

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:

2006-08-23

I. A. 2. Agency:

005

I. A. 3. Bureau:

32

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

(short text - 250 characters)

APHIS Comprehensive Electronic Permit System (ePermits)

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

005-32-01-61-01-2001-00-114-043

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?

FY2004

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)

ePermits provides a web-based tool that will enable industry to apply for APHIS permits and subsequently allow APHIS regulatory officials to issue/print, track, and rapidly verify the validity of a Federal Import Permit. The overall objective for ePermits is to establish a comprehensive electronic permit data collection and management system to track all activities associated with APHIS regulatory import permit processes. The ePermits system will greatly reduce the burden placed on US citizens in need of permits by providing a Web-based tool that enables the public to apply for, check application status, and receive permits on-line.

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)

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:

Budget Performance Integration

Financial Performance

Expanded E-Government

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

(medium text - 500 characters)

ePermits addresses the Presidents Management Agenda (PMA) for Improved Financial Management by providing enhanced capabilities to collect and track user fees associated with the issuance of permits and will be tied directly to Treasury's Pay.gov website. The system will also rely on several USDA e-Gov Smart Choice initiatives to become fully integrated with the USDA strategy. APHIS anticipates that ePermits would align with the USDA ePermits/Certificates LOB.

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?

no

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

(short text - 250 characters)

In FY 2005, APHIS Monitoring and Surveillance programs and Biotechnology Regulatory Services were assessed. In FY 2006, APHIS Pest and Disease Exclusion programs and Import- Export were assessed.

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

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 3

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?

no

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

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)

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)

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

4

I. A. 20. b. Software

4

I. A. 20. c. Services

92

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)

Lesia Banks

I. A. 22. b. Phone Number

I. A. 22. c. Title

(short text - 250 characters)

Privacy Officer

I. A. 22. d. Email

(short text - 250 characters)

Lesia.M.Banks @aphis.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	7.97	1.77	1.54	0.72					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	7.97	1.77	1.54	0.72					
Operations & Maintenance	0	0	0	1.67					
TOTAL	7.97	1.77	1.54	2.39					
Government FTE Costs	0.141	0.141	0.141	0.146					
Number of FTE represented by cost	2	2	2	2					

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)

A slight increase of about \$630,000 was added to the FY08 budget figures over the FY07 Presidents Budget for FY 2008. This increase was to cover D/M/E as needed as a result of changes to the regulatory process for permit issuance and to collect user fees on-line for new permits not previously included. In addition, server hosting charges rose slightly and Federal FTEs were included in the estimates. Over the period of FY08 -- FY11, 2.23 million was added to cover these increases. An additional 2.93 was added for FY12 which was not included in last years figures.

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)

EVM will not be required for Certification and Accreditation (C&A). We will seek an independent contractor to perform Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) services on the ePermits system in FY07 & FY10.

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

yes

I. C. 3. a. Explain Why:

(medium text - 500 characters)

The contract issued requires compliance with Section 508. A checklist of Section 508 requirements was submitted to the contractor. The contractor will be tested to ensure that the software meets the 508 compliance required by USDA. APHIS and USDA will test and ensure Section 508 compliance against the requirement.

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?

2002-04-01

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)
2004	USDA Goal 1 USDA Goal 3 USDA Goal 5 APHIS Goal 1 APHIS Goal 2 APHIS Goal 3 PPQ Goal 2VS Goal 1VS Goal 3BRS Goal	Implement pilot software that automates a permit and multiple forms	Prototype enables reduced turnaround time: electronic transfer of data from application to response modules, selection of permit conditions, creation of permit based on data entry, etc.	Pilot Software implemented reduce administrative logging by 25%	Deployment at USDA data center (NITC) on March 2004, Acceptance test completed on March 2004, and Workflow has been incorporated
2004	USDA Goal 1 USDA Goal 3USDA Goal 5 APHIS Goal	Respond to Government	Number of new permits/forms automated and ability to show	2 Forms implemented (PPQ)	Achieved - 2 forms (PPQ 526 and BRS Notifications)

