

Exhibit 300 FY2011

FAAXX294: ATC Beacon Interrogator Replacement (ATCBI-6)

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)	FAAXX294: ATC Beacon Interrogator Replacement (ATCBI-6)
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53.9. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-12-01-20-01-1020-00
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)	ATCBI-6 is a secondary surveillance radar, a "beacon" radar, that provides aircraft location data to FAA air traffic controllers for separation assurance, traffic management, navigation and flight information in the en route airspace. DoD and DHS personnel also use ATCBI-6 data. The secure Identify Friend or Foe (IFF) function allows them to identify friendly aircraft from enemy. The ATCBI-6 Mode-4 configuration (ATCBI-6M) includes the IFF function. Mode-4 is a DoD requirement. ATCBI-6 addresses performance gap generated by ATCBI-4/5 systems past their 20-year life cycles. ATCBI-6 supports the goal, Greater Capacity, and aligns with Strategic Management Process (SMP) Objective, Optimize Service Availability, by reducing aircraft delays and radar service operating costs. The legacy, analog systems are not sustainable due to parts obsolescence; high failure rates and maintenance costs; and long repair times; and are not compatible with the new automation systems. ATCBI-6 will improve system performance with the use of selective interrogation and monopulse technology which enables direct interrogation of a single aircraft, increases the detection of aircraft, improves the accuracy of reported aircraft location and reduces occurrences of false detections (reports of aircraft when there are none). Implementation of ATCBI-6 is consistent with the end-state architecture outlined in NAS-SS-1000 and will ensure service/data is available through the transition to FAA's use of GPS-based technology. The approved 2008 rebaseline adjusts the program cost and schedule to account for increase of scope to 139 systems (due to additional sites from agency cost share agreements, congressional earmarks, and other government programs); prior year funding reductions; lack of funding for facility establishments in FY04 and FY05; and lower acquisition and implementation costs. The rebaseline covers the completion of all DME activities. Complete 139 system deliveries from vendor by end of 2009; commissioned 125 sites as of 8/18/09. BY10 plan: complete 129th site commissioning. BY11 plan: complete 132nd site commissioning.
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)	The current ATCBI-6 baseline was approved by the FAA JRC on May 5, 2008 and OMB on July 10, 2008. The Business Case Analysis Report (BCAR) documenting the latest alternative analysis was approved on July 11, 2007. The latest Risk Management Plan used by the program was approved on August 21, 2009. The program's risk register is reviewed and updated monthly and the last review and update was completed on August 12, 2009.
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?	2008-05-05
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	\$1.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
Acquisition	\$260.720	\$10.000	\$4.700	\$0.000
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	\$261.720	\$10.000	\$4.700	\$0.000
Operations and Maintenance	\$9.298	\$3.860	\$4.336	\$4.987
Disposition Costs (Optional)	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
SUBTOTAL	\$271.018	\$13.860	\$9.036	\$4.987
Government FTE Costs	\$17.392	\$4.052	\$3.314	\$3.194
TOTAL	\$288.410	\$17.912	\$12.350	\$8.181

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	137	30	25	24

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)

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
2005	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2005	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs
2005	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2005	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2005	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR)
2006	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2006	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs
2006	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2006	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2006	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR)
2007	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2007	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR)
2007	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to

				unscheduled equipment outage
2007	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2007	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs
2008	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR)
2008	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2008	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2008	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2008	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs
2009	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2009	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2009	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR)
2009	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2009	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce CD-2 repair costs
2010	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2010	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2010	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR)
2010	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2010	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs
2011	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2011	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2011	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR)
2011	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2011	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs
2012	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2012	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2012	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Reduce en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR)
2012	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2012	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs
2013	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2013	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2013	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2013	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2013	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs
2014	Mobility	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Reduce aircraft delays due to unscheduled equipment outage
2014	Mobility	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Increase en route beacon Mean Time Between Outage (MTBO)
2014	Mobility	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Increase en route beacon Mean Time to Restore (MTTR) (MTBO)
2014	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduce en route beacon repair costs
2014	Mobility	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Reduced CD-2 repair costs

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.