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:	8/24/2007
2. Agency:	Department of Transportation
3. Bureau:	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	NHTSA009: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	021-18-01-19-01-1010-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2001 or earlier

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:

FARS is a steady state crash data collection and analysis program. It was implemented to improve the availability of data needed for improving vehicle safety performance and reducing deaths related to vehicles in transport. The Agency's goal is to reduce fatal injuries resulting from motor vehicle crashes to a rate of 1.0 fatalities per 100M VMT from the current rate of 1.5. It is the only national census data system for fatal vehicle crashes. FARS is extensively referenced to support legislation, enforcement and education programs designed to reduce injury and property damage resulting from motor vehicle crashes. The FARS data are used by virtually all traffic safety professionals and other customers interested in traffic safety including: Congress, NHTSA, USDOT, State agencies, the automotive industry, the insurance industry, advocacy groups, international users, and the general public. The FARS data support customers' most significant programs that address traffic safety. It is the basis for the Agency's traffic safety grants to the States for programs such as the Impaired Driver Program. FARS collects State level data for analysis of traffic safety crashes to identify problems and evaluate countermeasures designed to reduce injuries and property damage resulting from motor vehicle crashes. The data are used for agency rulemaking and targeting grant money to areas most in need. The types of data collected can be used specifically to conduct research on ways to remediate problems such as alcohol involvement, vehicle types, weather and road conditions, seat belt use, car seats, air bags. The program provides analytical data and information to the public through various media, including the program's web services. The program is able to target data collections to respond to the most recent Congressional interest and mandates for new data. The Information Technology component provides for support for operations and maintenance of the program's data collection application, client server platform, and communications network that is consistent with the Agency's architecture and standards. Without the FARS program and data, many of the legislative actions, enforcement, and education programs designed to save lives and reduce traffic safety related injuries and property damage could not be targeted, affected, or enacted.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	8/24/2007
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?	
Name	Eisemann, Barry
Phone Number	Redacted
Email	barry.eisemann@dot.gov
a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?	Mid/Journeyman-level
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	No

to non-IT assets only)	
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?	Yes
If "yes," check all that apply:	Expanded E-Government
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?)	FARS supports the objectives of the E-Government Act of 2002 by using internet-based technology to enhance government and citizen access to government information. Over 5,000 unique visitors each month use FARS to search and browse more traffic safety information. Citizens can use this information to make wiser decisions about behavior and use patterns for motor vehicles.
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?	No
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	NHTSA Operations and Research
c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	Moderately Effective
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?	
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	5.000000
Software	10.000000
Services	85.000000
Other	

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?	Yes

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

Name	Smith, Dee
Phone Number	Redacted

Title	Information Systems Security Officer (ISSO)
E-mail	dee.smith@dot.gov
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	Yes
Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:	
24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?	No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.94	0	0	0.035	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Acquisition:	0	0	0	0.465	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0.94	0	0	0.500	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Operations & Maintenance:	10.09	2.2	2.2	2.3	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
TOTAL:	11.03	2.2	2.2	2.800	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0.84	0.22	0.23	0.48	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	1	1	1	1	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	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

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

EVM will be required for the DME portion of this investment in BY 09. Currently, FARS is a steady state investment and an Operational Analysis is performed.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
a. Explain why:	To ensure compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, NHTSA includes in its contracts and agreements the following language: "All deliverables and services rendered under this contract/agreement must comply with the accessibility standards at 36 CFR 1194." For example, FARS contractors are required to ensure that HTML code contains "alt "attributes for accessing web-based data and information and that user documentation, manuals and online help files are available.
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	No
a. If "yes," what is the date?	
b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	Yes
1. If "no," briefly explain why:	

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

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

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data.	Maintain 91% reporting of the GIS data, which will increase the visibility & knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	The actual results were 95% GIS data reported for 2005.
2005	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	Provide data for the number of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	FARS data reports the fatalities and FHWA alerts the VMT that is used to calculate the fatalites per miles traveled.	Provide data to contribute to the Agency's goal of reducing highway fatalities.	The actual results were provided in August 2006 of 1.47 fatalities per million vehicle miles traveled in 2005. This information is used to support the agency's goal of lower rates in 2008.
2005	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time required to collect, report,	Currently for full reporting it takes 90 days or less from a crash	Reduce amount of time it takes to collect fatal crash event data	The actual results will best be measured in April 2007 since

