

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: 9/11/2006
2. Agency: Department of Transportation
3. Bureau: Federal Aviation Administration
4. Name of this Capital Asset: FAAXX084: Instrument Flight Procedure Automation (IFPA); formerly Instrument Approach Procedure Automation (IAPA); ATO-W, AVN; BUDGET: 2D09 CIP: A-14
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 021-12-01-11-01-3120-00
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? FY2008
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:

Instrument Flight Procedures Automation (IFPA) is an automation system used to create new Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs) and sustain existing IFPs. IFPs provide pilots with an approach path into and out of an airport clear of obstacles such as cell towers, buildings and trees. They are defined operational rules for executing defined maneuvers, which provides safety without direct control from air traffic personnel. The current automation used by the National Flight Procedures Group within Aviation System Standards, includes a system first implemented in the 1970s. The system is technically obsolete and inefficient. The legacy software is antiquated with no centralized database support and cannot be integrated into the FAA Enterprise Architecture. The majority of the maintenance workload on the 14,000+ existing IFP's within the NAS is being accomplished through manual processes with very limited automation support. This workload has grown by 45 percent since the mid-1990s. In addition, the number of obstacle evaluations studies has doubled since the late-90s to approximately 40,000 requests per year. A large backlog of work currently exists. The program office has recommended a three-pronged approach to improve efficiency and eliminate the backlog: 1) New automation; 2) Contract & Temporary employees; & 3) Policy changes. Three alternatives were considered for the new automation initiative: buy a COTS product, develop In-house, or partner with the DoD. The preferred alternative, partner with the DoD, was selected by the JRC on June 6, 2006, at Initial Investment Decision, then confirmed September 20, 2006 at Final Investment Decision. The DOD has committed to providing approximately one-half of the ongoing maintenance cost for IPDS, beginning in FY09. The DOD users will be added to the FAA user base. IFPA is a suite of tools, which focuses on increasing productivity in Aviation System Standards' (AVN) four primary products: Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs), Amendments to IFPs, obstacle evaluations (OEs), and Notices to Airmen (NOTAMs). The IFPA Program is mixed lifecycle investment. Each software system component can be divided further into sub-components called modules, which will be delivered incrementally. Planned modules are: IPDS Module 1 (FY09), 2 (FY10), and 3 (FY11); Obstacle Evaluation (part of IPDS module 3); AirNav database (FY09); IFP Modules: STARS, Radar, Departures, EnRoute (FY08-10); APTS Modules: PTS, NTS, Reporting (FY08-10).
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 9/20/2006
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name Black, Stephan
Phone Number Redacted
Email stephan.black@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? No

Exhibit 300: FAAXX013: Automated Surface Observing System / Automated Weather Observing System (ASOS/AWOS)
(Revision 12)

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 the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.) Yes

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

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? 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 Guidance) Level 2

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

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

19. Is this a financial management system? No

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

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	7.000000
Software	87.000000
Services	6.000000
Other	0.000000

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:

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

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

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

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

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	1.441	0	0	0	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Acquisition:	4.4	9.3	17.8	10.9	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	5.841	9.3	17.8	10.9	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0.689	1.564	1.597	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
TOTAL:	5.841	9.989	19.364	12.497	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.361	1.442	1.553	1.244	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	3	11	11	9	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:

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)
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:

EVM will be applied at the program level encompassing all IFPA system components. The IFPA program is following an EVM POAM, including having an EVMS in place by the end of July 2007. An IBR was conducted during July 2007 for the IFP and APTS components of IFPA. The IFPA EVMS will be reviewed by AIO in accordance with the latest POAM.

The prime contractor for the IPDS-OE software component is being required to track and report EVM, which covers 75% of the total IFPA investment. The contractor will achieve EVMS certification, which includes ANSI/EIA 748 compliance, during the course of the IPFA-IPDS development. Although the contract was not competitively bid, the single source justification provided a strong case with benefits accruing to both the FAA and the Department of Defense, including most notably the U.S. Air Force. The Air Force has a substantial investment in software, called Global Procedures Designer (GPD), which was developed by MacDonald, Dettwiler & Associates (MDA). IPDS will replace GPD, as well as the FAA's legacy IAPA system. Currently the USAF owns limited rights to the GPD software. It is the FAA's intent to modify and expand on the GPD software to work in the FAA's enterprise technical architecture and to own with government purpose rights, the newly enhanced software. While leveraging the existing Government investment in GPD, the FAA also recognizes the unique knowledge base offered by MDA for IPDS software development, which no other company can offer. A Joint Application Design/Development (JAD) was conducted in 2005/2006 with the FAA, Air Force, Army, and Navy to determine high-level requirements for IPDS, with functionality allocated to three development modules. Module One (DTFAAC-07-00009) is currently under development. Contract type of CPFF was determined after consultation with FAA CFO's office in late 2006. An IBR was conducted for IPDS Module One in May 2007. All IPDS contracts are structured with extensive task performance work statements containing explicit deliverables, as well as data item descriptions requiring EVM metrics reporting.

