## *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: | 7/31/2007 |
| 2. Agency: | Department of Transportation |
| 3. Bureau: | Federal Aviation Administration |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | FAAXX159: Voice Switching and Control System (VSCS) Tech Refresh |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | 021-12-01-14-01-1060-00 |
| 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? | FY2006 |

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

Voice switches enable air traffic controllers to transition efficiently between air-to-ground radio communication and ground-to-ground telephone communication. The Voice Switching Control System (VSCS) technology has been deployed since 1994 to provide air traffic controllers in en route facilities with this connectivity. The VSCS is in steady state, maintained by O&M funding.

The goal of VSCS Tech Refresh, which is tied to the FAA goals of modernizing air traffic control, improving runway safety, improving safety requirements for long-range flights and enhancing air tour safety, is to address identified performance gaps by maintaining required operational availability of the current system and avoiding growth of operations costs that result from parts obsolescence.

The VSCS system was scheduled to be in the inventory until 2014, but is now expected to be operational until a new switch is fielded in 2020. Phase I and II of the VSCS Tech Refresh program were presented to the JRC for a final baseline decision on August 24, 2006. This decision was to obtain funding for the execution of Tech Refresh Phase II, lasting from FY2007 through FY2012. Funds approved and allocated for FY09 will provide the following: PLM/C++ software language conversion; Modification and integration of Depot Test Equipment; Continuing retrofit of power supplies; and Program Management and Contract Support.

The Tech Refresh investment, for program management tracking purposes, is from October 1, 1999 to planned completion September 30, 2020. There is and will continue to be an on-going analysis conducted on parts of the system that have not been tech refreshed and the analysis results may lead to additional funds being requested in FY10 or beyond to support the system until its removal from service currently planned for 2020. Any new work activity identified will require JRC approval.

| | |
|---|---|
| 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 8/24/2006 |
| 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | Yes |
| 11. Contact information of Project Manager? | |
| Name | Syptak, William |
| Phone Number | Redacted |
| Email | william.syptak@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 |
| 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 | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| fund this investment? | |
| 2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? | No |
| 3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? | |
| 13. Does this investment 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: | N/A |
| 2. If "no," what does it address? | |
| b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52 | |
| 20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%) | |
| Hardware | 40.000000 |
| Software | 30.000000 |
| Services | 30.000000 |
| 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? | N/A |
| 22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions: | |
| Name | Syptak, William |
| Phone Number | 202-267-8485 |
| Title | william.syptak@faa.gov |
| E-mail | Syptak, William |
| 23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? | No |
| 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: | 28.212 | 3.963 | 3.003 | 3.49 | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted |
| Acquisition: | 100.813 | 11.037 | 11.997 | 19.357 | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition: | 129.025 | 15.000 | 15.000 | 22.847 | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted |
| Operations & Maintenance: | 209.85 | 23.7 | 25.1 | 30.9 | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted |
| TOTAL: | 338.875 | 38.700 | 40.100 | 53.747 | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted |
| **Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.** | | | | | | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs | 23.448 | 1.242 | 1.304 | 1.369 | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted | Redacted |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs: | 222 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 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:

Although awarded before the AMS threshold, the two prime contracts, D00004/C00014, have EVM and PBC clauses incorporated. EVM is applied to CR and FFP efforts and meets ANSI/EIA 748 standards; included are VDMR, PSR, WSU and MTSR. The T&M efforts are in the Program Office EVM baseline as Level Of Effort (LOE); included are VDMR, EA (minor testing, or quick turnaround items with a durations of two, or fewer, months), WSU, PLM/C++ G/G, Prime PM and Support Contractors. The CR activity is included in PBC, however, the LOE, with the exception of VDMR, is not. The LOE includes program/technical management, minor testing, or quick turnaround items being tasked on an ad hoc basis. CR and T&M are being used in lieu of FFP in cases where adequate cost standards and estimates are unavailable. All activity is analyzed and monitored by the FAA program office and incorporated into the overall program office EVM reporting. On-site FAA Quality and Contract personnel monitor all activity. Additionally, Operational Site Reviews are performed approximately six times a year by program office headquarters personnel. EVM is being implemented at the program level to encompass FTE, Support Contractors and WJHTC activities. Weekly telecommunication conferences, which include all involved parties, are held to identify Contract Action Items, with significant outstanding issues and tasks. This risk management approach reduces the likelihood of cost/schedule overruns and performance shortfalls by all parties. Those efforts that are not under EVM are such activities as program management, minor testing, or quick turnaround items (duration two months or less).

