

Exhibit 300 FY2011

FAAXX084: Instrument Flight Procedure Automation (IFPA)

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:	2010-02-12
I.A.2. Agency:	021
I.A.3. Bureau:	12
I.A.4. Name of this Investment: Description: (Up to 250 characters)	FAAXX084: Instrument Flight Procedure Automation (IFPA)
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53.9. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-12-01-11-01-3120-00
I.A.6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2011? Description: Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2011, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2011 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; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits. Description: (Up to 2500 characters)	Instrument Flight Procedures Automation (IFPA) is an automation system used to create new Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs) and sustain existing IFPs. IFPs provide pilots with an approach path into and out of an airport clear of obstacles such as cell towers, buildings and trees. IFPs are defined operational rules for executing defined maneuvers, which provides safety without direct control from air traffic personnel. The current automation used by the National Flight Procedures Office within Aviation System Standards (AVN), includes a system first implemented in the 1970s. The system is technically obsolete and inefficient. The legacy software is antiquated with no centralized database support and cannot be integrated into the FAA Enterprise Architecture. The majority of the maintenance workload on the 18,000 existing IFP's within the NAS is being accomplished through manual processes with very limited automation support. This workload has grown by 45% since the mid-1990s. In addition, the number of Obstacle Evaluation (OE) studies has doubled since the late-90s to approximately 50,000 requests per year. A large backlog of work currently exists. The program has implemented a 3-pronged approach to improve efficiency and eliminate the backlog: 1) New automation; 2) Contract and Temporary employees; and 3) Policy changes. Three alternatives were considered for the new automation initiative: buy a COTS product, develop In-house, or partner with the DoD. The preferred alternative, partner with the DoD, was selected by the JRC on June 6, 2006, at Initial Investment Decision, then confirmed September 20, 2006 at Final Investment Decision. The DOD has committed to providing one-half of the ongoing maintenance cost for IPDS, beginning in FY10. The DOD users will be added to the FAA user base. IFPA is a suite of tools, which focuses on increasing productivity in AVN's four primary products: IFPs, Amendments to IFPs, OEs, and Notices to Airmen (NOTAMs). The IFPA Program is a mixed life cycle investment. Each application component can be divided further into sub-components called modules, which will be delivered incrementally. Planned modules are: IPDS Module 1 (FY10), Module 2 (FY12); OE (part of IPDS module 2); AirNav database (FY10); IFP Modules (FY10-12); APTS Modules (FY08-12). Tech refreshes begin in 2012 and are scheduled thru 2028. Operational analysis will be performed on a periodic basis to measure system performance against performance baseline.
I.A.8.a. Enter dates for approved rebaselining, alternative analysis, and risk management plan and risk register information. Description: Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned) alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register. (Up to 500 characters)	Alternatives Analysis: 04/12/2006. Risk Management Plan: 10/31/2008. Risk Registers: 07/31/2009 (Monthly Updates)
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?	2006-09-20
I.A.12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):	
I.A.12.a. Financial Management System Table	
I.A.12.b. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one):	

I.B. Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

I.B.1. Summary of Funding 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. Funding for all costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be

included in this report. Funding levels should be shown for budget authority by year consistent with funding levels in Exhibit 53. The Summary of Funding table shall include the amounts allocated to the investment from, and should be directly tied to, the Fiscal Year Budget. This includes direct appropriations (discretionary or mandatory accounts), user fees, and approved self-funding activities and will provide the actual annual "budget" for the investment. This "budget" will be a subset of the congressionally approved budget for each fiscal year. This will provide Departments/Agencies and OMB useful information on the actual Fiscal Year dollars being asked for and spent on an investment.

