Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission:	7/30/2007
2. Agency:	Department of Transportation
3. Bureau:	Federal Aviation Administration
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	FAAXX600: Oceanic Automation System: Advanced Technologies and Oceanic Procedures (ATOP)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	021-12-01-11-01-1130-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2005

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

Advanced Technologies and Oceanic Procedures (ATOP) is the FAA's modernization program for oceanic air traffic control.

Before ATOP, there was no aircraft radar tracking and no automated communications for oceanic air traffic. Pilots would radio position reports based on onboard aircraft navigational systems to the controller. Due to the uncertainty in position report reliability, overseas flights required greater separation margins to ensure safe flight, and were rarely able to obtain maximum fuel efficiency, minimum travel times, or access to preferred flight paths.

Now we can be in touch with aircraft mid-oceanic flight, electronically and digitally. ATOP further closes the performance gap by allowing properly equipped aircraft and qualified aircrews to operate using reduced oceanic separation criteria. This enables more aircraft to fly optimal routes, enhancing aircraft flight time (and fuel and payload) efficiency during oceanic legs of their flights. Reduced lateral (side-to-side) separation may provide space for additional routes between current locations or new direct markets. Reduced longitudinal (nose-to-tail) separation may provide more opportunities to add flights without delays.

The ATOP program has replaced oceanic air traffic control systems and procedures and modernized the Oakland (ZOA), New York (ZNY) and Anchorage (ZAN) Air Route Traffic Control Centers with a satellite-based, integrated oceanic system for all three centers - with common procedures, training, maintenance and support.

ATOP is currently in the Solution Implementation phase of the Acquisition Management System (AMS), and operating live traffic in all sectors of ZNY and ZOA airspace. Initial Operating Capability (IOC) for ZAN was declared in March 2006 and operation of live traffic in oceanic sectors of ZAN began in March 2007. The Solution Implementation phase of AMS correlates to the "Control" phase of the CPIC process. The operational portions of the investment are in the CPIC "Evaluate" phase. All portions of the investment have been approved for funding by the JRC2b final investment decision on May 1, 2001.

Funding for FY 2009 and beyond is essential for continued improvements in the safety and efficiency of oceanic air traffic control. Requirements for that time-frame include sustaining operational activities, hardware and software technical refresh, Pre-Planned Product Improvements (P3I) and further facility modernization.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	5/1/2001
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?	
Name	Moore, John F
Phone Number	Redacted
Email	john.f.moore@faa.gov
a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?	TBD
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?	Yes
a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No

    1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

    2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

    3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? No

    If "yes," check all that apply:

    a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using 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 1

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) Yes

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	12.000000
Software	29.000000
Services	9.000000
Other	50.000000

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	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? No

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

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

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	5.2	0.6	0.6	0.6	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Acquisition:	361.049	30.3	52.2	20.1	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	366.249	30.9	52.8	20.7	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Operations & Maintenance:	118.837	52.102	69.708	77.218	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
TOTAL:	485.086	83.002	122.508	97.918	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	59.987	9.513	9.894	10.289	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	434	64	64	64	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   No
FTE's?

    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:

