

Exhibit 300 FY2008

FY2008 Exhibit 300

PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION

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.

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

The following series of questions are to be completed for all investments.

I. A. 1. Date of Submission:

2006-09-11

I. A. 2. Agency:

005

I. A. 3. Bureau:

49

I. A. 4. Name of this Capital Asset:

(short text - 250 characters)

Consolidated Farm Loan Program Information and Delivery System #103

I. A. 5. Unique ID: (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)

005-49-01-51-01-0103-00-105-014

I. A. 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?

(Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)

Mixed Life Cycle

I. A. 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?

FY2007

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:

(long text - 2500 characters)

CFLPIDS is a portfolio investment in the Control Phase cycle that directly support FSA's Farm Loan Program (FLP) and its goal of assisting American farmers and ranchers by providing them with ownership, operating and emergency loans. Specifically, the Farm Loan Program acts as a lender of last resort to new and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers who are unable to obtain credit through commercial lenders, helping them to establish or stabilize their operations in the face of financial hardship and/or natural disasters. The Farm Loan Program (FLP) is administered through a network of 850 USDA Service Centers, 50 State offices, the Loan Accounting Division, the Loan Operations Division, and a National Program Office. As a result, the legacy FLP systems and business environment is highly decentralized. The status quo environment presents a combination of strategic, operational, and technical issues that, taken together, severely undermine FSAs ability to continue to support the mission of reliably and equitably providing loans to qualified farmers. The CFLPIDS investment has been specifically designed to achieve the following key benefits: - Enable an integrated, timely view of the programs risk profile by creating a centralized data repository. - Streamlined, modernized business processes that eliminate redundant data entry. - Faster delivery and obligation of loans to eligible farmers and ranchers. - Automation of routine tasks that currently require substantial manual effort. - Redeployment of some USDA Service Center staff to higher value added activities - Significant reductions in scheduled and unscheduled system outages and associated productivity losses. - A return to regular work schedules for USDA Service Center staff due to improved system availability. - More accurate, comprehensive, reliable and available data for reporting, research and inquiry. - Reduced loan delinquency through improved system capability to ensure that official lending procedures are followed for each loan application. By reengineering redundant processes, centralizing and integrating data, and leveraging modern technology, FLPIDS will allow the FLPs business objectives to drive technology implementation, rather than allowing legacy technology to drive business operations. The FLPIDS investment will provide FSA staff with tools to do their job efficiently and provide FSAs farmer and rancher customers with efficient and effective service.

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?

2006-09-06

I. A. 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?

yes

I. A. 11. Contact information of Project Manager?

I. A. 12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.

yes

I. A. 12. a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?

yes

I. A. 12. b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)

no

I. A. 12. b. 1. If "yes", is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

I. A. 12. b. 2. If "yes", will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

I. A. 12. b. 3. If "yes", is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

I. A. 13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?

yes

I. A. 13. a. If "yes", check all that apply:

Financial Performance

Expanded E-Government

I. A. 13. b. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s).

(medium text - 500 characters)

FLPIDS will enhance Financial Performance by implementing a standardized and systematically enforced loan eligibility process that will ensure that only eligible producers will receive loans. It will enhance Expanded E-Government by (i) creating a single point of access, (ii) reducing reporting burdens and duplication, (iii) sharing real-time information, and (iv) automating internal processes.