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					and make available data on crash events.	event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	by 4%. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about traffic safety by customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	it took some 7 months to make the equipment refresh in all states. An improvement of .8% was shown even with the down time during equipment change over.
2005	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability of FARS data via the web site.	90% availability of FARS data on a 24 hour, 7 days a week basis	Improve availability of FARS data to 95% by upgrading the current, aging equipment. This will provide greater access to quality analytical information such as reports, charts and graphs, which are extremely valuable to customers and stakeholders	The actual results were 95.1%. It was based on the average availability post-implementation of the new hardware.
2006	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data.	Maintain 91% reporting of GIS data, which will increase the visibility and knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	The actual results 95% GIS data reported for 2006
2006	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Delivery time for early reporting data.	Early reporting data on traffic fatalities is available 2 weeks after the crash events.	Using the FastFARS enhancement, provide key data from early notification reports on traffic fatalities within 2 weeks after the crash event.	The actual results show improvement throughout the year. The average time to report crash fatalities from the date of the crash to the date entered into the FastFARS system decreased from 29 days to 12 days. Avg. reporting for the year is 20 days.
2006	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	# fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	Currently 1.5 fatalities occur per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in the U.S.	Contribute to reduction in highway fatalities to 1.0 per 100M VMT in the U.S. by 2008, with an interim goal of 1.35 fatalities per 100M VMT the end of 2005. This is to be accomplished by meeting scheduled publication date on time.	The actual results will be provided by August 2007.
2006	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time	Currently for full reporting it	Reduce amount of time it takes	The actual results show a

