

Exhibit 300 FY2011

FAAXX600: Oceanic Automation System: Advanced Technologies and Oceanic Procedures (ATOP)

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)	FAAXX600: Oceanic Automation System: Advanced Technologies and Oceanic Procedures (ATOP)
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53.9. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-12-01-11-01-1130-00
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)	
Advanced Technologies and Oceanic Procedures (ATOP) is the FAA's modernization program for oceanic air traffic control. Before ATOP, there was no aircraft radar tracking and no automated communications for oceanic air traffic. Pilots would radio position reports based on onboard aircraft navigational systems to the controller. Due to the uncertainty in position report reliability, overseas flights required greater separation margins to ensure safe flight, and were rarely able to obtain maximum fuel efficiency, minimum travel times, or access to preferred flight paths. Now we can be in touch with aircraft mid-oceanic flight, electronically and digitally. ATOP further closes the performance gap by allowing properly equipped aircraft and qualified aircrews to operate using reduced oceanic separation criteria. This enables more aircraft to fly optimal routes, enhancing aircraft flight time (and fuel and payload) efficiency during oceanic legs of their flights. Reduced lateral (side-to-side) separation may provide space for additional routes between current locations or new direct markets. Reduced longitudinal (nose-to-tail) separation may provide more opportunities to add flights without delays. The ATOP program has replaced oceanic air traffic control systems and procedures and modernized the Oakland (ZOA), New York (ZNY) and Anchorage (ZAN) Air Route Traffic Control Centers with a satellite-based, integrated oceanic system for all three centers - with common procedures, training, maintenance and support. ATOP is currently in the Solution Implementation phase of the Acquisition Management System (AMS), and operating live traffic in all sectors of ZNY and ZOA airspace. Initial Operating Capability (IOC) for ZAN was declared in March 2006 and operation of live traffic in oceanic sectors of ZAN began in March 2007. The Solution Implementation phase of AMS correlates to the "Control" phase of the CPIC process. The operational portions of the investment are in the CPIC "Evaluate" phase. All portions of the investment have been approved for funding by the JRC2b final investment decision on May 1, 2001. Funding for FY 2011 and beyond is essential for continued improvements in the safety and efficiency of oceanic air traffic control. Requirements for that time-frame include sustaining operational activities, hardware and software technical refresh, and Pre-Planned Product Improvements (P3I).	
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 ATOP program has never been rebaselined. The alternative analysis was completed April 1, 2001. ATOP actively manages to the risk management plan dated May 14, 2007 and the latest review of the risks on the risk register was conducted on May 6, 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?	2001-05-01
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 FFMA 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	\$6.400	\$0.600	\$0.600	\$0.600
Acquisition	\$470.500	\$20.100	\$7.151	\$3.400
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	\$476.900	\$20.700	\$7.751	\$4.000
Operations and Maintenance	\$240.649	\$77.219	\$79.816	\$83.098
Disposition Costs (Optional)	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
SUBTOTAL	\$717.549	\$97.919	\$87.567	\$87.098
Government FTE Costs	\$88.300	\$10.289	\$10.701	\$11.129
TOTAL	\$805.849	\$108.208	\$98.268	\$98.227

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	632	64	64	64

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)

O&M cost adjustments were increased by \$60.988M, while the FTEs and FTEcost were increased by 70 and \$9.093M respectively. In the BY10 submission these items were erroneously decreased by the same amount based on an assumption that program cost savings based on a contract award had an impact on the programs JRC APB baseline. These items would be accounted for in adjustments to cost and schedule variances but should not have impacted the JRC APB baseline. So therefore, the cost were readjusted in this years submission.

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
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs based on actual aircraft trajectories.
2006	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Average time in minutes to respond to weather altitude change requests and weather deviation requests.
2006	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2006	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2006	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average international coordination time for flights.
2006	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to

				respond to altitude change requests.
2006	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.
2007	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs based on actual aircraft trajectories.
2007	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Average time in minutes to respond to weather altitude change requests and weather deviation requests.
2007	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2007	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZNY, and ZAN ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average international coordination time for flights.
2007	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.
2007	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.
2008	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel burn per flight for selected city pairs based on actual aircraft trajectories.
2008	Safety	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Average time in minutes to respond to weather altitude change requests and weather deviation requests.
2008	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2008	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2008	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.
2008	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel savings per passenger seat for selected city pairs based on actual aircraft trajectories.
2009	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2009	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2009	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.
2009	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.
2010	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel savings per passenger seat for selected city pairs based on actual aircraft trajectories.
2010	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2010	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN,

				and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2010	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.
2010	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.
2011	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel savings per passenger seat for selected city pairs based on actual aircraft trajectories.
2011	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2011	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2011	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.
2011	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.
2012	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel savings per passenger seat for selected city pairs based on actual aircraft trajectories.
2012	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2012	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2012	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.
2012	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.
2013	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average fuel savings per passenger seat for selected city pairs based on actual aircraft trajectories.
2013	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2013	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2013	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.
2013	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.
2014	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.
2014	Mobility	Customer Results	Response Time	% altitude change requests granted. This allows the customer to reach their requested/optimal altitudes sooner.
2014	Organizational Excellence	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	Average time to collect and analyze data from ZOA, ZAN, and ZNY ATOP. Data available for air carriers and other countries.

2014	Safety	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average time in minutes to respond to altitude change requests.
2014	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Technology Improvement	Reduction of separation standards.

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.