I. A. 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

I. A. 14. a. If "yes", does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?

yes

I. A. 14. b. If "yes", what is the name of the PARTed Program?

(short text - 250 characters)

Direct Farm Loan Program

I. A. 14. c. If "yes", what PART rating did it receive?

Moderately Effective

I. A. 15. Is this investment for information technology? (see section 53 for definition)

yes

I. A. 16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)?

Level 1 - Projects with low-to-moderate complexity and risk. Example: Bureau-level project such as a stand-alone information system that has low- to-moderate complexity and risk. Level 2 - Projects with high complexity and/or risk which are critical to the mission of the organization. Examples: Projects that are part of a portfolio of projects/systems that impact each other and/or impact mission activities. Department-wide projects that impact cross-organizational missions, such as an agency-wide system integration that includes large scale Enterprise Resource Planning (e.g., the DoD Business Mgmt Modernization Program). Level 3 - Projects that have high complexity, and/or risk, and have government-wide impact. Examples: Government-wide initiative (E-GOV, President's Management Agenda). High interest projects with Congress, GAO, OMB, or the general public. Cross-cutting initiative (Homeland Security).

Level 2

I. A. 17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per OMB's PM Guidance):

(1) - The project manager assigned for this investment has been validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (2) - The project manager assigned for this investment is in the process of being validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (3) - The project manager assigned for this investment is not validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (4) - The qualifications for the project manager named have not been evaluated.; (5) - No project manager is currently assigned for this investment.; (6) - N/A -- This is not an IT investment.

(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

I. A. 18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?

no

I. A. 19. Is this a financial management system?

yes

I. A. 19. a. If "yes", does this investment address a FFIA compliance area?

no

I. A. 19. a. 1. If "yes" which compliance area?

(short text - 250 characters)

I. A. 19. a. 2. If "no", what does it address?

(medium text - 500 characters)

FLPIDS is designed to streamline and modernize the Farm Loan Programs inefficient, duplicative and paper-based loan making and loan servicing process and system. By reengineering redundant processes, centralizing and integrating data, and leveraging modern technology, FLPIDS will significantly enhance Service Centers ability to provide and support timely loans.

I. A. 19. 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

(long text - 2500 characters)

FLPIDS is a collection of integrated applications that together will provide robust financial management support for the Farm Loan Program. FLPIDS is made up of the following existing and proposed applications: Appraisals is a standalone PC-based COTS program first implemented in 2000 and is used to support loan collateral appraisal activities in the field. Farm Business Plan (FBP) is a COTS program that supports determination of loan eligibility; it was implemented 9/2004. FBP data w/b transferred to another system (DLS), eliminating a duplicate data entry point. Direct Loan System (DLS) will replace Service Center loan making and servicing functions currently provided by the legacy Management of Agricultural Credit (MAC) application, eliminating duplicate data entry into MAC and the Program Loan Accounting System (PLAS). PLAS is a legacy mainframe system that continues to provide core loan accounting functions for the entire loan portfolio. It will interface with DLS to support loan making and servicing functions. AgCredit, implemented in 2004, supports treatment of delinquent borrowers in accordance with appropriate Government regulations and will be integrated with DLS. Electronic Debt and Loan Restructuring System (eDALR\$) will replace the existing PC-based standalone DALR\$ application in 2008 as the loan restructuring eligibility and decision support tool. This system will interface with DLS eliminating duplicate data entry. Farm Loan Program Risk Assessment (FLPRA) replaced the National Internal Review (NIR) supporting annual internal program review and auditing. FLPRA is a powerful risk management tool that helps focus management attention on the highest priority areas such as

discrimination and compliance with lending policies and procedures. Loan Servicing Technology for America's Rural Residents (Loan STARR) will provide a seamlessly integrated service delivery of multiple components through a single portal for customers and business partners. With the integration of servicing components into Loan STARR, the consolidated system will be able to provide the automation needs for originating and servicing of USDA loans and grants.