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					required to collect, report, and make available data on crash events.	takes 90 days or less from a crash event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	to collect fatal crash event data by 4%. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about traffic safety by customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	reduction of 15% average time to report crash data to the FARS system - reduced from 132 days in 2005 to 115 days in 2006.
2006	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability of FARS data via the web site.	95% availability of FARS data on a 24 hour, 7 days a week basis.	Maintain improved availability of the FARS data.	Additional staff has been assigned to monitor server availability and maintain service. Actual results cannot be measured at this time due to limitations of server to store web logs.
2007	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data.	Maintain 91% reporting of GIS data, which will increase the visibility and knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	The actual results will be provided by August 2008.
2007	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Delivery time for early reporting data.	Early reporting data on traffic fatalities is available 2 weeks after the crash events.	Using the FastFARS enhancement, provide key data from early notification reports on traffic fatalities within 2 weeks after the crash event.	The actual results will be provided by August 2008.
2007	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	# fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	Currently 1.5 fatalities occur per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in the U.S.	Contribute to reduction in highway fatalities to 1.0 per 100M VMT in the U.S. by 2008, with an interim goal of 1.35 fatalities per 100M VMT the end of 2005. This is to be accomplished by meeting scheduled publication date on time.	The actual results will be provided by August 2008.
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time required to collect, report, and make available data on crash events.	Currently for full reporting it takes 90 days or less from a crash event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	Maintain amount of time it takes to collect fatal crash event data. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about traffic safety by	The actual results will be provided by August 2008.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	
2007	Safety	Technology	Financial (Technology)	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Actual operations and maintenance costs will not exceed 10% of the planned value.	Funded value for FY 2007	Not to exceed 10% of funded value for FY 2008.	The actual results will be provided by November 2008.
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data	Maintain 91% reporting of GIS data, which will increase the visibility and knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	The actual results will be provided by August 2009.
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Delivery time for early reporting data.	Early reporting data on traffic fatalities is available 2 weeks after the crash events.	Using the FastFARS enhancement, provide key data from early notification reports on traffic fatalities within 2 weeks after the crash event.	The actual results will be provided by August 2009.
2008	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	# fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	Currently 1.5 fatalities occur per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in the U.S.	Contribute to reduction in highway fatalities to 1.0 per 100M VMT in the U.S. by 2008, with an interim goal of 1.35 fatalities per 100M VMT the end of 2005. This is to be accomplished by meeting scheduled publication date on time - August 2009.	The actual results will be provided by August 2009.
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time required to collect, report, and make available data on crash events.	Currently for full reporting it takes 90 days or less from a crash event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	Maintain amount of time it takes to collect fatal crash event data. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about traffic safety by customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	The actual results will be provided by August 2009.
2008	Safety	Technology	Financial (Technology)	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Actual operations and maintenance costs will not exceed 10% of the planned value.	Funded value for FY 2008	Not to exceed 10% of funded value for FY 2008.	The actual results will be provided by November 2009.
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data	Maintain 91% reporting of GIS data, which will increase the visibility and	The actual results will be provided by August 2010.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Delivery time for early reporting data.	Early reporting data on traffic fatalities is available 2 weeks after the crash events.	Using the FastFARS enhancement, provide key data from early notification reports on traffic fatalities within an average of 2 weeks after the crash event.	The actual results will be provided by August 2010.
2009	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	# fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	Currently 1.5 fatalities occur per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in the U.S.	Contribute to reduction in highway fatalities to 1.0 per 100M VMT in the U.S. by 2008, with an interim goal of 1.35 fatalities per 100M VMT the end of 2005. This is to be accomplished by meeting scheduled publication date on time - August 2010.	The actual results will be provided by August 2010.
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time required to collect, report, and make available data on crash events.	Currently for full reporting it takes 90 days or less from a crash event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	Maintain amount of time it takes to collect fatal crash event data. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about traffic safety by customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	The actual results will be provided by August 2010.
2009	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	IPv6 capability.	Currently the system does not have IPv6 capability.	Make system 100% IPv6 capable by FY 09.	The actual results will be provided by October 2010.
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data	Maintain 91% reporting of GIS data, which will increase the visibility and knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	The actual results will be provided by August 2011.
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Delivery time for early reporting data.	Early reporting data on traffic fatalities is available 2 weeks after the crash events.	Using the FastFARS enhancement, provide key data from early notification	The actual results will be provided by August 2011.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							reports on traffic fatalities within an average of 2 weeks after the crash event.	
2010	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	# fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	Currently 1.5 fatalities occur per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in the U.S.	Contribute to reduction in highway fatalities to 1.0 per 100M VMT in the U.S. by 2008, with an interim goal of 1.35 fatalities per 100M VMT the end of 2005. This is to be accomplished by meeting scheduled publication date on time - August 2011.	The actual results will be provided by August 2011.
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time required to collect, report, and make available data on crash events.	Currently for full reporting it takes 90 days or less from a crash event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	Maintain amount of time it takes to collect fatal crash event data. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about traffic safety by customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	The actual results will be provided by August 2011.
2010	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	HSPD-12 capability.	Currently the system does not have HSPD-12 capability.	Make system 100% HSPD-12 capable by FY 10.	The actual results will be provided by October 2011.
2011	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data	Maintain 91% reporting of GIS data, which will increase the visibility and knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	The actual results will be provided by August 2012.
2011	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Delivery time for early reporting data.	Early reporting data on traffic fatalities is available 2 weeks after the crash events.	Using the FastFARS enhancement, provide key data from early notification reports on traffic fatalities within an average of 2 weeks after the crash event.	The actual results will be provided by August 2012.
2011	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	# fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	Currently 1.5 fatalities occur per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in the U.S.	Contribute to reduction in highway fatalities to 1.0 per 100M VMT in the U.S. by 2008, with an interim goal of 1.35 fatalities per 100M VMT the end of 2005. This is to be accomplished by	The actual results will be provided by August 2012.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							meeting scheduled publication date on time - August 2012.	
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time required to collect, report, and make available data on crash events.	Currently for full reporting it takes 90 days or less from a crash event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	Maintain amount of time it takes to collect fatal crash event data. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about traffic safety by customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	The actual results will be provided by August 2012.
2011	Safety	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing	e-Authentication implementation.	Currently the system does not have e-Authentication.	Add e-Authentication to the entire system (100%) by FY 2011.	The actual results will be provided by October 2012.
2012	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data	Maintain 91% reporting of GIS data, which will increase the visibility and knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	The actual results will be provided by August 2013.
2012	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Delivery time for early reporting data.	Early reporting data on traffic fatalities is available 2 weeks after the crash events.	Using the FastFARS enhancement, provide key data from early notification reports on traffic fatalities within an average of 2 weeks after the crash event.	The actual results will be provided by August 2013.
2012	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	# fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	Currently 1.5 fatalities occur per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in the U.S.	Contribute to reduction in highway fatalities to 1.0 per 100M VMT in the U.S. by 2008, with an interim goal of 1.35 fatalities per 100M VMT the end of 2005. This is to be accomplished by meeting scheduled publication date on time - August 2013.	The actual results will be provided by August 2013.
2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time required to collect, report, and make available data on crash events.	Currently for full reporting it takes 90 days or less from a crash event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	Maintain amount of time it takes to collect fatal crash event data. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about	The actual results will be provided by August 2013.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							traffic safety by customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	
2012	Safety	Technology	Financial (Technology)	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Planned operations and maintenance costs will not exceed 10% of the planned value.	Funded value for FY 2012	Not to exceed 10% of funded value for FY 2012.	The actual results will be provided by November 2013.
2013	Safety	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Reporting of GIS data.	The FARS data collection provides at least 91% reporting of GIS data	Maintain 91% reporting of GIS data, which will increase the visibility and knowledge of the value of the GIS data, thereby directly contributing to the DOT's traffic safety commitment by providing precise location data for use by decision-makers.	The actual results will be provided by August 2014.
2013	Safety	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Delivery time for early reporting data.	Early reporting data on traffic fatalities is available 2 weeks after the crash events.	Using the FastFARS enhancement, provide key data from early notification reports on traffic fatalities within an average of 2 weeks after the crash event.	The actual results will be provided by August 2014.
2013	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Ground Transportation	# fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.	Currently 1.5 fatalities occur per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in the U.S.	Contribute to reduction in highway fatalities to 1.0 per 100M VMT in the U.S. by 2008, with an interim goal of 1.35 fatalities per 100M VMT the end of 2005. This is to be accomplished by meeting scheduled publication date on time - August 2014.	The actual results will be provided by August 2014.
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	Timeliness: Average time required to collect, report, and make available data on crash events.	Currently for full reporting it takes 90 days or less from a crash event for the data from most crashes to be collected, reported and available for review	Maintain amount of time it takes to collect fatal crash event data. By collecting valuable information faster, the FARS system directly contributes to decisions about traffic safety by customers and stakeholders with decision-making authority	The actual results will be provided by August 2014.
2013	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Install Operating System upgrade.	The current Operating System is MS Windows XP.	Install MS technology based on FARS tech refresh and/or operating system upgrade needs or requirements on all (100%) program	The actual results will be provided by October 2014.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							supplied CPUs.	