The FAA has included the EVM requirements of OMB Circular A-11 into its recently revised acquisition policy as part of the FAA AMS. FAA EVM policy does not require EVM in contracts that are less than $10M in total value or for those contracts that are for O&M/steady state activities. In 2005, an independent review was conducted on Oceanic program management system practices and EVM capabilities. The review assessed the program's current EVM implementation using the FAA approved compliance criteria aligned with the ANSI/EIA 748 Standard. The independent assessment team determined that Oceanic has established an EVM business management system that has many core elements represented in the ANSI/EIA 748 guidelines. The assessment team also noted that while there is room for some improvement, the system applies a number of best practices that include: 1) investing early in detailed and integrated cost estimating/risk planning and effectively translating that data into a time phased cost/schedule baseline through the program-level WBS incorporating the contractor's WBS elements; 2) risk adjusting baseline cost/schedule estimates for all high risk and critical path activities; 3) reporting of prime contractor EVM performance for the fixed price development phase including subcontractors; 4) maintaining integrated program schedules for contractor and FAA activities; 5) segregating cost data reported for the program by the major organizations; the prime, sub, and support contractors, and FAA effort; 6) assigning organization duties to control accounts via responsibility assignment Matrix (RAM); and 7) conducting an IBR after the prime contract award to conduct a risk assessment and review the EVM implementation. The ATOP (01-C-A0065) and MicroEARTS (05-C-00033) prime contractor, Lockheed Martin (LM), uses Program Control Management System (PCMS) as the EVM cost/schedule control system. LM states that PCMS is in compliance with ANSI/EIA Standard 748A. The Aeronautical Mobile Communications Services (AMCS) contract (05-D-00020) is O&M funded, therefore no EVM is required. The Oceanic Integrated Services contract (03-C-00070) does not have a contractual EVM requirement since it is totally level of effort. All other contracts are less than $10 million and do not require EVM. The Oceanic Programs have successfully achieved several planned Plan of Action and Milestones (POA&M) to implement EVM at our program level.as well as conducting a program IBR by October 2006.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?   No

    a. Explain why: The ATOP procurement took place before June 21, 2001, therefore the Section 508 standards do not apply.

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

    a. If "yes," what is the date?   3/24/2000

    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	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.	On average 74% change requests are granted Baseline established using operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL.	Increase the change requests granted by 2% from the baseline. Therefore, allowing aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 76% of the time.	Increased the change requests granted by 4% from the baseline. Allowed aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 78% of the time.
2006	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn cost per flight, in dollars for selected city pairs, based on actual aircraft trajectories	Use 2004 baseline established from simulation and modeling	Compare the fuel cost savings per flight using baseline, and 2005 and 2006 actual trajectories. Use this as a	Average fuel burn cost per flight was established for 2005 and 2006, and was compared to the baseline (2004)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							performance target for the savings for 2007 and 2008.	to create the performance target of 2.9 million pounds of fuel saved during 2007.
2006	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.	In 2004 automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data is about two months. The source for the data collection is the systems ODAPS and MSODL	Establish automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing ATOP data from ZAN. Reduce automated method to a one month process, and as needed, update method for data changes with ZOA and ZNY.	Method established for collecting, analyzing, and sharing ZAN ATOP data. Automated method was reduced down to a one month process, and changes were implemented for ZOA and ZNY.
2006	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.	5.9 minutes to respond to an altitude change request. Baseline established using operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL at ZNY and ZOA.	17% improvement over 2004 baseline. Reduce average time to respond to altitude change requests to 4.9 minutes.	An improvement of 52% from the baseline occurred. The average time to respond to an altitude change was reduced to 2.8 minutes.
2006	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Reduction of separation standards	In the S. Pacific, lat/long separation is 50/80 (avg) for properly equipped aircraft.	Implement 30/30 separation trials in the South Pacific airspace.	On December 22, 2005 we implemented 30/30 separation trials in the South Pacific airspace.
2007	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.	On average 74% change requests are granted Baseline established using operational data from system ODAPS	Increase the change requests granted by 3% from the baseline. Therefore, allowing aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 78% of the time.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2008. Currently on target to meet the increase.
2007	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs, based on actual aircraft trajectories	Use 2004 baseline that was established from simulation and modeling	Savings of at least 2.9 million pounds during 2007 relative to the 2004 baseline	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2008. Currently on target to meet the savings.
2007	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZNY, and ZAN ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.	In 2004 automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data is about two months. The source for the data collection is the current systems ODAPS and MSODL	Improve and expand automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing ATOP data from ZOA, ZNY, and ZAN. Automated method for data collection and production of performance metrics will be reduced down to a three-week process.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2008.
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.	5.9 minutes to respond to an altitude change request. Baseline established using	25% improvement over 2004 baseline. Reduce average time to respond to altitude change	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2008. Currently on target to meet the improvement.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
						operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL at ZNY and ZOA.	requests to 4.4 minutes.	
2007	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Reduction of separation standards	Lat/long separation is 50/80 (avg) in the Pacific	Expand 30/30 separation in the Pacific Oceanic airspace	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2008
2008	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.	On average 74% change requests are granted Baseline established using operational data from system ODAPS	Given the increase in demand, maintain the increase over 2004 in altitude change requests granted. Allow aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 78% of the time.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2009
2008	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs, based on actual aircraft trajectories	Use 2004 baseline that was established from simulation and modeling	Given the increase in demand, 2007 fuel savings is the target for 2008.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2009
2008	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.	In 2004 automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data is about two months. The source for the data collection is the systems ODAPS and MSODL	Continue to improve automated method for collecting, sharing, and reporting metrics using the ATOP data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY. Automated method for data collection and production of performance metrics will be reduced down to a two-week process.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2009.
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.	5.9 minutes to respond to an altitude change request. No baseline cost per flight exists for oceanic flights. (Values from 2004 baseline YTD). Baseline established using operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL at ZNY and ZOA.	32% improvement over 2004 baseline. Reduce average time to respond to altitude change requests to 4.0 minutes.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2009
2008	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Reduction of separation standards	Lat/long separation is 50/80 (avg) in the Pacific and 60/80 (avg) in the North Atlantic	Implement 50 lat separation in WATRS airspace.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2009
2009	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.	On average 74% change requests are granted Baseline established using operational data from system ODAPS	Given the increase in demand, maintain the increase over 2004 in altitude change requests granted. Allow aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 78% of	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2010