I. A. 20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

I. A. 20. a. Hardware

5

I. A. 20. b. Software

10

I. A. 20. c. Services

85

I. A. 20. d. Other

0

I. A. 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

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

I. A. 22. a. Name

(short text - 250 characters)

Terry Tanner

I. A. 22. b. Phone Number

I. A. 22. c. Title

(short text - 250 characters)

FLPIDS Project Manager

I. A. 22. d. Email

(short text - 250 characters)

terry.tanner@stl.usda.gov

I. A. 23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?

yes

Section B: Summary of Funding

I. B. 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.

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing and partner agencies). Government

FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

	PY-1 Spending Prior to 2006	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008					
Planning	0	0	0	0					
Acquisition	11.134	2.287	2.481	6.316					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	11.134	2.287	2.481	6.316					
Operations & Maintenance	5.631	3.79	2.364	4.215					
TOTAL	16.765	6.077	4.845	10.531					
Government FTE Costs	11.643	4.626	4.503	4.607					
Number of FTE represented by cost	133.3	45.0	43.0	43.0					

I. B. 2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?

no

I. B. 2. a. If "yes", How many and in what year?
(medium text - 500 characters)

I. B. 3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

(long text - 2500 characters)

no change

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

I. C. 1. Complete the table for all contracts and/or task orders in place or planned for this investment:

(Character Limitations: Contract or Task Order Number - 250 Characters; Type of Contract/Task Order - 250 Characters; Name of CO - 250 Characters; CO Contact Information - 250 Characters)

I. C. 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:

(long text - 2500 characters)

Several contracts are for Steady State Systems and the contract dollars represent licensing and maintenance costs.

I. C. 3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

yes

I. C. 3. a. Explain Why:

(medium text - 500 characters)

Section 508 compliance is specified in every contract. Section 508 compliance is ensured by using a COTS package called Page Screamer that identifies real and potential discrepancies. Further, FSAs Testing and Certification Laboratory must certify the software as 508 compliant prior to release to the field.

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

yes

I. C. 4. a. If "yes", what is the date?

2005-01-03

I. C. 4. b. If "no", will an acquisition plan be developed?

I. C. 4. b. 1. If "no", briefly explain why:

(medium text - 500 characters)

Section D: Performance Information

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 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 Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

I. D. 1. Table 1

(Character Limitations: Strategic Goal(s) Supported - 250 Characters; Performance Measure - 250 Characters; Actual/baseline (from Previous Year) - 250 Characters; Planned Performance Metric (Target) - 250 Characters; Performance Metric Results (Actual) - 250 Characters; Measurement Indicator - 250 Characters; Baseline - 250 Characters; Planned Improvement to the Baseline - 250 Characters; Actual Results - 250 Characters)

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2003	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of loans made to SDA applicants	In 2001, 9.12% of loans were made to SDA applicants	Increase the number / Percentage of loans to SDA applicants	10.3% of loans made to SDA Applicants
2003	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of loans made to beginning farmer applicants	In 2001, 22% of loans were made to beginning farmers	Increase the number / percentage of loans to beginning farmers	24% of Loans were made to beginning farmers
2003	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of new loans delinquent within their first year	In 2001, 15.8% of new loans were delinquent within their first year	Decrease the percentage of delinquent new loans	15.8% of new loans were delinquent within their first year
2003	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	Average number of days required to process a direct loan	In 2001, the average time for direct loans (from application completed to final disposition) was 16 days nationally	Decrease the average time to make a direct loan	Direct Loans took an average of 17 days to process nationally
2003	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	Number of states whose average processing time for direct loans (from application completed to final disposition) greater than 20 days	In 2001, 15 states have average processing times for direct loans (from application completed to final disposition) that exceed 20 days	Reduce the number of states with average processing time exceeding 20 days to 0	21 states have average processing time for Direct Loans greater than 20 days
2004	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of loans made to SDA applicants	In 2001, 9.12% of loans were made to SDA applicants	Increase the number / Percentage of loans to SDA applicants	12% of loans made to SDA applicants
2004	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of loans made to beginning farmer applicants	In 2001, 22% of loans were made to beginning farmers	Increase the number / percentage of loans to beginning farmers	27% of loans were made to Beginning Farmers
2004	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of new loans delinquent within their first year	In 2001, 15.8% of new loans were delinquent within their first year	Decrease the percentage of delinquent new loans	8.2% of new loans were delinquent within their first year
2004	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	Average number of days required to process a direct loan	In 2001, the average time for direct loans (from application completed to final disposition) was 16 days nationally	Decrease the average time to make a direct loan	Average processing time nationally for Direct Loans was 14 days
2004	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	Number of states whose average processing time for direct loans (from application completed to	In 2001, 15 states have average processing times for direct loans (from application completed to final disposition)	Reduce the number of states with average processing time exceeding 20 days to	13 states have average processing time for Direct Loans greater than 20 days