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: 12.00

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	Redacted	Redacted	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	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	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
FARS	No	Yes	http://www.dot.gov/pia/nhtsa_fars.htm	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. — Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS)

b. If "no," please explain why?

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

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

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Data Classification	Allow classification of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Classification			No Reuse	2
Data Cleansing	Support the maintenance and administration of data that describes data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Cleansing			No Reuse	3
Data Exchange	Support the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications; includes verification that transmitted data was received unaltered.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	7

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)
Data Recovery	Support the restoration and stabilization of data sets to a consistent, desired state.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Recovery			No Reuse	2
Data Warehouse	Defines the set of capabilities that support the archiving and storage of large volumes of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Warehouse			No Reuse	1
Extraction and Transformation	Defines the set of capabilities that support the manipulation and change of data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation			No Reuse	3
Loading and Archiving	Defines the set of capabilities that support the population of a data source with external data.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Loading and Archiving			No Reuse	2
Metis	To facilitate the collection, classification, visualization, and maintenance of enterprise metadata.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Meta Data Management	Meta Data Management	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	2
Rapid Application Development (RAD)	RAD will provide a component-based event-driven framework for developing web user interfaces	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Software Development	Software Development	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	1
Resource Planning and Allocation	Support the determination of strategic direction, the identification and establishment of programs and processes, and the allocation of resources (capital and labor) among those programs and processes.	Back Office Services	Human Capital / Workforce Management	Resource Planning and Allocation			No Reuse	4
Skills Management	Support the proficiency of employees in the delivery of NCSA's products or services	Back Office Services	Human Capital / Workforce Management	Skills Management			No Reuse	3
Team/Org Management	Support the hierarchy structure and identification of employees within the various sub-groups of NHTSA.	Back Office Services	Human Capital / Workforce Management	Team / Org Management			No Reuse	2
Recruiting	Support the identification and hiring of employees for FARS.	Back Office Services	Human Resources	Recruiting			No Reuse	2
Travel Management	Support the transit and mobility of State employees for business purposes.	Back Office Services	Human Resources	Travel Management			No Reuse	2
Mathematical	Support the formulation and mathematical	Business Analytical Services	Analysis and Statistics	Mathematical			No Reuse	4