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	**Strategic Goal(s) Supported**	**Measurement Area**	**Measurement Category**	**Measurement Grouping**	**Measurement Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual Results**
							the time.	
2009	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs, based on actual aircraft trajectories	Use 2004 baseline that was established from simulation and modeling	Given the increase in demand, 2007 fuel savings is the target for 2009.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2010
2009	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.	In 2004 automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data is about two months. The source for the data collection is the systems ODAPS and MSODL	Continue to improve automated method for collecting, sharing, and reporting metrics using the ATOP data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY. Automated method for data collection and production of performance metrics will be reduced down to a one-week process.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2010.
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.	5.9 minutes to respond to an altitude change request. No baseline cost per flight exists for oceanic flights. (Values from 2004 baseline YTD). Baseline established using operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL at ZNY and ZOA.	34% improvement over 2004 baseline.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2010
2009	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Reduction of separation standards	Lat/long separation is 50/80 (avg) in the Pacific and 60/80 (avg) in the North Atlantic	Implement separation reduction in ZAN Oceanic airspace.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2010
2010	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.	On average 74% change requests are granted Baseline established using operational data from system ODAPS	Given the increase in demand, maintain the increase over 2004 in altitude change requests granted. Allow aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 78% of the time.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2011
2010	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs, based on actual aircraft trajectories	Use 2004 baseline that was established from simulation and modeling	Given the increase in demand, 2007 fuel savings is the target for 2010.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2011
2010	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.	In 2004 automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data is about two months. The source for the data collection is the systems ODAPS and MSODL	Continue to improve automated method for collecting, sharing, & reporting metrics using the ATOP data from ZOA, ZAN, & ZNY. Automated method for data collection & production of	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2011.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	**Strategic Goal(s) Supported**	**Measurement Area**	**Measurement Category**	**Measurement Grouping**	**Measurement Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual Results**
							performance metrics will maintain the 2009 reduction of a 1 week process.	
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.	5.9 minutes to respond to an altitude change request. No baseline cost per flight exists for oceanic flights. (Values from 2004 baseline YTD). Baseline established using operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL at ZNY and ZOA.	36% improvement over 2004 baseline.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2011
2010	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Reduction of separation standards	Extend RNP-10 and RNP-4 reduced lateral and distance based longitudinal separation into additional airspace volumes	Begin ICAO Approvals (ZNY)	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2011
2011	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.	On average 74% change requests are granted Baseline established using operational data from system ODAPS	Given the increase in demand, maintain the increase over 2004 in altitude change requests granted. Allow aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 78% of the time.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2012
2011	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs, based on actual aircraft trajectories	Use 2004 baseline that was established from simulation and modeling	Given the increase in demand, 2007 fuel savings is the target for 2011.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2012
2011	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.	In 2004 automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data is about two months. The source for the data collection is the systems ODAPS and MSODL	Continue to improve automated method for collecting, sharing, & reporting metrics using the ATOP data from ZOA, ZAN, & ZNY. Automated method for data collection & production of performance metrics will maintain the 2009 reduction of a 1 week process.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2012.
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.	5.9 minutes to respond to an altitude change request. No baseline cost per flight exists for oceanic flights. (Values from 2004 baseline YTD). Baseline established using	38% improvement over 2004 baseline.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2012