	Productive Farms and Ranches)	final disposition) greater than 20 days	that exceed 20 days	0	
2005	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of loans made to SDA applicants	In 2001, 9.12% of loans were made to SDA applicants	Increase the number / Percentage of loans to SDA applicants	12% of loans made to SDA applicants
2005	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of loans made to beginning farmer applicants	In 2001, 22% of loans were made to beginning farmers	Increase the number / percentage of loans to beginning farmers	28% of loans were made to Beginning Farmers
2005	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	% of new loans delinquent within their first year	In 2001, 15.8% of new loans were delinquent within their first year	Decrease the percentage of delinquent new loans	8.0% of new loans were delinquent within their first year
2005	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	Average number of days required to process a direct loan	In 2001, the average time for direct loans (from application completed to final disposition) was 16 days nationally	Decrease the average time to make a direct loan	Average processing time nationally for Direct Loans was 14 days
2005	USDA Goal # 1 (Enhance Economic Opportunities for Agricultural Producers), FSA Goal # 1 (Supporting Productive Farms and Ranches)	Number of states whose average processing time for direct loans (from application completed to final disposition) greater than 20 days	In 2001, 15 states have average processing times for direct loans (from application completed to final disposition) that exceed 20 days	Reduce the number of states with average processing time exceeding 20 days to 0	12 states have average processing time for Direct Loans greater than 20 days

I. D. 2. Table 2

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2006	Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	Average number of days from application receipt to disposition for Emergency Loans	37 days	Decrease average to 35 days by end of FY06	Data available 9/06
2006	Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	First Year Delinquent Rates for New Loans (average of previous 4 years)	13.4%	Decrease to 13% by end of FY06	Data available 9/06
2006	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Average number of days required to complete loan processing (from application completed to final disposition)	14 days	Maintain at 14 days for FY06	Data available 9/06
2006	Customer Results	Response Time	Number of States with average loan processing time greater than 20 days	12 States	Decrease to 6 States by end of FY06	Data available 9/06
2006	Technology	Improvement	Number of separate systems to query to provide input data to annual audit process	850 (one standalone system per Service Center)	Reduce to one central system by end of FY06	Data available 9/06
2006	Technology	Interoperability	Maximum number of manual data entry and/or manual file transfer points among systems during an delinquent loan life cycle	5 points	Maintain at 5 points	Data available 9/06
2006	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	% of time that system is available to internal users during normal business hours	Existing system is available 80% of the time during normal business hours	Maintain availability at 80% during normal business hours	Data available 9/06
2007	Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	Average number of days from application receipt to disposition for Emergency Loans	37 days	Decrease average to 30 days by end of FY07	Data available 9/07
2007	Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	First Year Delinquent Rates for New Loans (average of previous 4 years)	13.4%	Decrease to 12% by end of FY07	Data available 9/07
2007	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Average number of days required to complete loan processing (from application	14 days	Decrease to 13.5 days by end of FY07	Data available 9/07