	1 APHIS Goal 3BRS Goal PPQ Goal 2VS Goal 1VS Goal 3VS Goal 4	Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA) and implement solution for 2 GPEA forms	cross-APHIS applicability	and BRS)	
2004	USDA Goal 3 APHIS Goal 3 PPQ Goal 2VS Goal 1BRS Goal	Increase acceptance of the pilot within the internal APHIS ePermits user community	Greater than 25% of surveyed users (i.e., APHIS permit staff and managers) indicate a preference of the automated prototype vs. current processes	> 50 % of users responding approve of new system	Survey/Training Report conducted April 2004
2005	USDA Goal 1, USDA Goal 3 ,USDA Goal 5, APHIS Goal 1, APHIS Goal 3, PPQ Goal 2,VS Goal 1, VS Goal 2,VS Goal 3, VS Goal 4 BRS Goal & Priority 1	Compile elements to be measured aligned with process improvement noted in Table 2 below for Release 2	Determine which part of workflow process creates greatest lag time and improve by 15%	Improve cycle time by 15%	TBD

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	Border and Transportation Security	Improved coordination in safeguarding the health of animals, plants, and ecosystems (supports APHIS strategic mission and goals)	3 independent permit programs	3 ePermit programs (enabling consistent management oversight) and 5 independent programs	Three programs: Biotechnology Regulatory Services (BRS), Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ), and Veterinary Services (VS).
2006	Mission and Business Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Additional Applicants using system	# Applicants using new forms	10% of applications received on line for VS and PPQ	As of 7/5/06, 32% of PPQ and VS applications were submitted electronically by applicants.
2006	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Collect and Process User Fees	# of Permits Collecting Fees on-line	As of 7/5/06, fees are being collected online for 2 permit application form types.
2006	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	# Users in ePermits process (supports eGov and PMA focus on Citizens)	No external users	2 external groups provided access to software	As of 7/6/06, 2 external groups are using the system: general applicant community using web access, and BRS applicant community using XML.
2006	Customer Results	Response Time	Timeliness of response to permit application (supports eGov/PMA and the government and adoption efficiencies in the Alternatives Analysis)	90 days	15% reduction in turn-around time for implemented permit programs	As of 7/6/06, BRS Notification (17 days), VS On-hold shipment (18 days), PPQ 526 (55 days), PPQ 585 (1 day), PPQ 587 (4 days), PPQ 588 (13 days), PPQ 621 (4 days), VS 16-3 (20 days).
2006	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Number of applicants using ePermits instead of manual processes and applications (supports government efficiency and adoption benefits in Alternatives Analysis)	No applications submitted using ePermits	At least 10% of APHIS permit applications received electronically through ePermits for the Release 2 import programs	As of 7/5/06, 34% of applications were submitted electronically by applicants.
2006	Processes and Activities	Security Management	# Applicants registered with eAuthentication	0 applicants registered	25% of applications received electronically for forms implemented	As of 7/5/06, 34% of applications were submitted electronically by applicants.
2006	Technology	Availability	Number of new permits/forms automated (supports GPEA requirements, eGov/PMA customer satisfaction, and government efficiency benefit in Alternatives Analysis)	2 forms automated in pilot	10+ total forms automated	10 forms: (1) PPQ 526, (2) PPQ 585, (3) PPQ 587, (4) PPQ 588, (5) (6) PPQ 621, (7) BRS Notification, (8) VS 16-3 for animal products, (9) VS 16-3 for organisms and vectors, (10) VS 16-7
2006	Technology	Service Efficiency	User Satisfaction	# Repeat Customers using system	>60% use ePermits vs. paper	As of 7/6/06, 37% of applicants have submitted more than 1 application.
2007	Mission and Business Results	Border and Transportation Security	Improved coordination in safeguarding the health of animals, plants, and ecosystems (supports APHIS strategic mission and goals)	3 independent permit programs	3 ePermit programs (enabling consistent management oversight) and 5 independent programs	TBD
2007	Mission and Business Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Additional Applicants using system	# Applicants using new forms	35% of applications received on line for VS and PPQ	TBD