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
						operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL at ZNY and ZOA.		
2011	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Reduction of separation standards	Extend RNP-10 and RNP-4 reduced lateral and distance based longitudinal separation into additional airspace volumes	Begin Operational Trials (ZNY)	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2012
2012	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.	On average 74% change requests are granted Baseline established using operational data from system ODAPS	Given the increase in demand, maintain the increase over 2004 in altitude change requests granted. Allow aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 78% of the time.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2013
2012	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs, based on actual aircraft trajectories	Use 2004 baseline that was established from simulation and modeling	Given the increase in demand, 2007 fuel savings is the target for 2012.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2013
2012	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.	In 2004 automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data is about two months. The source for the data collection is the systems ODAPS and MSODL	Continue to improve automated method for collecting, sharing, & reporting metrics using the ATOP data from ZOA, ZAN, & ZNY. Automated method for data collection & production of performance metrics will maintain the 2009 reduction of a 1 week process.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2013.
2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.	5.9 minutes to respond to an altitude change request. No baseline cost per flight exists for oceanic flights. (Values from 2004 baseline YTD). Baseline established using operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL at ZNY and ZOA.	40% improvement over 2004 baseline.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2013
2012	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Reduction of separation standards	Separation below RNP-4 30/30	Begin ICAO approvals processes and develop implementation plans (aircraft cert, training etc)	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2013
2013	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the	On average 74% change requests are granted Baseline	Given the increase in demand, maintain the	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2014

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.	established using operational data from system ODAPS	increase over 2004 in altitude change requests granted. Allow aircraft to achieve their preferred altitude 78% of the time.	
2013	Mobility	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs, based on actual aircraft trajectories	Use 2004 baseline that was established from simulation and modeling	Given the increase in demand, 2007 fuel savings is the target for 2013.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2014
2013	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.	In 2004 automated method for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data is about two months. The source for the data collection is the systems ODAPS and MSODL	Continue to improve automated method for collecting, sharing, & reporting metrics using the ATOP data from ZOA, ZAN, & ZNY. Automated method for data collection & production of performance metrics will maintain the 2009 reduction of a 1 week process.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2014.
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.	5.9 minutes to respond to an altitude change request. No baseline cost per flight exists for oceanic flights. (Values from 2004 baseline YTD). Baseline established using operational data from systems ODAPS and MSODL at ZNY and ZOA.	42% improvement over 2004 baseline.	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2014
2013	Mobility	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Reduction of separation standards	Separation below RNP-4 30/30	Implementation activity for potential new standards	Data will be available in 1st Qtr 2014

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: 0.65

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
ATOP	Yes	No	The system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No	
ATOP Tech Refresh	Yes	No		No	

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.	Oceanic Automation System: Advanced Technologies and Oceanic Procedures
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.	National Airspace System

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 Data Management	Flight Data Management maintains the knowledge of a flight within the NAS from activation until flight plan cancellation or closing. Flight Data Management accepts, processes, and validates flight plan data from all users (e.g., general aviation, commercial, military, Customs, law enforcement, etc.).	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Cleansing			No Reuse	9
Monitoring and Maintenance	Monitoring and maintenance includes the activities necessary to monitor the NAS status, detect and isolate failures and outages, and perform corrective and preventive maintenance to ensure the operational readiness of the NAS.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Instrumentation and Testing			No Reuse	15
Aircraft to Aircraft Separation Capability	Aircraft are separated from other known aircraft the oceanic environment. Separation assurance involves the application of	Business Analytical Services	Visualization	Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS			No Reuse	15

