Exhibit 300 FY2010

FAAXX155: Next Generation Air/Ground Communications (NEXCOM) Segment 1a

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)
Description: In Part I, complete Sections A, B, C, and D for all capital assets (IT and non-IT). Complete Sections E and F for IT capital assets.

I.A. Overview (All Capital Assets)
Description: The following series of questions are to be completed for all investments.

I.A.1. Date of Submission:	2008-08-01
I.A.2. Agency:	021
I.A.3. Bureau:	12
I.A.4. Name of this Capital Asset: Description: (Up to 250 characters)	FAAXX155: Next Generation Air/Ground Communications (NEXCOM) Segment 1a
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-12-01-15-01-1020-00
I.A.6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2010? Description: Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.	Mixed Life Cycle

I.A.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:
Description: (Up to 2500 characters)

If many more planes fly during peak periods, or if Air Traffic Controllers become empowered to work more efficiently, then more Very High Frequency (VHF) radio spectrum will be needed for Air Traffic Control (ATC) communications; either for more voice, data, Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) technologies or a combination of these. NEXCOM's new radio technologies support the FAA's goal of Greater Capacity by making more efficient use of existing spectrum. Furthermore, replacing very old radios and their higher failure rates with newer radios will reduce the future growth rate of O&M costs, a cost avoidance. The NEXCOM program first received approval in May, 1998, received a JRC Revalidation Decision in May, 2000, and was Rebaselined in December, 2005. NEXCOM will be implemented in two segments. Segment 1 addresses the high- and ultrahigh-sector air traffic voice channels for aircraft flying en route above 24,000 feet. Segment 1 is divided into two phases, Segments 1a and 1b. Only Segment 1a has been approved to date. Due to higher agency priorities Segment 1b has been cancelled. A business case for Segment 2, terminal and flight service radio replacement will be submitted separately. The new radios are Multimode Digital Radios (MDRs). This exhibit is for Segment 1a which will replace all en route radios (at 1212 sites) with MDRs by 2013. The first installation was in 2004. MDRs installed in 2006 enter the "Evaluate" phase in 2008. MDRs installed in 2007 and later are in the "Control" phase. In FY10, MDRs will be installed at 158 sites completing 64% (778 of 1212). The program has been designed for growth and flexibility. The MDRs can emulate the existing analog protocol, thus facilitating transition, or they can operate in the spectrally efficient 8.33 kHz voice mode currently in use in Europe, or with additional expenditures in a later phase they can operate in the VDL-3 mode especially designed for Air Traffic Control. The VDL mode can provide integrated data and voice. The 8.33 kHz voice-only mode can recover spectrum needed for the data communications program, a key component of the Next Generation Air Traffic Control System (NextGen). At this time, the FAA is conducting the data communications investment analysis to analyze the alternatives for the future of ATC Communications. Regardless of the alternative chosen, the MDRs remain key building blocks for NextGen because of their operational flexibility and capabilities.

I.A.9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	yes
I.A.9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	2005-12-14
I.A.10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	yes
I.A.12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?	no
I.A.12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	yes
I.A.12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	no
I.A.12.b.1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
I.A.12.b.2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
I.A.12.b.3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
I.A.13. Does this investment directly support any of the PMA initiatives?	no
I.A.13.a. If "yes," select all that apply:	

I.A.13.b. 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?) Description: (Up to 500 characters)	
I.A.14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? Description: (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)	yes
I.A.14.a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?	yes
I.A.14.b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	10001121 - FAA Air Traffic Services
I.A.14.c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	Adequate
I.A.15. Is this investment for information technology?	yes
I.A.16 What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Description: Level 1 - Projects with low-to-moderate complexity and risk. Example: Bureau-level project such as a stand-alone information system that has low- to-moderate complexity and risk. Level 2 - Projects with high complexity and/or risk which are critical to the mission of the organization. Examples: Projects that are part of a portfolio of projects/systems that impact each other and/or impact mission activities. Department-wide projects that impact cross-organizational missions, such as an agency-wide system integration that includes large scale Enterprise Resource Planning (e.g., the DoD Business Mgmt Modernization Program). Level 3 - Projects that have high complexity, and/or risk, and have government-wide impact. Examples: Government-wide initiative (E-GOV, President's Management Agenda). High interest projects with Congress, GAO, OMB, or the general public. Cross-cutting initiative (Homeland Security).	Level 3
I.A.17. In addition to the answer in 1.A.11.d, 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
I.A.18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4-FY 2008 agency high risk report? (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)	no
I.A.19. Is this a financial management system?	no
I.A.19.a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	
I.A.19.a.1. If "yes," which compliance area: Description: (Up to 250 characters)	
I.A.19.a.2. If "no," what does it address? Description: (Up to 500 characters)	
I.A.19.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 Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	
I.A.20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? Description: (This should total 100%)	
I.A.20.a. Hardware	51
I.A.20.b. Software	0
I.A.20.c. Services	49
I.A.20.d. Other	0
I.A.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
I.A.23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	yes
I.A.24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?	no

I.B. Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

I.B.1 Summary of Spending Table
Description: 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.

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.