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)
	analysis for fatal vehicle crash data and statistical analysis.							
Metis	Support the analysis of information and predict the impact of decisions before they are made.	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning	Decision Support and Planning	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	2
Ad Hoc	Support the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	3
Standardized/Canned	Support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	3
Mapping/Geospatial/Elevation/GPS	Provide for the representation of position information through the use of attributes such as latitude and longitude coordinates.	Business Analytical Services	Visualization	Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS			No Reuse	1
Performance Management	Measure the effectiveness of FARS's financial assets and capital.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management			No Reuse	2
Business Rule Management	Control the hardware and software environments, as well as documents of FARS.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management			No Reuse	2
Appian	Managed the enterprise process that support NHTSA and its policies; capture and execute business processes, manage process improvement, integrte existing systems and codify best practices.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management	Business Rule Management	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	2
Program/Project Management	Manage and control FARS	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	2
Requirements Management	Gather analyze and fulfill the needs and prerequisites of NCSA efforts.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Requirements Management			No Reuse	2
eRams	To assess risks for FARS by identifying critical functions for project and security functions for project and security; assessing threats, vulnerabilities, consequences and mitigations; and assessing and prioritizing risks.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Risk Management	Risk Management	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	2
Network	Defines the set	Business	Organizational	Network	Network	021-18-02-00-	Internal	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)
Management	of capabilities involved in monitoring and maintaining a communications network in order to diagnose problems, gather statistics and provide general usage.	Management Services	Management	Management	Management	02-4060-00		
Assistance Request	Support the solicitation of support from States and public.	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Assistance Request			No Reuse	3
Content Authoring	Allow for the creation of tutorials, web sites, CD-ROMs and other interactive programs.	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Content Authoring			No Reuse	4
Content Publishing and Delivery	Allow for the propagation/transmission of interactive programs	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Content Publishing and Delivery	Content Publishing and Delivery	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	1
Library/Storage	Support document and data warehousing and archiving.	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Library / Storage			No Reuse	2
Information Retrieval	Allow access to data and information for use by an NHTSA and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	4
Elements	Support the use of documents and data to be mined in a multi-user environment for use by NHTSA and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing	Information Sharing	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	2
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Support the transfer of knowledge to DOT, Congress and the public.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery			No Reuse	2
Document Library	Support the grouping and archiving of files and records on the FARS servers.	Support Services	Collaboration	Document Library			No Reuse	1
Email	Support the transmission of data, memos and messages over the FARS network.	Support Services	Collaboration	Email			No Reuse	3
Endeca	Support and leverage advance search capabilities; find information located in FARS repository; search both unstructured and structured data; and identify connection and patterns within data.	Support Services	Search	Query	Information Retrieval	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	1
Access Control	Support the management of	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control	Access Control	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	2

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)
	permissions for login onto the FARS computer, applications, services and network; includes user management and role/privilege management.							
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Support the identification and monitoring of activities within the FARS application.	Support Services	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis			No Reuse	2
Cyber Security Assessment and Management (CSAM)	CSAM will generate management reports, including enterprise system, compliance and ad hoc reports; support all other security requirements.	Support Services	Security Management	FISMA Management and Reporting	FISMA Management and Reporting	021-18-02-00-02-4060-00	Internal	2
Identification and Authentication	Support to acquire e-authentication login information about those parties attempting to log on to the FARS system for security purposes; and the validation of those users.	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication	Identification and Authentication		External	1
Intrusion Detection	Support the detection of unauthorized access to FARS information/data system.	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Detection	Intrusion Detection	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	2
ISARM (Instrumented Situational Awareness Reporting Metric)	An intrusion detection method and technology designed to monitor service level security agreements for the purpose of validating contractor responsibilities to the government authorizing official (DAA) for the system they are managing.	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Detection	Risk Management	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	1
Intrusion Prevention	Perform penetration testing and other measures to prevent unauthorized access to FARS.	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Prevention	Intrusion Prevention	021-18-03-00-02-3100-00	Internal	1
Virus Protection	Provides anti-virus service to prevent, detect, and remediate infection of government computing assets.	Support Services	Security Management	Virus Protection	Virus Protection	021-18-02-00-02-4060-00	Internal	1

