

Redacted

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Redacted

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

    a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment.

    b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems

Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?   Yes

    a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?   7/16/2007

    b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly   Yes
changed since last year's submission to OMB?

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

There are currently no high risks on the program. Implementation risks have been identified and are being mitigated within the program baseline.

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 point estimate results were modified to address both the uncertainty associated with the estimate as well as the risk associated with meeting the program objectives. Monte Carlo simulation was utilized to determine the overall effect of the individual risk elements on the estimate. Finally, the total risk dollars required to meet an 80 percent confidence level and risk mitigation costs were assigned to WBS elements summarizing individual tasks throughout the life of the program. Current year point estimate for the investment was $93,749,000. The current year risk adjusted estimate for the investment was $94,900,000. The risk mitigation/management reserve for the investment is $1,151,000. The program schedule was risk adjusted to reflect an 80 percent confidence level, which resulted in a three month extension in the overall schedule.

The program continuously monitors cost/schedule baselines through software tools, risk management programs, and established baseline and variance analysis methods. The ASR-9 program uses an Integrated Program Schedule, to track the contract elements. The FAA program office monitors cost, schedule, and performance status against targets in the Exhibit 300 Program Baseline on a continuing basis, and takes corrective action when variances from planning objectives arise. The ASR-9 program office also reports program status at Service-Level Reviews (SLR). The focus of these reviews is to identify high-risk issues requiring resolution and to ensure all actions necessary to achieve projected value and benefits are being executed satisfactorily, particularly those outside the control of the service organization. The service organization applies the principles of earned value management to the entire investment program, and when applicable, uses audits to ensure contract costs are proper and allowable.

The program uses the team's risk management process to manage program elements. The program office's risk management strategy is based on the FAA's Systems Engineering Manual. All ASR-9 program members and stakeholders meet periodically with the Risk Board meeting monthly to report on and status the mitigation plans for identified risks and to identify any potential new risks to the program. New risks are assigned to a responsible team member, a mitigation plan is established, and monitoring is commenced at the team level. The program manager acts as the team representative to internal and external organizations

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?   No

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)   Yes

    a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?   SV

    b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

The ASR-9 Phase 1B Transmitter Modification program shows a positive schedule variance due to the fact that the work scheduled to complete the Critical Design Review was completed 5 months ahead of schedule. The program is currently testing a fully functional prototype and the estimated completion date for the first article systems is four months ahead of schedule.

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

No corrective action plan required.

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			
Redacted										