2007	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Collect and Process User Fees	# of Permits Collecting Fees on-line for PPQ	TBD
2007	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	# Users in ePermits process (supports eGov and PMA focus on Citizens)	2 external groups	4 external user groups (2 additional user groups) provided access to software	TBD
2007	Customer Results	Response Time	Timeliness of response to permit application (supports eGov/PMA and the government and adoption efficiencies in the Alternatives Analysis)	90 days	15% reduction in turn-around time for implemented permit programs	TBD
2007	Mission and Business Results	Efficiency	Number of applicants using ePermits instead of manual processes and applications (supports government efficiency and adoption benefits in Alternatives Analysis)	No applications submitted using ePermits	At least 35% of APHIS permit applications received electronically through ePermits for the Release 3 import programs	TBD
2007	Mission and Business Results	Security Management	# Applicants registered with eAuthentication	0 applicants registered	25% of applications received electronically for forms implemented	TBD
2007	Technology	Availability	Number of new permits/forms automated (supports GPEA requirements, eGov/PMA customer satisfaction, and government efficiency benefit in Alternatives Analysis)	additional forms automated in Release 3	12+ total forms automated	TBD
2007	Technology	Service Efficiency	User Satisfaction	# Repeat Customers using system	>60% use ePermits vs. paper	TBD
2008	Mission and Business Results	Border and Transportation Security	Improved coordination in safeguarding the health of animals, plants, and ecosystems (supports APHIS strategic mission and goals)	3 independent permit programs	3 ePermit programs (enabling consistent management oversight) and 5 independent programs	TBD
2008	Mission and Business Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Additional Applicants using system	# Applicants using new forms	50% of applications received on line for VS and PPQ	TBD
2008	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Collect and Process User Fees	# of Permits Collecting Fees on-line	TBD
2008	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	# Users in ePermits process (supports eGov and PMA focus on Citizens)	4 external users	4 external groups provided access to software	TBD
2008	Customer Results	Response Time	Timeliness of response to permit application (supports eGov/PMA and the government and adoption efficiencies in the Alternatives Analysis)	90 days	15% reduction in turn-around time for implemented permit programs	TBD
2008	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Number of applicants using ePermits instead of manual processes and applications (supports government efficiency and adoption benefits in Alternatives Analysis)	No applications submitted using ePermits	At least 60% of APHIS permit applications received electronically through ePermits for import programs	TBD
2008	Processes and Activities	Security Management	# Applicants registered with eAuthentication	0 applicants registered	60% of applications received electronically for forms implemented	TBD
2008	Technology	Availability	Number of new permits/forms automated (supports GPEA requirements, eGov/PMA customer satisfaction, and government efficiency benefit in Alternatives Analysis)	forms automated in Release 4	12+ total forms automated	TBD
2008	Technology	Service Efficiency	User Satisfaction	# Repeat Customers using system	>60% use ePermits vs. paper	TBD
2009	Mission and Business Results	Border and Transportation	Improved coordination in safeguarding the health of	3 independent permit	3 ePermit programs (enabling consistent	TBD

		Security	animals, plants, and ecosystems (supports APHIS strategic mission and goals)	programs	management oversight) and 5 independent programs	
2009	Mission and Business Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Additional Applicants using system	# Applicants using new forms	60% of applications received on line for VS and PPQ	TBD
2009	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Collect and Process User Fees	# of Permits Collecting Fees on-line for PPQ	TBD
2009	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	# Users in ePermits process (supports eGov and PMA focus on Citizens)	2 external groups	5 external user groups (2 additional user groups) provided access to software	TBD
2009	Customer Results	Response Time	Timeliness of response to permit application (supports eGov/PMA and the government and adoption efficiencies in the Alternatives Analysis)	75 days	10% reduction in turn-around time for implemented permit programs	TBD
2009	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Number of applicants using ePermits instead of manual processes and applications (supports government efficiency and adoption benefits in Alternatives Analysis)	No applications submitted using ePermits	At least 75% of APHIS permit applications received electronically through ePermits for the Release 3 import programs	TBD
2009	Processes and Activities	Security Management	# Applicants registered with eAuthentication	0 applicants registered	75% of applications received electronically for forms implemented	TBD
2009	Technology	Availability	Number of new permits/forms automated (supports GPEA requirements, eGov/PMA customer satisfaction, and government efficiency benefit in Alternatives Analysis)	additional forms automated in Release 3	12+ total forms automated	TBD
2009	Technology	Service Efficiency	User Satisfaction	# Repeat Customers using system	>75% use ePermits vs. paper	TBD

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 (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

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)

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

USDA is in the process of developing a Transition Strategy that should be in place for calendar year 2007 annual OMB EA Assessment. This investment will likely be listed under its own name and linked to USDA's enterprise efforts as well as the associated presidential initiative

