

Exhibit 300 FY2011

FAAXX603: Traffic Mgmt Advisor-Single Cntr (TMA)

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)	FAAXX603: Traffic Mgmt Advisor-Single Cntr (TMA)
I.A.5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: Description: For IT investment only, see section 53.9. For all other, use agency ID system.	021-12-01-11-01-1190-00
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)	<p>The Traffic Management Advisor (TMA) system is an information technology tool that enables the FAA to land more aircraft at designated airports in a given amount of time. Prior to deploying TMA, air traffic controllers (ATC) used manual procedures to safely separate aircraft arriving at airports. This process often leaves gaps in the arrival streams. The TMA system processes flight data, radar data, and weather data to produce efficient airport arrival sequences that enable us to fill those gaps with additional aircraft. TMA provides data to ATC that enables them to give appropriate direction to pilots. No other known capability exists to perform this function for air traffic operations. The FAA Joint Resources Council (JRC) approved phase 1 of the TMA program (six sites) on 27 September 1999 and phase two (four sites) on 12 June 2002. The FAA Administrator approved deployment of TMA to seven additional in June 2005 and the FAA Joint Resources Council approved the revised baseline 29 May 2007. OMB approved the rebaseline on 16 July 2007. In addition, the En Route Automation Modernization (ERAM) program funded two systems and NASA owns and operates one. The performance gap is the need to fill the gaps in the arrival streams in order to improve service to FAA customers and TMA is already closing that performance gap. Metrics show we are seeing increases of 3% or more in landings-per-hour as well as reductions in delay-time for ground and airborne traffic. Put another way, when the configuration of an airports runways normally allows 100 aircraft to land in an hour, the TMA systems is enabling an additional 3 or more aircraft to land in the same time. This is significant for the airlines. TMA is based on commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) hardware/software and custom application software. TMA is currently operating at all 20 Air Route Traffic Control Centers (ARTCCs). Current work includes activating Time Based Metering on the last systems, continuing Sustainment and Technology Evolution Planning work, fielding the final planned S/W features, updating and teaching the adaptation S/W training course, and completing the adaptation S/W tool set.</p>
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)	<p>An alternative analysis is planned as part of the upcoming Integrated Enterprise Solution (IES) Investment Analysis. The IES IA will be completed by 2013. The TMA Program has an approved Risk Management Plan. Risk management plan revision 7.0 was approved on 16 Oct 2008. Risk register is housed on KSN. Risks and mitigation plans are reviewed and updated monthly. Last update to risk register was 8 Sept 2009.</p>
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?	2007-05-29
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	\$3.880	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
Acquisition	\$368.520	\$3.700	\$0.000	\$0.000
Subtotal Planning and Acquisition	\$372.400	\$3.700	\$0.000	\$0.000
Operations and Maintenance	\$51.570	\$6.439	\$6.162	\$6.295
Disposition Costs (Optional)	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
SUBTOTAL	\$423.970	\$10.139	\$6.162	\$6.295
Government FTE Costs	\$17.957	\$3.003	\$2.288	\$2.402
TOTAL	\$441.927	\$13.142	\$8.450	\$8.697

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	171	27	22	22

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)

Planning funding was added to consider the proposed TBFM Investment. FID is planned for the 2nd quarter of FY10. The O&M costs were also increased assuming approval of the proposed investment.

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
2002	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.) Note***: TMA compares pre-TMA data with post TBM data having similar weather conditions, traffic conditions, and the same airport configuration to determine the change in efficiency.
2003	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2004	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	TMA operational availability of percent per year.
2005	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users.
2005	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2005	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2005	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative Airline Direct

				Operating Costs (ADOC) dollars saved by greater NAS efficiency
2006	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater NAS efficiency
2006	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2006	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2006	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users
2007	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater NAS efficiency
2007	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2007	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2007	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users
2008	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater airport efficiency
2008	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2008	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2008	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users
2009	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2009	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater airport efficiency
2009	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2009	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users
2010	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater airport efficiency
2010	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2010	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users
2010	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2011	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2011	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater airport efficiency
2011	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped

				En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2011	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users
2012	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2012	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater airport efficiency
2012	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2012	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users
2013	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2013	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater airport efficiency
2013	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2013	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users
2014	Reduced Congestion	Mission and Business Results	Air Transportation	Peak airport capacity rate (arrival rate per hr.)
2014	Reduced Congestion	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	Cumulative ADOC dollars saved by greater airport efficiency
2014	Reduced Congestion	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Percentage of TMA equipped En Route Centers where time based metering is used to manage at least one peak demand period a day when airport demand exceeds capacity
2014	Reduced Congestion	Technology	Availability	Percentage of the time TMA is available to users

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.