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? | N/A |
| a. Explain why: | The sole end-users of this equipment are air traffic controllers working in a restricted and secure area of an air traffic facility. Therefore, the general exception, at 1194.3(e) applies to this equipment. The exception states "this part shall not be construed to require a fundamental alteration in the nature of a product or its components." |
| 4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," what is the date? | 8/24/2006 |
| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2006 | | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Impact or Burden | Air Traffic Delays due to VSCS outages | 117 hours/year in delays among eight largest metropolitan areas due to VSCS outages | Maintain 0 % increase (117 hours/year) in delays from VSCS outages | 104.3 Hours/year, AOP-100 Delays Database, Sep 30 2006 |
| 2006 | | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Air Transportation | Increase Capacity / VSCS operational availability | VSCS cumulative availability = .999 | Maintain VSCS availability at .9997 | .9994 through Sept 30, 2006 |
| 2006 | | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Air Transportation | Increase Safety / ATC Operational errors | Obsolete Goal | Obsolete Goal | Obsolete Goal |
| 2006 | | Processes and Activities | Financial (Processes and Activities) | Savings and Cost Avoidance | Reduce Costs / VSCS requisition growth | 2071 # of LRUs upgraded in FY05 | 2% decrease in growth of requisition for affected LRUs | 1833 requisitions through Sept 30 2006 (project |

**Performance Information Table**

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | 1644 end of year) |
| 2006 | | Processes and Activities | Financial (Processes and Activities) | Savings and Cost Avoidance | Cost Saving and cost avoidance / Maintenance costs on VSCS repair | Obsolete Goal | Obsolete Goal | Obsolete Goal |
| 2006 | | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Reliability | Mean Time before VSCS outages | Mean time before outages (MTBO) =64226 hours | 0% Improvement Maintain MTBO = 64226 hours | 35771 hours through Sept 30 2006 |
| 2007 | | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Impact or Burden | Air Traffic Delays due to VSCS outages | 117 hours/year in delays among eight largest metropolitan areas due to VSCS outages | 0 % Improvement Maintain 117 hours in delays from VSCS outages | Hours / year, AOP-100 Delays Database October 2007 |
| 2007 | | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Air Transportation | Increase Capacity/ VSCS operational availability | VSCS availability = .999 | 0 % Improvement Maintain VSCS availability to .9997 | Calculated availability NASPAS, October 2007 |
| 2007 | | Processes and Activities | Financial (Processes and Activities) | Savings and Cost Avoidance | Reduce Costs / # of VSCS requisition growth | TBD # of requisitions for LRUs upgraded in FY06 | 2% decrease in requisition # growth for affected LRUs | Requisition #s in Log Center Off of Acq Srvc, Oct 2007 |
| 2007 | | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Reliability | Mean time before outages | Mean time before outages (MTBO) = 64226 hours | 0 % Improvement Maintain MTBO = 64226 hours | Calculated MTBO, NASPAS October 2007 |
| 2008 | | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Impact or Burden | Air Traffic Delays due to VSCS outages | 117 hours/year in delays among eight largest metropolitan areas due to VSCS outages | 0% Improvement Maintain 117 hours in delays from VSCS outages | Hours / year, AOP-100 Delays Database, October 2008 |
| 2008 | | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Air Transportation | Increase Capacity: VSCS operational availability | VSCS availability = .999 | 0 % Maintain VSCS availability to .9997 | Calculated availability NASPAS, October 2008 |
| 2008 | | Processes and Activities | Financial (Processes and Activities) | Savings and Cost Avoidance | Reduce Costs / VSCS requisition growth | TBD Requisition # for LRUs upgraded by end of FY07 | 2% decrease in requisition # growth for affected LRUs | Requisition # in Log Center Off of Acq Srvc, Oct 2008 |
| 2008 | | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Reliability | Mean time before outages | Mean time before outages (MTBO) = 64226 hours | 0% Improvement Maintain VSCS MTBO = 64226 hours | Calculated MTBO, NASPAS, October 2008 |
| 2009 | | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Impact or Burden | Air Traffic delays due to VSCS outages | 117 hour/year in delays among eight largest metropolitcan areas do to VSCS outages | 0% Improvement; Maintain 117 hours in delays from VSCS outages | Hours/year FAA Delays database October 2009 |
| 2009 | | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Air Transportation | Increase Capacity: VSCS operational availability | VSCS availability =.999 | O % Maintain VSCS availability to .9997 | Calculated availability NASPAS, October 2009 |
| 2009 | | Processes and Activities | Financial (Processes and Activities) | Savings and Cost Avoidance | Reduce Costs/VSCS requisition growth | TBD Requisitions # for LRUs upgraded by end of FY08 | 2% decrease in requisition # growth for affected LRUs | Requisition # in Log Center Off. of Acq. Serv October 2009 |
| 2009 | | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Reliability | Mean time before outages | Mean time before outages (MTBO) - 64226 hours | 0% Improvement Maintain VSCS MTBO = 64226 hours | Calculated MTBO NASPAS, October 2009 |
| 2010 | | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Impact or Burden | Air Traffic Delays due to VSCS outages | 117 hours/year in delays among eight largest metropolitan areas due to VSCS outages | 0% Improvement Maintain 117 hours in delays from VSCS outages | Hours/year, AOP-100 Delays Database, October 2010 |
| 2010 | | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Air Transportation | Increase Capacity: VSCS operational availability | VSCS availability = .999 | O % Maintain VSCS availability to .9997 | Calculated availability NASPAS, October 2010 |
| 2010 | | Processes and Activities | Financial (Processes and Activities) | Savings and Cost Avoidance | Reduce Costs/VSCS requisition | TBD # of requisitions for LRUs upgraded | 2% decrease in requisition # growth for | Requisition # in Log Center Off. of Acq. Serv |