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 (Reported in Millions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011
Planning	\$1.441	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
Acquisition	\$31.500	\$10.900	\$7.900	\$0.600
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	\$32.941	\$10.900	\$7.900	\$0.600
Operations and Maintenance	\$2.253	\$9.597	\$1.615	\$4.702
Disposition Costs (Optional)	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
SUBTOTAL	\$35.194	\$20.497	\$9.515	\$5.302
Government FTE Costs	\$3.147	\$1.132	\$0.971	\$2.269
TOTAL	\$38.341	\$21.629	\$10.486	\$7.571

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

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011
Number of FTE represented by Costs	24	8	7	13

I.B.2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY2010 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:
Description: (Up to 2500 characters)

The following comments apply to the II.B.1 (Summary Of Spending) and the II.A.1 (previously II.C4) tables. There is only one small change for FY11 - that being the addition of \$100k of initial Tech Refresh startup funding, as shown in the SOS table above. Removal of IAPA Legacy System: The Budget Year (BY) 08 Exhibit 300 included the O&M costs of the IAPA legacy system that is being replaced by this investment. The legacy costs as well as the IFPA costs were included in the BY08 baseline decision and associated economic analysis, but are outside the scope of this OMB300 which addresses the replacement system. Consequently, legacy system O&M costs were pulled out of the SOS, II.A.2, and II.C.4 tables in the BY09 and BY10 Exhibit 300s. A total of \$19.7M was removed, inclusive of FTE costs, comprised of \$4.7M in FY07, \$4.8M in FY08, \$5.0M in FY09, and \$5.2M in FY10. O&M Adjustments: O&M Contractor costs of \$13.4M, associated with the IAPA legacy system, were removed; comprised of \$3.2M in FY07, \$3.3M in FY08, \$3.4M in FY09, & \$3.5M in FY10. O&M FTE costs of \$6.3M, associated with the IAPA legacy system, were removed; comprised of \$1.5M in FY07, \$1.5M in FY08, \$1.6M in FY09, & \$1.7M in FY10. Funding and variance changes: Expanded requirements/criteria due to changes in RNAV Order 8260.54A, TERPS Order 8260.3B, and Flight Procedures & Airspace Order 8260.19 CHG20 have added \$8M of cost to the IPDS project, as well as over 12 months delay to the schedule. On September 5 2008, the FAA Joint Resources Council (JRC) approved carrying a cost and schedule variance and a \$8M funding reserve. The \$8M funding has been added to the SOS table but not included in Table II.A.1 (previously II.C.4) which will carry a negative cost and schedule variance.

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 and the relevant Agency Segment Architecture. The investment must discuss its performance measures in support of the agency's mission and strategic goals as outlined in the corresponding Segment Architecture. Performance measures (indicators) must be provided. 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 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-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
2007	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2007	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published per year
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time

2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time
2007	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2008	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published per year
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time
2008	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate
2009	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2009	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published per year.
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time
2009	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate
2010	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2010	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time
2010	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate
2011	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2011	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time
2011	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate
2012	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2012	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published
2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time
2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time

2012	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate
2013	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2013	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time
2013	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate
2014	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2014	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published
2014	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time
2014	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2014	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2014	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time
2014	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate
2015	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Number of days from request to publish for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)
2015	Safety	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Number of WAAS Instrument Flight Procedures published
2015	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) development task time
2015	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) amendment task time
2015	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Obstacle Evaluation (OE) task time
2015	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	NOTAM preparation task time
2015	Safety	Technology	Technology Improvement	Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) production error rate

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.

Have the requisite investment-level architecture documentation requirements (e.g., reference model mappings, FTF mappings, etc.) for this investment been documented in the corresponding Segment Architecture? For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture requirements, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/>. See this guidance also regarding the reporting of six digit codes corresponding to agency segment architectures in Exhibit 53, and, for limited cases determined by the Chief Architect, reporting an investment alignment with multiple segments.

I.F.1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? yes

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.5. Does this investment replace any legacy systems investments?

Description: Disposition costs (costs of retirement of legacy systems) may be included as a category in Part I, Section B, Summary of Funding, or in separate investments, classified as major or non-major. For legacy system investments being replaced by this investment, include the following data on these legacy investments.