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)
License Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support the purchase, refresh and tracking of legal usage contracts for system software and applications.	Support Services	Systems Management	License Management			No Reuse	1

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)
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Requirements Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Program / Project Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Mathematical	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Decision Support and Planning	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Redacted
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Redacted
Query	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Redacted
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	Redacted
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Redacted
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Redacted
Software Development	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Redacted
Intrusion Prevention	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted
FISMA Management and Reporting	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted
Risk Management	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted
Email	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Redacted
Content Authoring	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Redacted
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Redacted
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Redacted
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Redacted
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Redacted
License Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Redacted
License Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Redacted
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Redacted
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Redacted
Content Publishing and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	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)
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	Redacted
Business Rule Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Redacted
Decision Support and Planning	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Redacted
Data Recovery	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	Redacted
Data Classification	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	Redacted
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	Redacted
Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	Redacted
Data Cleansing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	Redacted
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Document Library	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Assistance Request	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Redacted
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Redacted
Resource Planning and Allocation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Redacted
Skills Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Redacted
Team / Org Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Redacted
Recruiting	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Redacted
Travel Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Redacted
Governance / Policy Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Redacted
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Redacted
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Redacted
Intrusion Detection	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	Redacted
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Redacted
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Redacted
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Intrusion Detection	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Redacted
Virus Protection	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Redacted
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Redacted

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

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

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?	Yes

a. If "yes," please describe.

- FARS will leverage Department or Federal application components in the areas of risk management, PII protection solutions, e-authentication and HSPD-12.
- FARS will also leverage the COE capabilities for antivirus, IDS, VPN, and backup applications.
- We have shared our model and provided guidance to Agencies for development of their programs - CDC' Natl Violent Death Reporting System, Office of Fatal Statistics, and DOL.
- We developed FARS/traffic safety based on XML schemas for electronic transfer of data and submitted to Global Justice (consortium of government agencies spearheaded by the Department of Justice) for implementing in their national repository for sharing with government agencies - Federal and States.

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? No

a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?

b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? 3/31/2008

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	Redacted	Redacted	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.

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

List of Legacy Investment or Systems

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

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

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

a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 7/12/2007

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

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

Risk Management Plan changed to address risk/mitigation for the FARS web server move to new facility.

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:

Potential risks are routinely reported and assessed in the electronic Risk Assessment Management (eRAM) system. Costs for mitigating risks are estimated and reflected in the life cycle costs. The following extracts are examples of potential risks to the FARS program, and estimate costs for mitigating the risks:

Data inaccuracies: System provides data validation and error checking throughout the collection cycle. Cost for evaluating

potential data inconsistencies, developing specs for automated rule checking, and updating the system software is estimated at $20,000 annually. This cost is incorporated in the work order in the FARS maintenance contract.

Life-Cycle Costs: We take proactive steps to ensure that we maintain adequate funding and to remain informed of new requirements related to FARS. Risk is mitigated by monthly management meetings. Due to budget reductions at the office level, full investment in program IT is in jeopardy. In order to meet future performance milestones, the budget estimates should be maintained.

Scheduling file freezes made more difficult by new demands on data quality: Increased demand for the FARS data has resulted in increasing scrutiny and need for modifying QC processes. Changes in QC process timetable are under review to mitigate delays in meeting schedules.

Technical Obsolescence - Project Manager works with the contractor to factor in software/hardware product upgrades or technology refreshment into funding and project plans. Normal life cycle management technology refreshment is implemented to provide a cost effective alternative. New technical approaches, e.g. virtualization, reduce the need for replacement and maintenance of large quantity of the program hardware.

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?	Yes
a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?	8/13/2007

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	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
2	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
3	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
4	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
5	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
6	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
7	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
8	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
9	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
10	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
11	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
12	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
13	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
14	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
15	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
16	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Project Totals	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted