

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 9/10/2007
2. Agency: Department of Transportation
3. Bureau: Federal Aviation Administration
4. Name of this Capital Asset: FAAXX718 - Display System Replacement/User Request Evaluation Tool (DSR/URET) - Combines FAAXX002 and FAAXX604
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 021-12-01-11-01-1230-00
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.) Operations and Maintenance
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2002
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:

At 20 Air Route Traffic Control Centers (ARTCC) FAA controllers offer separation services, traffic advisories, conflict resolution and weather information to pilots en route between airports. The Display System Replacement (DSR) is the primary en route display processing system; it receives aircraft track and other data from the HOST computer and formats it for display to controllers. The User Request Evaluation Tool, or URET, is a decision support aid integrated into the DSR console that automatically tells air traffic controllers of potential conflicts between aircraft, as well as between aircraft and special use airspace. The tool allows air traffic controllers to more efficiently determine whether proposed flight plan changes will conflict with other aircraft or airspace. By allowing controllers to evaluate route change requests and more often assign conflict free direct routings, the aircraft operators are able to save the aviation community both time and fuel. URET benefit measurements are based on the ability of the URET system to allow the controller to provide the airlines more direct routes. The FY09 DSR/URET investment funds cross-functional team members working together to: (1) remove latent defects, (2) manage engineering changes to fix system problems, (3) assess system safety management associated with any change to the fielded system, (4) identify operational problems early enough to replace products before they become obsolete, (5) seek technology opportunities to maintain the fielded capability at current levels and reduce ownership costs and (6) monitor and assess performance, cost of ownership and support trends. DSR/URET continues to support the DOT and FAA Safety goals by providing a reliable display system and a conflict detection capability which was not available before URET. Performance Project Status: DSR/URET is in the evaluation stage of the FAA capital planning process. DSR/URET is in the In-Service Management phase of the FAA's Acquisition Management System life cycle. In the latest operational analysis report in August 2007, the FAA reviewed progress plans and concluded that DSR/URET is still meeting its intended requirements. Both systems will be replaced by the new En Route Automation Management System (ERAM) by first quarter FY 2011. On August 25, 2007 the JRC approved the consolidation of the separate investments into one investment with a shorter life. The JRC decision covers the segment from 2003-2011.
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/25/2007
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name McGovern, Daniel P
Phone Number Redacted
Email daniel.mcgovern@faa.gov
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? TBD
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes
 - a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes
 - b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No
 1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help

fund this investment?

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

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

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

If "yes," check all that apply:

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

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.) Yes

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

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? FAA Air Traffic Services

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Adequate

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 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 FFMI 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	10.000000
Software	80.000000
Services	5.000000
Other	5.000000

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

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

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

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? 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:	6.25	0	0	0	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Acquisition:	675.217	0	0	0	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	681.467	0	0	0	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Operations & Maintenance:	191.874	63.055	64.34	65.812	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
TOTAL:	873.341	63.055	64.34	65.812	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	39.205	14.776	15.512	16.288	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	348	131	137	144	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.

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:

All remaining work under the existing and future contracts is for O&M. EVM was not required in the past for DME activities that had been completed because contracts were issued before EVM was a requirement. There is a very minimal risk assumed with the execution of DSR contracts. Despite the use of cost plus contracts for 100 percent of the total value of the contracts, the tasks are well defined but the estimated level of work can vary from year to year even with mature contractor experience level. Constant monitoring of the LOE contractors performance by daily contact, weekly meetings, program status reports and constant communications ensures that the DSR program manager is aware of the status of the work effort at all times. The government does not assume abnormal risk due to these Level of Effort contracts.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why:

The air traffic controllers must meet strict medical qualifications under OPM Qualification Standards, GS-2152, Air Traffic Control Series, as stated in FAA Order 3930.3A, Air Traffic Control Series, as stated in FAA Order 3930.3A, Air Traffic Control Specialist Health Program. The GS-2152 require controllers to meet strict qualifications with respect to vision, hearing and other physical abilities that preclude the need for application of the 508 standards described at 1194 for this equipment.

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

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

5/17/2007

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

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

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings form increase direct routings.	18.4 million nmi (1999-2004 URET savings)	11.0 million nmi	Data available as of 1/06 shows that the distance saved has increased by 25.0 million nmi which is over 100% of the goal.
2005	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings	\$117.5 M in aircraft direct operating cost savings (1999-2004 URET savings)	URET plans to save the aviation community a total of \$76.4M in FY05.	Data available as of 1/06 shows that the savings for FY2005 were \$174.9M approximately 130% greater than planned goal.
2005	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	30% usage	Increase percentage to 50%	As of 1/06 70% of the controllers where using URET.

Exhibit 300: FAAXX718 - Display System Replacement/User Request Evaluation Tool (DSR/URET) - Combines FAAXX002 and FAAXX604 Redacted 1-25-2008

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Amount of DSR Priority 1 Software errors found in a National System Release	One Priority 1 error per two releases	Goal-one priority 1 error per one delivery	For FY05, 0 priority 1 errors. Source - FAA National Air Space Reporting System.
2005	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time that URET is available to the user.	99.999% available requirement	URET should exceed requirement	Latest analysis for URET dated 1/06 shows 99.9992% availability
2005	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	30%	50%	Data available as of 1/06 shows that 75% of centers are entering more than 32% of their flight plan amendments through
2005	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Amount of time that DSR is unavailable for use by AT due to unscheduled outage.	DSR availability 99.9%	The goal is to maintain or reduce the baseline.	8 minutes monthly average. For FY05, DSR availability is 100%. Source-FAA National Air Space Reporting System.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings (in nautical miles per year)	30.1 million nmi (1999-2005 URET savings).	15.1 million nmi in FY2006.	Thru as of the FY06 a total of 33.2 million nmi have been saved.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	URET has saved the aviation community a total of \$447.7M (1999-2005 URET savings)	Planned improvement for FY2006 is an additional \$106.2M.	As of the end of FY06 the savings is 90,959 nmi/day and \$636,712 per day in aircraft operating costs savings. This equals an annual savings to date of \$232.4M which is beating the \$106.2 goal for FY2006.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	50% usage	Increase percentage to 70%.	As of the end of FY06 95% of the controllers were using URET.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Amount of DSR Priority 1 Software errors found in a National System Release	One Priority 1 error per two releases	The goal is one priority 1 error per delivery	No P1 errors occurred during FY06
2006	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time URET is available to users.	99.999% availability requirement	URET should exceed requirement.	As of FY06 analysis for URET shows 99.9992% availability.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URE	50% usage	80% usage	Data available as of the end of FY06 shows that 95% of centers are entering more than 32% of their flight plan amendments through URET.
2006	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Amount of time that DSR is unavailable for use by AT due to	DSR Availability 99.999%	The goal is to maintain or reduce the baseline.	DSR Availability for FY06 was 99.9999%

Exhibit 300: FAAXX718 - Display System Replacement/User Request Evaluation Tool (DSR/URET) - Combines FAAXX002 and FAAXX604 Redacted 1-25-2008

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					unscheduled outage.			
2007		Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Complaints				
2007	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings from increased direct routings	Estimated 100.2 million nmi (1999-2006 URET savings)	25.0 million nmi in FY 2007	Results will be available in 1/30/08
2007	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	The number of reported aircraft delays specifically related to DSR as reported in the FAA National Database	FY06 delays = 4	Reduce delay time by 5%	Final result will be available 10/31/07
2007	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	\$701.7M (1999-2006 URET savings)	URET plans to save the aviation community an additional \$240M	Results will be available in 1/30/08
2007	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	95% usage	Increase percentage to 100%.	Data will be available 1/30/08.
2007	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Amount of DSR Priority 1 Software errors found in a National System release	No P1 errors in FY06	The goal is one priority 1 error per delivery.	Final results will be available 10/31/07
2007	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time URET is available to users	99.999% available requirement	URET should exceed requirement.	Data will be available 1/30/08.
2007	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	80%	Data available as of 1/06 shows that 75% of centers are entering more than 32% of their flight plan amendments through	Results will be available in 1/30/08
2007	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Amount of time that DSR is unavailable for use by AT due to unscheduled outage	DSR Availability of 99.999% for FY06	The loss of DSR service removes AT's ability to control aircraft movement thru their airspace. The risk of an accident is greatly increased. Goal is to maintain or reduce	Final results will be available 10/31/07. Source-FAA National Air Space Reporting System
2008	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings from increased direct routings.	Estimated 125.2 million nmi (1999-2007 URET savings)	25.0 million nmi in FY 2008	Results will be available in 1/31/09
2008	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	The number of reported aircraft delays specifically related to DSR as reported in the FAA National Database	FY06 delays = 4	Aircraft delays are costly to both commercial and civil aviation in wasted fuel. The flying public also suffers if their flights do not arrive and depart on time. Reduce delay time by 5%	Final results will be available 10/31/08
2008	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost	Estimated \$941.7M (1999-2007 URET)	URET plans to save the aviation community an	Results will be available in 1/31/09