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
Customer Preferences	ePermits will enable internal and external customers to retrieve notification and other permit-specific information and reports from a centralized and fully-integrated national database	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications	Alerts and Notifications	005-32-01-61-01-2001-00-114-043	No Reuse	0
Customer Initiated Assistance	ePermits will provide a self-service function or potential importers to identify which forms they are required to submit and obtain approval, denial, or other appropriate response to their request	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service	Self-Service	005-32-01-61-01-2001-00-114-043	No Reuse	0
Routing and Scheduling	ePermits will allow applicants to apply online, track the status of their request throughout the process, and receive the final APHS response	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management	Inbound Correspondence Management	005-32-01-61-01-2001-00-114-043	No Reuse	0
Tracking and Workflow	ePermits will automate creation, approval, printing and tracking of regulatory import permits.	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking	Process Tracking	005-32-01-61-01-2001-00-114-043	No Reuse	0
Financial Management	ePermits will accept and track payments for permit applications and interface with USDA Finance Center and Pay.GOV for processing	Financial Management	Credit / Charge	Debt Collection	005-32-01-61-01-2001-00-114-043	No Reuse	0
Security Management	ePermits will be integrated with the USDA eAuthentication component for this functionality	Security Management	Identification and Authentication	Identification and Authentication	005-32-01-61-01-2001-00-114-043	No Reuse	0

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)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Internet	
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Hosting	
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	

Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Browser	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	

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)

Yes, wherever possible. The system will utilize Treasury's Pay.Gov solution for user fee collection. At the Department level, the application is leveraging the eAuthentication module. Components that were developed for other federal agencies and reused in this alternative include (1) the Application Controller architecture framework, which is a framework for an object-oriented software architecture that provides event-based implicit-invocation, which provides high cohesion and loose coupling for ease of code maintenance and higher reusability; (2) Comprehensive error handling, which provides consistent complete error reporting throughout the application, as well as a sophisticated error logging and notification capability to communicate errors to the application support team immediately, in most cases before the user can report the problem to the help desk; (3) Integrated Security, which controls access to every component in the system using user id/password authentication, timed logout functionality, role-based security for ease of administration, password obfuscation, and a host of other security features; and (4) the Interview Engine, which provides a questionnaire-based data collection mechanism that can be configured and modified using simple tools instead of custom components.

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?

2004-07-16

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
3	?This alternative consists of a single system built using COTS and GOTS components. ?Instead of multiple new web-based systems, one for each program (BRS, PPQ, and VS) to handle their own permits, this alternative is made up of a single cross programmatic system.	20683	49904

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

(medium text - 500 characters)

Alternative 3 was chosen because it outperformed the other alternatives in all four quantitative decision criteria used and in the qualitative analysis. Risks associated with the 3 alternatives are incorporated into each of the cost elements. During the analysis it was determined that the difference in risk among 3 alternatives was negligible; therefore a quantitative risk analysis was conducted only on the chosen alternative.

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

(long text - 2500 characters)

The chosen alternative achieves significant quantitative benefits through the replacement of the costly labor-intensive business processes with less costly automated systems. While the government expects growth in workload, and thus process costs, this investment will reduce the rate of cost growth significantly. For the chosen alternative, the net present value is \$21.5 million, the internal rate of return is 31%, the risk-adjusted return on investment is 219%, and the payback period is 5 years. In addition, a quantitative risk analysis was performed to determine risk-adjusted costs and the impact of these costs on the alternative analysis. The analysis accounted for the risks that are primarily government and/or not mitigated through the current fixed-price, performance-based contract. Costs of all other risks are transferred in the contractor's fixed price estimates. As a result after evaluating all risks in the Risk Mitigation Plan, the resulting residual risk is \$138K, accounting for less than 1% of the total budget. This factor does not impact the positive nature of Net Present Value or Return on Investment.

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?

2005-10-31

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)

We reassessed risks in light of the recent security events.

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

yes

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)

For the 2008 to 2012 period, funding has been identified to maintain the system and to update the application software as regulatory changes occur. There are likely to be changes to the permit issuance process for Veterinary Services, Plant Protection and Quarantine and Biotechnology Regulatory Services. In addition to the regulatory changes, there are likely to be changes affecting the user fees charged for those who require a permit. A small amount of funding has been included in the 2008 budget for these changes (\$600,000).