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)
	separation standards to ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance or altitude from other known aircraft. (NAS Separation Assurance)							
Monitoring and Maintenance	Monitoring and maintenance includes the activities necessary to monitor the NAS status, detect and isolate failures and outages, and perform corrective and preventive maintenance to ensure the operational readiness of the NAS.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Change Management			No Reuse	3
Monitoring and Maintenance	Monitoring and maintenance includes the activities necessary to monitor the NAS status, detect and isolate failures and outages, and perform corrective and preventive maintenance to ensure the operational readiness of the NAS.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			No Reuse	3
Flight Data Management	Flight Data Management maintains the knowledge of a flight within the NAS from activation until flight plan cancellation or closing. Flight Data Management accepts, processes, and validates flight plan data from all users (e.g., general aviation, commercial, military, Customs, law enforcement, etc.).	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Reservations / Registration			No Reuse	5
Flight Data Management	Flight Data Management maintains the knowledge of a flight within the NAS from activation until flight plan cancellation or closing. Flight Data	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	8

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)
	Management accepts, processes, and validates flight plan data from all users (e.g., general aviation, commercial, military, Customs, law enforcement, etc.).							
Flight Data Management	Flight Data Management maintains the knowledge of a flight within the NAS from activation until flight plan cancellation or closing. Flight Data Management accepts, processes, and validates flight plan data from all users (e.g., general aviation, commercial, military, Customs, law enforcement, etc.).	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	5
Weather Advisory Capability	ATC Advisories - Weather information is available either automatically or manually through communication with ATC and other facilities.	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	5
Aircraft Airspace Capability	Aircraft are separated from airspace for special use such as prohibited, restricted, and warning areas.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Conflict Resolution			No Reuse	3
Aircraft to Aircraft Separation Capability	Aircraft are separated from other known aircraft the oceanic environment. Separation assurance involves the application of separation standards to ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance or altitude from other known aircraft. (NAS Separation Assurance)	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Conflict Resolution			No Reuse	16
Monitoring and Maintenance	Monitoring and maintenance includes the activities necessary to monitor the NAS status, detect and isolate	Support Services	Systems Management	Issue Tracking			No Reuse	3

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)
	failures and outages, and perform corrective and preventive maintenance to ensure the operational readiness of the NAS.							
Monitoring and Maintenance	Monitoring and maintenance includes the activities necessary to monitor the NAS status, detect and isolate failures and outages, and perform corrective and preventive maintenance to ensure the operational readiness of the NAS.	Support Services	Systems Management	System Resource Monitoring			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)
Issue Tracking	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Redacted
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Redacted
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Redacted
System Resource Monitoring	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Interface and	Integration	Middleware	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)
	Integration			
Conflict Resolution	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Redacted
System Resource Monitoring	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Data Cleansing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Reservations / Registration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Conflict Resolution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Redacted
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Redacted
Instrumentation and Testing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	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?   3/1/2007

    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
Oceanic Display and Planning System		10/1/2005

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?   3/1/2007

    b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?   No

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

ATOP risks are reviewed on a monthly basis through scheduled program reviews and team meetings.

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?

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

    b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

The ATOP Risk Evaluation Board (AREB) evaluates and prioritizes risks; 2) recommends plans for mitigation of risks within suitable schedules; 3) recommends responsibilities according to the approved mitigation plans; and 4) performs continuous monitoring of technical, cost, and schedule risk elements. The AREB is chaired by the PM, and may include several members from the support team.

Once a potential risk has been identified, documented and reported to management, the PM will, if appropriate, assign a task to assist in risk assessment or perform a more vigorous risk analysis. The analysis will determine the cause, effects, and magnitude of the risk perceived, and helps develop and examine alternative options leading to a mitigation strategy. Risk analysis for elements such as cost, schedule or software development may involve extensive use of tools and statistical techniques.

A risk assessment matrix is use to determine a risk rating which consists of a probability of occurrence and outcome severity. Medium and High risk must be mitigated to an acceptable level incorporating both cost and schedule reserve. Risks are tracked until closure or manifestation.

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?   Yes

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										