2007	Customer Results	Response Time	Number of States with average loan processing time greater than 20 days	12 States	Decrease to 0 States by end of FY07	Data available 9/07
2007	Technology	Improvement	Number of separate systems to query to provide input data to annual audit process	850 (one standalone system per Service Center)	Maintain at one central system thru FY07	Data available 9/07
2007	Technology	Interoperability	Maximum number of manual data entry and/or manual file transfer points among systems during a delinquent loan life cycle	5 points	Decrease to 2 points by Dec 2006	Data available 12/06
2007	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	% of time that system is available to internal users during normal business hours	Existing system is available 80% of the time during normal business hours	FLPIDS Service Center applications will be available to Service Center 95% of the time during normal business hours	Data available 9/07
2008	Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	Average number of days from application receipt to disposition for Emergency Loans	37 days	Decrease average to 25 days by end of FY08	Data available 9/08
2008	Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	First Year Delinquent Rates for New Loans (average of previous 4 years)	13.4%	Decrease to 10% by end of FY08	Data available 9/08
2008	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Average number of days required to complete loan processing (from application completed to final disposition)	14 days	Decrease to 13 days by end of FY08	Data available 9/08
2008	Customer Results	Response Time	Number of States with average loan processing time greater than 20 days	12 States	Maintain at 0 states	Data available 9/08
2008	Technology	Improvement	Number of separate systems to query to provide input data to annual audit process	850 (one standalone system per Service Center)	Maintain at one central system through FY08	Data available 9/08
2008	Technology	Interoperability	Maximum number of manual data entry and/or manual file transfer points among systems during a delinquent loan life cycle	5 points	Maintain at 2 for FY08	Data available 9/08
2008	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	% of time that system is available to internal users during normal business hours	Existing system is available 80% of the time during normal business hours	FLPIDS Service Center applications will be available to Service Center 95% of the time during normal business hours	Data available 9/08
2009	Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	Average number of days from application receipt to disposition for Emergency Loans	37 days	Decrease average to 23 days by end of FY09	Data available 9/09
2009	Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	First Year Delinquent Rates for New Loan	13.4%	Decrease to 8% by end of FY09	Data available 9/09
2009	Customer Results	Delivery Time	Average number of days required to complete loan processing (from application completed to final disposition)	14 days	Decrease to 12.5 days by end of FY09	Data available 9/09
2009	Customer Results	Response Time	Number of States with average loan processing time greater than 20 days	12 States	Maintain at 0 States	Data available 9/09
2009	Technology	Improvement	Number of separate systems to query to provide input data to annual audit process	850 (one standalone system per Service Center)	Maintain at one central system through FY09	Data available 9/09
2009	Technology	Interoperability	Maximum number of manual data entry and/or manual file transfer points among systems during a delinquent loan cycle	5 points	Maintain at 2 for FY09	Data available 9/09
2009	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	% of time that system is available to internal users during normal business hours	Existing system is available 80% of the time during normal business hours	FLPIDS Service Center applications will be available to Service Center 95% of the time during normal business	Data available 9/09

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPI) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also

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

yes

I. F. 1. a. If "no", please explain why?
(long text - 2500 characters)

I. F. 2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

no

I. F. 2. a. If "yes", provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.
(medium text - 500 characters)

Waiting for USDA EA results of assessment.

I. F. 2. b. If "no" please explain why?
(long text - 2500 characters)

USDA is in the process of developing a Transition Strategy for the calendar year 2007 annual OMB EA Assessment. This investment will likely be listed under its own name and link to USDA Economic Development efforts.

I. F. 3. 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.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

FEA SRM Component - Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM. FEA Service Component Reused - 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. Internal or External Reuse? - '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. Funding Percentage - Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service. (Character Limitations: Agency Component Name - 250 Characters; Agency Component Description - 500 Characters)

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused - Component Name	FEA Service Component Reused - UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
Information Sharing	FLPIDS will support sharing information among its subsystems	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange		No Reuse	4
Funds Disbursement	FLPIDS will support disbursement of obligated funds to approved farm loan customers	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement	Payment / Settlement		No Reuse	5
Debt Collection	FLPIDS will support debt collection by providing improved loan restructuring capabilities and controls to ensure compliance with 1951S regulations governing treatment of delinquent borrowers.	Financial Management	Debt Collection	Debt Collection		No Reuse	5
Information Retrieval	FLPIDS will provide loan and payment information to management, staff, and customers.	Financial Management	Information Retrieval	Information Retrieval		No Reuse	8
Data Repository	FLPIDS will provide central repository of farm loan application and servicing information, and will track system actions taken by logging	Financial Management	Auditing	Auditing		No Reuse	10