Exhibit 300: FAAXX718 - Display System Replacement/User Request Evaluation Tool (DSR/URET) - Combines FAAXX002 and FAAXX604 Redacted 1-25-2008

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	savings)	additional \$240M in FY 2008.	
2008	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	70% usage	Continue to maintain controller usage at 100%	Data will be available 01/31/09
2008	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Amount of DSR Priority 1 Software errors found in a National System Release	No P1 errors in FY07	The impact of errors in a release causes disruption and financial loss. The goal is one priority 1 error per delivery	Final results will be available 10/31/08
2008	Safety	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time URET is available to users	99.999% available requirement	URET should exceed requirement.	Data will be available 1/31/09.
2008	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	80%	Data available as of the end of FY06 shows that 95% of centers are entering more than 32% of their flight plan amendments through URET.	Results will be available in 1/31/09
2008	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Amount of time that DSR is unavailable for use by AT due to unscheduled outage.	DSR Availability 99.99%	The loss of DSR service removes AT's ability to control aircraft movement thru their airspace. The risk of an accident is greatly increased. The goal is to maintain or reduce baseline	Final results will be available 10/31/08
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings from increased direct routings	Estimated 150.2 million nmi (1999-2008 URET savings)	25.0 million nmi in FY20	Results will be available in 1/31/10
2009	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	Estimated \$1.2B (1999-2008 URET savings)	URET plans to save the aviation community an additional \$240M in FY 2009.	Results will be available in 1/31/10
2009	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	100% usage	Continue to maintain controller usage at 100%.	Data will be available 01/31/10
2009	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Amount of URET/DSR Priority 1 Software errors found in a National System Release	No P1 errors in FY08	The impact of errors in a release causes disruption and financial loss. The goal is one priority 1 error per delivery	Final results will be available 9/30/09
2009	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are	95%	Data available as of the end of FY06 shows that 95% of centers are entering more than 32%	Results will be available in 1/31/09

Exhibit 300: FAAXX718 - Display System Replacement/User Request Evaluation Tool (DSR/URET) - Combines FAAXX002 and FAAXX604 Redacted 1-25-2008

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					entered through URET		of their flight plan amendments through URET.	
2009	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Amount of time that URET/DSR is unavailable for use by AT due to unscheduled outage.	DSR/URET Availability of 99.999% for FY08	The loss of URET/DSR service removes AT's ability to control aircraft movement thru their airspace. The risk of an accident is greatly increased. The goal is to maintain or reduce baseline	Final results will be available 9/30/09
2010	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings from increased direct routing	Estimated 175.2 million nmi (1999-2009 URET savings)	25.0 million nmi in FY 2010	Results will be available in 1/31/11
2010	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	Estimated \$1.4B (1999-2009 URET savings)	URET plans to save the aviation community an additional \$240M in FY 2010	Results will be available in 1/31/11
2010	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	100% usage	Continue to maintain controller usage at 100%.	Results will not be available until 1/31/11
2010	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Amount of URET/DSR Priority 1 Software errors found in a National System Release	No P1 errors in FY08	The impact of errors in a release causes disruption and financial loss. The goal is one priority 1 error per delivery	Final results will be available 10/31/10
2010	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	80%	Data available as of the end of FY09 shows that 95% of centers are entering more than 32% of their flight plan amendments through URET.	Results will be available in 1/31/11
2010	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Amount of time that URET/DSR is unavailable for use by AT due to unscheduled outage.	99.999% available requirement	The goal is to maintain or reduce baseline	Final results will be available 10/31/10
2011	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings from increased direct routings	Estimated 200.2 million nmi (1999-2010 URET savings)	25.0 million nmi in FY2011	Results will be available in 1/31/11
2011	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	FAA aircraft delay data for DSR/URET	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	URET plans to save the aviation community an additional \$240M in FY 2011	Results will be available in 1/31/2011
2011	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	Estimated \$1.4B (1999-2009 URET savings)	URET plans to save the aviation community an additional \$50M in FY 2010	Results will be available in 1/31/11
2011	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air	100% usage	Continue to maintain	Results will not be available until

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.		controller usage at 100%.	1/31/11
2011	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors	Amount of URET/DSR Priority 1 Software errors found in a National System Release	No P1 errors in FY08	The impact of errors in a release causes disruption and financial loss. The goal is one priority 1 error per delivery	Final results will be available 9/30/11
2011	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	80%	Data available as of the end of FY11 shows that 95% of centers are entering more than 32% of their flight plan amendments through URET.	Results will be available in 1/31/2011
2011	Safety	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Amount of time that URET/DSR is unavailable for use by AT due to unscheduled outage.	DSR/URET Availability of 99.999% for 2010	The loss of DSR service removes AT's ability to control aircraft movement thru their airspace. The risk of an accident is greatly increased. Goal is to maintain or reduce baseline.	Final results will be available 1/31/2011.

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 Yes and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the 1.50 budget year:
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part Yes of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.

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

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
Redacted			

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Redacted							

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?

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
Display System Replacement/User Request Evaluation Tool (DSR/URET)	No	No	No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	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. DSR/URET

b. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as Traffic Control 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)
TM Synchronization - Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)	Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Computers / Automation Management			No Reuse	15
ATC-Separation Assurance- Aircraft Airspace Cabability	Aircraft are separated from airspace for special use such as prohibited, restricted, and warning areas. The SUA is designed to ensure safety for unique aircraft operations or to prohibit flight within a specified area. Separation standards ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance from the airspace. The standards are applied via methods including regulatory publications and specific control instructions. (NAS ATC-Separation Assurance -)	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Instrumentation and Testing			No Reuse	20
TM Synchronization-Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Legacy Integration			No Reuse	15

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table: Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)							
ATC-Separation Assurance - Aircraft Airspace Capability	Aircraft are separated from airspace for special use such as prohibited, restricted, and warning areas. The SUA is designed to ensure safety for unique aircraft operations or to prohibit flight within a specified area. Separation standards ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance from the airspace. The standards are applied via methods including regulatory publications and specific control instructions. (NAS ATC-Separation Assurance -)	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Software Development			No Reuse	30
Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate	Business Analytical Services	Knowledge Discovery	Data Mining			No Reuse	0

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:								
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)							
ATC - Separation Assurance - Aircraft Airspace Capability	Aircraft are separated from airspace for special use such as prohibited, restricted, and warning areas. The SUA is designed to ensure safety for unique aircraft operations or to prohibit flight within a specified area. Separation standards ensure aircraft remain an appropriate minimum distance from the airspace. The standards are applied via methods including regulatory publications and specific control instructions. (NAS ATC- Separation Assurance -)	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Network Management			No Reuse	20
Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	0
		Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	0
Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Detection			No Reuse	0

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:								
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)							

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)
Network Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Redacted
Access Control	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Redacted
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Redacted
Intrusion Detection	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Redacted
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Redacted
Legacy Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	Redacted
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	Redacted
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	Redacted
Legacy Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	Redacted
Data Mining	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Redacted
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	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	Servers / Computers	Redacted
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	Redacted
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Redacted
Instrumentation and Testing	Service Platform and	Software Engineering	Test Management	Redacted

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.				
FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
	Infrastructure			
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Redacted

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

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

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No

a. If "yes," please describe.

Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)

Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

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? 4/26/2007
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

The DSR/URET risk management plan has recently been updated to describe the changes to the DSR/URET Risk Management processes based on incorporating Risk Radar as the risk tracking tool for the DSR/URET program. Risk Radar software was acquired by the DSR/URET project in Jan 07. Risk Radar provides a centralized repository for archiving, tracking, and managing DSR/URET project risk data. Risk Radar supports continuous and proactive Risk Management by helping the project manager prioritize, track, report, and mitigate project risk while keeping the highest priority risks clearly in management's sight allowing for timely risk management decisions. Risk Radar conforms to the NAS System Engineering Manual (SEM), and supports industry accepted Risk Management processes.

DSR/URET risk management (RM) endeavors to mitigate DSR/URET program risks and capture opportunities. RM is an integral part of program management in that RM identifies and analyzes uncertainties of achieving program objectives and develops mitigation plans to reduce the likelihood and/or consequences of those uncertainties.

RM is both a "bottom-up" and "top-down" collaborative process that involves the entire DSR/URET team.

There are currently 14 active/open DSR/URET risks that have the status of 'mitigate.' Each risk is assigned an owner who has responsibility to coordinate the efforts to mitigate and eliminate the risk. Risks are tracked in terms of two attributes: 1) probability - likelihood of occurrence and 2) consequence - undesirable impact.

Risk Management meetings are held on a monthly basis (or more frequently as needed) to discuss the status of open risks, and propose candidate risks.

Early and late impact dates are determined for each risk, so that each risk can be assessed in terms of how it may impact the DSR/URET schedules. Each risk is described in terms of an "If-Then" statement. I.e. If this event happens, then what will be the consequence. Mitigation steps for certain risks have driven changes to deployment planning when appropriate.

Example of current DSR/URET Program Risk:

Risk #487 - DPOS CAS Creep may impact formal test and key site schedules

Risk Description: If DSR/URET is asked to deploy additional CAS for BCC26, then the start of BCC26 APL & CAS formal test and BCC26 OS key site milestones are at risk.

Mitigation: Steps are then determined that will mitigate the risk.

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?

Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

1. Was operational analysis conducted? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed. 8/30/2007
 - b. If "yes," what were the results?

The DSR/URET Operational Analysis (OA) Report documents the performance analysis for the DSR/URET system. It complies with reporting requirements placed on the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) established for performance analysis of operationally fielded systems. DSR/URET Operational Analysis is a systemic, ongoing part of the DSR/URET Program Management Plan, and as such is presented to upper FAA Management on a quarterly basis, and documented annually using the Operational Analysis template as mandated by the OMB Capitol programming Guide supplement to OMB Circular A-11. Using performance metrics gathered by both the DSR/URET Program Management team and other FAA offices, DSR/URET OA

systematically measures and monitors the performance and cost of DSR/URET. The financial performance is measured against the approved FAA Joint Resource Council (JRC) spending baseline. Strategic and business results are measured against the DSR/URET requirements as approved and managed by FAA Headquarters. Asset performance is measured using FAA Operational Metric data including but not limited to: Mean Time to Restore (MTTR), System Availability(SA), and Mean Time Between Outages (MTTO) both planned and unplanned. Customer satisfaction is measured in both terms of financial reports which details cost savings to users of the En Route Air traffic System and in weekly telecons with DSR/URET stakeholders.

As mandated by OMB, the DSR/URET OA is annually entered into the OA template and as such is too lengthy to be presented here, therefore only major highlights will be entered into the OMB-300. The DSR/URET OA document was completed 8/30/2007.

As of the 8/30/07 DSR/URET OA Report :

- Technical Performance: Are operating at a 99.999% SA.
- Financial Performance: Are within their established JRC financial baseline.
- Strategic and Business Results: Are in use at 100% of the ARTCC, with 95% of the Air Traffic controllers using URET electronic flight plan data management. No priority Configuration Control Decisions (CCDs) pending, which demonstrates that both systems are operating within the FAA Business requirements.
- Customer Satisfaction: Have no Priority 2nd level Support issues as identified by weekly telecons with stakeholders.
- Innovation: Have no End of Life/End of Service, hardware, software or supply issues which will preclude the continued successful operation through 2011.

c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Contractor and Government Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table: Redacted

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table							
Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)
Redacted							