**Performance Information Table**

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | growth | by end of FY10 | affected LRUs | October 2010 |
| 2010 | | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Reliability | Mean time before outages | Mean time before outages (MTBO) = 64226 hours | 0% Improvement Maintain VSCS MTBO = 64226 hours | Calculated MTBO, NASPAS, October 2010 |
| 2011 | | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Impact or Burden | Air Traffic delays due to VSCS outages | 117 hour/year in delays among eight largest metropolitcan areas do to VSCS outages | 0% Improvement Maintain 117 hours in delays from VSCS outages | Hours/year, AOP-100 Delays Database, October 2011 |
| 2011 | | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Air Transportation | Increase Capacity: VSCS operational availability | VSCS availability = .999 | O % Maintain VSCS availability to .9997 | Calculated availability NASPAS, October 2011 |
| 2011 | | Processes and Activities | Financial (Processes and Activities) | Savings and Cost Avoidance | Reduce Costs / # of VSCS requisition growth | TBD # of requisitions for LRUs upgraded by end of FY11 | 2% decrease in requisition # growth for affected LRUs | Requisition # in Log Center Off. of Acq. Serv October 2011 |
| 2011 | | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Reliability | Mean time before outages | Mean time before outages (MTBO) = 64226 hours | 0% Improvement Maintain VSCS MTBO = 64226 hours | Calculated MTBO, NASPAS, October 2011 |
| 2012 | | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Impact or Burden | Air Traffic delays due to VSCS outages | 117 hour/year in delays among eight largest metropolitcan areas do to VSCS outages | 0% Improvement Maintain 117 hours in delays from VSCS outages | Hours/year, AOP-100 Delays Database, October 2012 |
| 2012 | | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Air Transportation | Increase Capacity: VSCS operational availability | VSCS availability = .999 | O % Maintain VSCS availability to .9997 | Calculated availability NASPAS, October 2012 |
| 2012 | | Processes and Activities | Financial (Processes and Activities) | Savings and Cost Avoidance | Reduce Costs/VSCS requisition growth | TBD # of requisitions for LRUs upgraded by end of FY 2012 | 2% decrease in requisition # growth for affected LRUs | Requisition # in Log Center Off. of Acq. Serv October 2012 |
| 2012 | | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Reliability | Mean time before outages | Mean time before outages (MTBO) = 64226 hours | 0% Improvement Maintain VSCS MTBO = 64226 hours | Calculated MTBO, NASPAS, October 2012 |

## *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: Yes

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 10.00

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.