The DTFAAC-05-D-00016 IT services contract has a 5-year total value of \$175M; however only \$11.2M is budgeted for IFPA projects, with \$5.9M allocated for DME and \$5.3M allocated for O&M. Although not required contractually, EVM will be tracked on the DME portion. This contract is for IT staff augmentation. The IFP & APTS components will be developed under this contract.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why: In accordance with FAA's Section 508 Procurement Standard Operating Procedures, IFPA has determined that the following Section 508 standards apply to the program and will comply with each applicable standard.

- CFR 1194.21 - Software Applications and Operating Systems
- CFR 1194.22 - Web Based Information and Applications
- CFR 1194.26 - Desktop and Portable Computers
- CFR 1194.31 - Functional Performance Criteria
- CFR 1194.41 - Information, Documentation, and Support

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

a. If "yes," what is the date? 9/11/2006

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
2007	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)	180 days/ IFP	6 days. Pipeline time reduced to 174 days and establish FY08 baseline at 174, consistent with ATO-F guidance.	12/31/2007
2007	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published per year	300/yr	Meet or exceed Agency WAAS IFP Baseline	12/31/2007
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time	132 Hours/IFP	Establish and validate the FY08 baseline at 132 hours for one IFP	12/31/2007
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time	46 Hours/IFP	Establish and validate the FY08 baseline at 46 hours for an IFP amendment	12/31/2007
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time	0.50 Hour/OE	Establish and validate the FY08 baseline at .5 hour for an OE	12/31/2007
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time	0.50 Hours/NOTAM	Establish and validate the FY08 baseline at .5 hour for a	12/31/2007

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							NOTAM	
2007	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate	3%/Cycle	Reduce error rate to 2.5% or less.	12/31/2007
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)	174 days/ IFP (established in FY07 per ATO-F guidance)	7 days reduction. Pipeline time reduced to 167 days.	11/30/2008
2008	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published per year	300/yr	Meet or exceed Agency WAAS IFP Baseline	11/30/2008
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time	132 Hours/ IFP (established in FY07 per ATO-F guidance)	9% (12 hours) reduction; task time reduced to 120 hours.	11/30/2008
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time	46 Hours/ IFP (established in FY07 per ATO-F guidance)	17% (8 hours) reduction; task time reduced to 38 hours.	11/30/2008
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time	0.5 Hour/ OE (established in FY07 per ATO-F guidance)	10% (0.05 hour) reduction; task time reduced to 0.45 hour.	11/30/2008
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time	0.5 Hour/ NOTAM (established in FY07 per ATO-F guidance)	None (Maintain)	11/30/2008
2008	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate	3.0%/Cycle	Reduce error rate to 2% or less.	11/30/2008
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)	174 days/ IFP	14 days reduction. Pipeline time reduced to 160 days.	11/30/2009
2009	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures	300/yr	Meet or exceed Agency WAAS IFP Baseline	11/30/2009

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					published per year.			
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time	132 Hours/ IFP	15% (20 hours) reduction; task time reduced to 112 hours.	11/30/2009
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time	46 Hours/ IFP	33% (15 hours) reduction; task time reduced to 31 hours	11/30/2009
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time	0.5 Hour/ OE	20% (0.1 hour) reduction; task time reduced to 0.4 hour.	11/30/2009
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time	0.5 Hour/ NOTAM	50% (0.25 hour) reduction; task time reduced to 0.25 hour.	11/30/2009
2009	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate	3%/ Cycle	Reduce error rate to 1.5% or less.	11/30/2009
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)	174 days/ IFP	25 days. Pipeline time reduced to 149 days.	11/30/2010
2010	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published	300/ Yr	Meet or exceed Agency WAAS IFP Baseline	11/30/2010
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time	132 Hours/ IFP	21% (28 hours); task time reduced to 104 Hours	11/30/2010
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time	46 Hours/ IFP	41% (19 hours); task time reduced to 27 hours	11/30/2010
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time	0.5 Hour/ OE	25% (0.125 hour); task time reduced to .375 hour	11/30/2010
2010	Safety	Processes and	Productivity and	Efficiency	NOTAM	0.5 Hour/	50% (0.25	11/30/2010

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
		Activities	Efficiency		preparation task time	NOTAM	hour); task time reduced to 0.25 hour	
2010	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate	3%/ Cycle	Reduce error rate to 1% or less.	11/30/2010

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 5.00
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment. Yes

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

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
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 the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? Yes

a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the 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? Redacted

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

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

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
Airports and Navigation Aids (AIRNAV) database	Yes	No	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

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
			identifying information.		
Aviation System Standards Process Tracking System (APTS)	Yes	No	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
AVN-40 EDC WEST (ATO Ent DC West)	Yes	No	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) database	Yes	No	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Instrument Flight Procedures Development System (IPDS) + Obstacle Evaluation (OE)	Yes	No	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	The system 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. [A14.02-01] Instrument Flight Procedures Automation (IFPA)

b. If "no," please explain why?

To effectively balance the development and management of the DOT Transition Strategy, the first version was scoped to include those investments with development activities (non O&M). Additionally, as the NAS Architecture was publicly available; it was also not fully integrated with the materials forwarded to OMB in February 2006. However, the NAS is considered part of the DOT Transition Strategy and will be more fully integrated within the next revision. Future revisions are set to expand that scope and include both steady state (O&M) investments and expanded linkages to the NAS Architecture. Since this FAA investment does not appear to be specifically mentioned within the DOT Transition Strategy or the FAA Modernization Blueprint, please refer to the following public NAS websites that document the plan for the FAA's target architecture where the investment can be found as well as a sequencing plan showing the dependencies.

www.nas-architecture.faa.gov/nas5/Programmatic/Segment/segment_data.cfm?Seg_ID=442

http://www.nas-architecture.faa.gov/nas5/mechanism/mech_data.cfm?mid=291&

IAPA can be found on page 268 in the NAS Operational Improvement Report - http://www.nas-architecture.faa.gov/nas5/downloads/full_oi_long_report.pdf

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a Yes target architecture) and approved segment architecture?

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as Air Traffic 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)
Flight Plan Support	Flight plan support provides NAS users essential weather and aeronautical information. Flight planning requires such information as expected route, altitude, time of flight, available navigation systems, available routes, special use airspace (SUA) restrictions, daily demand conditions, and anticipated flight conditions.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	0

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)
	including weather and sky conditions (e.g., volcanic ash, smoke, or birds). (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Flight Planning)							
Airspace Design	Airspace design criteria establish the conditions for designing structures in the airspace to support safety of flight and efficient flow of traffic. Design criteria include the standards and guidelines for establishing classes of airspace, designation of volumes of airspace for the provision of separation (sectors, special use, etc.), waypoints, published routes etc. (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Airspace Management)	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	0
Airborne Guidance	NAS provides signals in space through space-based mechanisms and ground based aids for point-in-space navigation through a variety of operating environments. These environments	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	0

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)
	include structured routes, random routings and transitions. Guidance is provided for position determination in both vertical and lateral planes in all phases of flight. Visual NAVAIDS provide approach and landing guidance to aircraft in addition to electronic type NAVAIDS. (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Airspace Management)							
Flight Plan Support	Flight plan support provides NAS users essential weather and aeronautical information. Flight planning requires such information as expected route, altitude, time of flight, available navigation systems, available routes, special use airspace (SUA) restrictions, daily demand conditions, and anticipated flight conditions, including weather and sky conditions (e.g., volcanic ash, smoke, or	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Software Development			No Reuse	0

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)
	birds). (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Flight Planning)							
Airspace Design	Airspace design criteria establish the conditions for designing structures in the airspace to support safety of flight and efficient flow of traffic. Design criteria include the standards and guidelines for establishing classes of airspace, designation of volumes of airspace for the provision of separation (sectors, special use, etc.), waypoints, published routes etc. (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Airspace Management)	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Software Development			No Reuse	0
Airborne Guidance	NAS provides signals in space through space-based mechanisms and ground based aids for point-in-space navigation through a variety of operating environments. These environments include structured routes, random routings and transitions.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Software Development			No Reuse	0

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)
	Guidance is provided for position determination in both vertical and lateral planes in all phases of flight. Visual NAVAIDS provide approach and landing guidance to aircraft in addition to electronic type NAVAIDS. (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Airspace Management)							
Flight Plan Support	Flight plan support provides NAS users essential weather and aeronautical information. Flight planning requires such information as expected route, altitude, time of flight, available navigation systems, available routes, special use airspace (SUA) restrictions, daily demand conditions, and anticipated flight conditions, including weather and sky conditions (e.g., volcanic ash, smoke, or birds). (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Flight Planning)	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Product Management			No Reuse	10

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)
Airspace Design	Airspace design criteria establish the conditions for designing structures in the airspace to support safety of flight and efficient flow of traffic. Design criteria include the standards and guidelines for establishing classes of airspace, designation of volumes of airspace for the provision of separation (sectors, special use, etc.), waypoints, published routes etc. (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Airspace Management)	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Product Management			No Reuse	10
Airborne Guidance	NAS provides signals in space through space-based mechanisms and ground based aids for point-in-space navigation through a variety of operating environments. These environments include structured routes, random routings and transitions. Guidance is provided for position determination in both vertical and	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Product Management			No Reuse	80

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)
	lateral planes in all phases of flight. Visual NAVAIDS provide approach and landing guidance to aircraft in addition to electronic type NAVAIDS. (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Airspace Management)							
Flight Plan Support	Flight plan support provides NAS users essential weather and aeronautical information. Flight planning requires such information as expected route, altitude, time of flight, available navigation systems, available routes, special use airspace (SUA) restrictions, daily demand conditions, and anticipated flight conditions, including weather and sky conditions (e.g., volcanic ash, smoke, or birds). (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Flight Planning)	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	0
Airspace Design	Airspace design criteria establish the conditions for designing structures in the	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	0

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)
	airspace to support safety of flight and efficient flow of traffic. Design criteria include the standards and guidelines for establishing classes of airspace, designation of volumes of airspace for the provision of separation (sectors, special use, etc.), waypoints, published routes etc. (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Airspace Management)							
Airborne Guidance	NAS provides signals in space through space-based mechanisms and ground based aids for point-in-space navigation through a variety of operating environments. These environments include structured routes, random routings and transitions. Guidance is provided for position determination in both vertical and lateral planes in all phases of flight. Visual NAVAIDS provide	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	0

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)
	approach and landing guidance to aircraft in addition to electronic type NAVAIDS. (NAS - Air Traffic Services: Airspace Management)							

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)
Software Development	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Software Development	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Redacted
Software Development	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Redacted
Software Development	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Redacted
Software Development	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Redacted
Software Development	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Redacted
Software Development	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Redacted
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	Redacted
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Redacted
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Redacted

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)
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Redacted
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Product Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Software Development	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Redacted
Software Development	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	Redacted
Software Development	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Discovery	Redacted
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	Redacted
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	Redacted
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	Redacted
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	Redacted
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	Redacted
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Redacted
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Redacted
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Redacted

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)
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	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? 4/12/2006
 - 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 or in-whole? Yes

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. This 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
IAPA - Instrument Approach Procedures Automation		11/30/2010

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? 7/27/2007
 - 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:

Programmatic risk was assessed for each WBS line item according to FAA guidelines. Total risk was calculated by summarizing all WBS element risk dollars. Higher risk was applied to software development line items due to historical cost overruns associated with software intensive IT projects. Risk was calculated via Monte Carlo analysis for each WBS line item, and then applied to inflation-adjusted estimate dollars as a percent yielding a risk-adjusted total by WBS line item. Programmatic risk dollars will be held as management reserve.

Of the total IFPA F&E baseline authorization of \$50.8M, \$10.6M is considered risk or management reserve.

Of the total IFPA OPS baseline estimate of \$213.092M, \$20.5M is considered risk adjustment.

Of the total IFPA lifecycle cost, \$32.4 is risk adjustment.

The IFPA program development schedule has been risk adjusted, resulting in the following additional days:

IPDS/OE: 754 days

IFP: 139 days

AIRNAV: 340 days

APTS: 614 days

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) No

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

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

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

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

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

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline										
Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '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										