I.B.1.a. Summary of Spending for Project Phases

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010
Planning	$3.426	$0.000	$0.000	$0.000
Acquisition	$175.674	$30.400	$33.400	$33.700
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	$179.100	$30.400	$33.400	$33.700
Operations and Maintenance	$0.514	$0.548	$0.663	$0.798
TOTAL	$179.614	$30.948	$34.063	$34.498
Government FTE Costs	$37.642	$9.590	$10.941	$11.997

I.B.1.b. Summary of Spending for Project Phases (Government FTE Costs Only)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010
Number of FTE represented by cost	332	79	86	90

I.B.2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?	no
I.B.2.a. If "yes," How many and in what year? Description: (Up to 500 characters)	
I.B.3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	No Changes

I.D. Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

I.D.1. Performance Information Table
Description: 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 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 the next President's Budget.

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator
2005	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent
2005	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent
2005	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages.
2005	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent
2006	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent
2006	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages
2006	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests

2007	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent
2007	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent
2007	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages.
2007	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests
2007	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average training time for radio maintenance repair
2008	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent
2008	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent
2008	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages.
2008	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests
2008	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average training time for radio maintenance repair
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2009	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2009	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages.
2009	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests
2009	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average training time for radio maintenance repair.
2010	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2010	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2010	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages
2010	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests
2010	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average training time for radio maintenance repair.
2011	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2011	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2011	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages
2011	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests
2011	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average training time for radio maintenance repair.
2012	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2012	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2012	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages
2012	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests
2012	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average training time for radio maintenance repair.
2013	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Percent of pilots who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.
2013	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Percent of controllers who rate the air traffic control radio system as excellent.

2013	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Reduce delays due to reported Very High Frequency (VHF) radio outages
2013	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Reliability	Equipment sparing requests
2013	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average training time for radio maintenance repair.

I.F. Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

Description: 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.

I.F.1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	yes
I.F.1.a. If "no," please explain why? Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	
I.F.2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	yes
I.F.2.a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Description: (Up to 500 characters)	Next Generation VHF Air/Ground Communications (NEXCOM)
I.F.2.b. If "no," please explain why? Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	
I.F.3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture?	yes
I.F.3.a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to http://www.egov.gov. Description: (In the format "XXX-000")	102-000

I.F.4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table

Description: 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.

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 this column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused - Component Name (b)
Weather Advisory Capability (446)	Weather information is available either automatically or manually through communication with ATC and other facilities. For example, pilots receive weather advisories from automated surface observing systems and other systems, or from personnel at ATC facilities and aircraft operations centers (AOCs). Advisories provide both routine and hazardous weather information and/or flight conditions, at airports or along a flight path. (ATC Advisories)	Communication	Voice Communications	
Weather Advisory Capability (446)	Weather information is available either automatically or manually through communication with ATC and other facilities. For example, pilots receive weather advisories from automated surface observing systems and	Security Management	Digital Signature Management	

	other systems, or from personnel at ATC facilities and aircraft operations centers (AOCs). Advisories provide both routine and hazardous weather information and/or flight conditions, at airports or along a flight path. (ATC Advisories)			
Aircraft to Aircraft Separation Capability (389)	Aircraft are separated from other known aircraft in the terminal, en route, and oceanic environments. Separation assurance involves the application of separation standards to ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance or altitude from other known aircraft. Standards are defined for aircraft based on aircraft type, size, equipment, and for operating in different environments. (ATC-Separation Assurance)	Security Management	Digital Signature Management	
Aircraft to Aircraft Separation Capability (389)	Aircraft are separated from other known aircraft in the terminal, en route, and oceanic environments. Separation assurance involves the application of separation standards to ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance or altitude from other known aircraft. Standards are defined for aircraft based on aircraft type, size, equipment, and for operating in different environments. (ATC-Separation Assurance)	Communication	Voice Communications	

I.F.5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table

Description: 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.

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.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Voice Communications	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Wireless / PDA	NEXCOM MDR Specification; MDR Vendor: ITT Industries; Product: Multimode Digital Radio (CAVU-2100)
Digital Signature Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	NEXCOM MDR Specification and SCAP; MDR Vendor: ITT Industries; Product: Multimode Digital Radio (CAVU-2100)

I.F.6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (e.g. USA.gov, Pay.gov, etc.)?	no
I.F.6.a. If "yes," please describe. Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	

Part IV: Planning for "Multi-Agency Collaboration" ONLY
Description: Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative, a Line of Business (LOB) Initiative, or a Multi-Agency Collaboration effort. The "Multi-Agency Collaboration" choice should be selected in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. Investments identified as "Multi-Agency Collaboration" will complete only Parts I and IV of the exhibit 300.

IV.A. Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (All Capital Assets)
Description: Multi-agency Collaborations, such as E-Gov and LOB initiatives, should develop a joint exhibit 300.

IV.A.1. Stakeholder Table Description: As a joint exhibit 300, please identify all the agency stakeholders (all participating agencies, this should not be limited to agencies with financial commitment). All agency stakeholders should be listed regardless of approval. If the partner agency has approved this joint exhibit 300 please provide the date of approval.	
IV.A.9. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole?	
IV.A.9.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?	
IV.A.9.b. If "yes," please provide the following information:	