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VSCS | No | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| VSCS (Tech Refresh Phase II) | No | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. | No | No, because 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. | Within the DOT Transition Strategy, see Appendix A, the Architecture Segment, in the section entitiled, Transportation Management |
| b. If "no," please explain why? | |
| 3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? | Yes |
| a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. | Air Traffic; within the DOT Transition Strategy, see Appendix A, the Architecture Segment, in the section entitled, Transportation Management |

**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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aircraft to aircraft Separation Capability | 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: ATC Separation Assurance | Support Services | Communication | Audio Conferencing | | | No Reuse | 20 |
| Traffic Advisory | Traffic advisories are provided to alert aircraft to potential conflicts with others, on the surface or in-flight. For example, traffic advisories are provided to aircraft or other flight objects that are in the proximity of hot air/gas balloons, missile launches, or other potential hazards. Traffic advisories for aircraft on the surface include the number, type, position, and intent of the ground traffic. NAS: ATC | Support Services | Communication | Audio Conferencing | | | No Reuse | 20 |

**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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Advisory | | | | | | | |
| Aircraft to aircraft Separation Capability | 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: ATC Separation Assurance | Support Services | Communication | Computer / Telephony Integration | | | No Reuse | 20 |
| Traffic Advisory | Traffic advisories are provided to alert aircraft to potential conflicts with others, on the surface or in-flight. For example, traffic advisories are provided to aircraft or other flight objects that are in the proximity of hot air/gas balloons, missile launches, or other potential hazards. Traffic advisories for aircraft on the surface include the number, type, position, and intent of the ground traffic. NAS: ATC Advisory | Support Services | Communication | Computer / Telephony Integration | | | No Reuse | 10 |
| Aircraft to aircraft Separation Capability | 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 | Support Services | Communication | Voice Communications | | | No Reuse | 20 |

**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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 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: ATC Separation Assurance | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Advisory | Traffic advisories are provided to alert aircraft to potential conflicts with others, on the surface or in-flight. For example, traffic advisories are provided to aircraft or other flight objects that are in the proximity of hot air/gas balloons, missile launches, or other potential hazards. Traffic advisories for aircraft on the surface include the number, type, position, and intent of the ground traffic. NAS: ATC Advisory | Support Services | Communication | Voice Communications | | | No Reuse | 10 |

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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Voice Communications | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | Redacted |
| Computer / Telephony Integration | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | Redacted |
| Audio Conferencing | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Other Electronic Channels | Redacted |
| Audio Conferencing | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Intranet | Redacted |
| Audio Conferencing | Service Interface and Integration | Interface | Service Description / Interface | Redacted |
| Audio Conferencing | Service Platform and | Delivery Servers | Application Servers | 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Infrastructure | | | |
| Audio Conferencing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) | 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? 8/17/2006

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? No

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

## 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? 8/24/2006

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

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

The original Depot Test Equipment sub-projects (Depot Test Equipment Upgrade and FAST-R) were reevaluated and the requirements were reduced from nine to two sets of equipment. With the reduction of the number of pieces of equipment comes a significant reduction in the development risk for this project.

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:

A total of 39 risks have been identified: No (0) risks rated "High"; Ten (10) rated "Medium"; Twenty-nine (29) risks rated "Low." Medium risks include government estimates being lower than actual costs; cost growth potential due to unavailability of personnel to complete tasks or unknown costs associated with renegotiating an extension of current depot support contract. Cost estimates for each milestone have been risk-adjusted by 8% to mitigate the medium risks. A management reserve is not designated as a separate budget item. Investment risks for cost are handled by reducing the number of contracts that are not Firm Fixed Price. Schedule risks are mitigated through contract incentives when possible. VSCS program office has the following procedures in place for managing cost, schedule and technical risks: monthly reviews of contractor work packages; software development monitoring by a joint FAA/contractor team; monthly joint review of progress and schedule risk by program office, WHJTC, and prime contractor; and contractually imposed requirement for contractor to maintain a Network Logic Schedule.

## *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 | | | | | | | | | | |