Systems Integration	FLPIDS is a combination of new applications integrated with legacy applications such as Program Loan Accounting System (PLAS)	Development and Integration	Legacy Integration	Legacy Integration		No Reuse	5
Workload Leveling	FLPIDS workflow capabilities will enable workload balancing across numerous offices: the workflow data will enable reporting to review work performance statistics	Human Capital / Workforce Management	Resource Planning and Allocation	Resource Planning and Allocation		No Reuse	3
Information Retrieval	FLPIDS centralized database will support ad hoc reporting on loan application and borrower information	Reporting	Ad Hoc	Ad Hoc		No Reuse	5
Management Reporting	FLPIDS will support production of a wide variety of management reports to help manage the program at all levels	Reporting	Standardized / Canned	Standardized / Canned		No Reuse	8
Manage oversight / Review	FLPIDS will reduce potential liability for acts of lending discrimination by enabling a proactive program review process that focuses detailed audits where they are most needed to address potential problems as early as possible	Management of Processes	Risk Management	Risk Management		No Reuse	8
Procedures Management	FLPIDS will ensure consistent treatment of borrowers by systematically requiring users to follow the correct lending and servicing procedures	Management of Processes	Quality Management	Quality Management		No Reuse	5
Customer / Account Management	FLPIDS will support the full customer lifecycle from initial loan application through loan servicing and payoff	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management	Customer / Account Management		No Reuse	5
Customer Assistance	FLPIDS will provide assistance to customers in preparing Farm Business Plans or any other loan application or servicing request	Customer Initiated Assistance	Customer / Account Management	Customer / Account Management		No Reuse	3
Customer Profile Information	FLPIDS will support entering / updating customer profile information and uses a USDA-wide customer demographic information repository	Customer Preferences	Customer / Account Management	Customer / Account Management	005-49-01-51-01-0103-00-105-014	Internal	0
Information Retrieval	FLPIDS will support retrieval of customer or USDA loan program information	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval	Information Retrieval		No Reuse	8
Process Management	FLPIDS will manage loan making and servicing workflow across all 850 service centers, 50 State offices, and the national office	Tracking and Workflow	Activity-Based Management	Activity-Based Management		No Reuse	5
Outbound Correspondence	FLPIDS will manage the automated creation of outbound correspondence related to loan applications, standard servicing, and special servicing (including communications required by 1951S regulations for treatment of delinquent borrowers)	Routing and Scheduling	Activity-Based Management	Activity-Based Management		No Reuse	3
Data Retrieval	FLPIDS will support management, staff and/or customer retrieval of records	Search	Query	Query		No Reuse	10

I. F. 4. 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 - 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. Service Specification - 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. (Character Limitations: Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name) - 250 characters)

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name)
-------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Network Devices / Standards	
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Network Devices / Standards	
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Browser	
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Quality Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
Intrusion Prevention	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Internal Controls	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Computers / Automation Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	
Data Integration	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Quality Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Database Connectivity	
Computers / Automation Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Computers / Automation Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	

I. F. 5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

yes

I. F. 5. a. If "yes", please describe.

(long text - 2500 characters)

FLPIDS will leverage existing Treasury EFT services via Program Funds Control System (PFCS) to support disbursement of loan funds to customers. FLPIDS also uses USDA ITS Shared Services such as eAuthentication for security/single sign-on, the ITS Web Farm at NITC for web server services, and AgLearn for online training.

I. F. 6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?

yes

I. F. 6. a. If "yes", does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?

no

I. F. 6. a. 1. If "yes", provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).
(medium text - 500 characters)

PART II: PLANNING, ACQUISITION AND PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Part II should be completed only for investments which in FY2008 will be in "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments, i.e., selected one of these three choices in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

II. A. 1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?

yes

II. A. 1. a. If "yes", provide the date the analysis was completed?

2005-05-25

II. A. 1. b. If "no", what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

II. A. 1. c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

(long text - 2500 characters)

II. A. 2. Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

(Character Limitations: Alternative Analyzed - 500 characters; Description of Alternative - 500 Characters)

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Cost Estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits Estimate
1- Mixed Enhancement / COTS Model	Alternative 1: Mixed Enhancement/COTS Model Integrate a mix of custom enhancements and COTS products to centralize processing and replace outdated systems. This alternative utilizes a mix of technology to achieve a centralized FLPIDS system. The new FLPIDS applications will share a common DB2 database, which will enable sharing data across systems and improve reporting capabilities.	155454491	875208785

II. A. 3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

(medium text - 500 characters)

Alternative 1 provides FSA with the optimal combination of value, cost and risk. It provides the most complete solution, delivering all Service Center functionality in a consolidated browser-based user interface and provides the benefits of a centralized database. It is expected to provide substantially greater benefits, both non-financial and financial, as demonstrated by its high value score and it has the highest NPV and SIR and the shortest payback period of any of the alternatives.

II. A. 4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

(long text - 2500 characters)

FLPIDS will provide a modernized, integrated system and process reengineering that will streamline and standardize the loan making, servicing, and reporting processes, resulting in an overall better, quicker, and more positive customer experience. The Mixed Enhancement / COTS model is significantly easier to maintain than the legacy system due to its centralized server platform and flexible architecture. This solution presents a substantial improvement in maintainability due to the elimination of redundant features and data that must be kept synchronized in the Legacy environment. Data will be available in a real-time centralized database for regional and national management queries and reporting. This solution will greatly improve the efficiency of the loan making, servicing, and reporting processes by eliminating duplicative data entry, automating tasks, and enforcing compliance, enabling FSA staff to focus on improving risk management and proactively managing the lending process. This solution fully aligns to the USDA and Federal Enterprise Architectures. The productivity and efficiency enhancements provided by this solution will enable FSA to "do more with less", and actually improve its ability to meet its mission, despite staffing reductions. FLPIDS will

increase staff productivity and efficiency by creating a single point of entry and a centralized data repository, eliminating duplicative data entry and minimizing time spent on error corrections, login procedures, report extraction, query processing, and toggling between multiple systems. Also, this centralized system will aid in the ability to avoid future lawsuits and respond more effectively to future litigation, due to the improved accessibility of detailed loan program data for managing analysis and tracking. The inability to produce loan application data to defend the Government has been identified as a weakness in the current environment.

Section B: Risk Management

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.

II. B. 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

yes

II. B. 1. a. If "yes", what is the date of the plan?

2006-02-15

II. B. 1. b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

yes

II. B. 1. c. If "yes", describe any significant changes:

(long text - 2500 characters)

CFLPIDS risks have been reassessed in light of the recent security events.

II. B. 2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?

II. B. 2. a. If "yes", what is the planned completion date?

II. B. 2. b. If "no", what is the strategy for managing the risks?

(long text - 2500 characters)

II. B. 3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

(long text - 2500 characters)

FLPIDS follows a rigorous approach to accurately estimate program life-cycle costs. We include costs to mitigate risks in the event risk occur throughout the project life-cycle. We use ranges for estimates and adjust cost estimates for risk.. We update costs on a regular basis and upon availability of most accurate cost data. We implement project management, performance based contracting, and earned value management system practices. FLPIDS has a demonstrated history of accurate cost projections and meeting budget targets. Methods for risk adjusted cost are implemented and monitored regularly by the program management team. Firm fixed price contracts will also be used to minimize government risk.