

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:

2006-09-01

I. A. 2. Agency:

005

I. A. 3. Bureau:

53

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

(short text - 250 characters)

Natural Resource Information, Inventory, & Assessment

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

005-53-01-11-01-1000-00-117-057

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?

FY2003

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)

The Natural Resource Information, Inventory, and Assessment (NRIIA) investment contains 23 applications organized into four application systems that are in mixed lifecycle. The four application systems include: Resource Data Warehouse/Marts; Resource Data Collection and Development; Natural Resource Information and Delivery; and National Resources Inventory. NRIIA supports the collection, maintenance, update, and dissemination of data and information about the nation's soil and plant resources. NRIIA provides for public access to the NRCS natural resource data holdings, some of which are considered to be a standard for reference material. NRIIA assets directly support applications within the NRCS Conservation Program Delivery (CPD) investment. NRIIA investment supports the USDA mission of providing "leadership in natural resources and related issues based on sound public policy, the best available science, and efficient management." NRIIA provides the science-based geospatial natural resource information for NRCS business applications conservation planning and implementation to make informed decisions about soil, water, plant, and other natural resource issues. NRCS has strived to improve the availability of information to citizens. The underlying business strategy is documented in "Future Directions: A Vision of Information Technology for Field Conservationists," August 1997; and the NRCS Modernization Blueprint: 2005 to 2010, August 2004. These reports serve as the overarching strategic guidance for the investment. NRCS will continue to aggressively make NRIIA data available in easy to use formats via the internet. USDA and NRCS will purchase mobile computer devices and continue to invest in GIS and Global Positioning Systems. NRIIA applications will continue leveraging data developed and maintained by other government agencies and the private sector. Funding will continue for data collection, NRIIA staff resources, appropriate hardware and software updates, and cooperative agreements with universities. The transition to a service oriented architecture and the deployment of web services is underway, and will enable external users to interact with NRIIA data in a more powerful manner. By supporting standard interfaces, external organizations can access NRIIA records and data via either plug-ins or web services. The growth in online access to data and reports as presented in the Performance Goals section is evidence of the investment's progress.

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:

Expanded E-Government

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

(medium text - 500 characters)

NRIIA provides 3-click public access to natural resource information. Web Soil Survey delivered more soil survey information to citizens in the first year of operation than the previous 10 years. PLANTS web site has seen a doubling of usage every year for the last 3 years. NRI is providing data online to quantify the environmental benefits of conservation practices used by private landowners. NRIIA systems utilize the full suite of ESRI SmartBUY products as part of the technical configuration.

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)

Soil Survey 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?

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

1

I. A. 20. b. Software

1

I. A. 20. c. Services

I. A. 20. d. Other

18

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?

yes

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

I. A. 22. a. Name

(short text - 250 characters)

Mary Alston

I. A. 22. b. Phone Number**I. A. 22. c. Title**

(short text - 250 characters)

FOIA Officer

I. A. 22. d. Email

(short text - 250 characters)

mary.alston@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	63.825	10.796	10.96	11.20					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	63.825	10.796	10.96	11.20					
Operations & Maintenance	80.813	5.538	5.63	5.76					
TOTAL	144.638	16.334	16.59	16.96					
Government FTE Costs	21.08	2	2.03	2.08					
Number of FTE represented by cost	0	16	16	16					

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)

The cost per FTE and projected FTE numbers have been updated.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

(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)

[illegible]

N/A

yes

508 Compliance is ensured by testing and modifying applications to bring them into compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998. This includes a robust testing approach and the modification of applications to make the changes necessary to for them to be compliant with the provisions of section 508.

no

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

yes

(medium text - 500 characters)

Section D: Performance Information

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.

(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	NRCS Strategic Goal 4: Deliver high quality services to the public to enable natural resource stewardship; USDA Strategic Goal 5: Protect and enhance the nation's natural resource base and environment	New or updated soil surveys released for public use: goal of 47.5 million acres covered in FY2003.	New or updated soil surveys released for public use in FY 2002, covering 26.8 million acres.	Number of acres covered by new/updated soil surveys released for public use during fiscal year.	NRCS exceeded the planned performance goal of 47.5 million acres by 9% adding 22.5 million acres for a total of 49.3 million acres covered.
2003	NRCS Strategic Goal 4: Deliver high quality services to the public to enable natural resource stewardship; USDA Strategic Goal 5: Protect and enhance the nation's natural resource base and environment	Soil surveys available electronically on the NRCS website; goal of 1,685 surveys available electronically in FY2003.	1,368 soil surveys available electronically for public use in FY 2002	Soil surveys available electronically on the NRCS website in the fiscal year, number of surveys available.	NRCS met the planned performance goal of 1,685 soil surveys available.
2003	NRCS Strategic Goal 4: Deliver high quality services to the public to enable natural resource stewardship; USDA Strategic Goal 5: Protect and enhance the nation's natural resource base and environment	150 plant materials technical documents prepared and transferred to customers during FY2003.	117 plant materials technical documents prepared and transferred to customers during FY2002.	Plant materials technical documents prepared and transferred to customers during the fiscal year, number.	NRCS met the performance goal with 153 plant materials technical documents prepared and transferred to customers during FY 2003.
2003	NRCS Strategic Goal 4: Deliver high quality services to the public to enable natural resource stewardship; USDA Strategic Goal 5: Protect and enhance the nation's natural resource base and environment	1,880,000 user visits to PLANTS web site in FY 2003	1,880,000 user visits to PLANTS web site in FY 2002	User visits to PLANTS web site, number of.	User visits exceeded 2003 Goal by 65% to 3,103,557.
2003	NRCS Strategic Goal 4: Deliver high quality services to the public to enable natural resource stewardship; USDA Strategic Goal 5: Protect and enhance the nation's resource base and environment	50,400 customers accessing or downloading soils data (total STATSGO or SSURGO downloads or CD orders) in FY 2003.	50,361 customers accessing or downloading soils data (total STATSGO or SSURGO downloads or CD orders) in FY 2002.	Number of STATSGO or SSURGO soils data downloads or CDs ordered.	NRCS exceeded the FY 2003 performance plan for 50,400 accesses to soils data by over 50% with 78,394 accesses or downloads.
2004	NRCS Strategic Goal 4: Deliver high quality services to the public to enable natural resource stewardship; USDA Strategic Goal 5: Protect and enhance the nation's natural resource base and environment	New or updated soil surveys released for public use: goal of 70 surveys covering 40.7 million acres in FY2004.	New or updated soil surveys released for public use in FY 2003, covering 49.3 million acres.	New/updated soil surveys released for public use during fiscal year and number of acres covered.	NRCS met performance goal

I. D. 2. Table 2

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2005	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	New Soil Surveys released to public	New Goal for FY 05	74 soil surveys	132 Soil Surveys
2005	Mission and Business Results	Conservation, Marine and Land Management	Digital Soil Surveys made available, number	New Goal for FY 05	Make available 361 Digital Soil Surveys	366
2005	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Soil Surveys published per million dollars	40 Soil Surveys	Increase to 62 Soil Surveys	61
2005	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Acres mapped per million dollars	472,462 acres	Increase to 480,000 acres	480,429 acres
2006	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Average number of visits per day to PLANTS web site	25,000 visits per day	Increase visits per day to 25,294	26155 est.
2006	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	New Soil Surveys released to public	74 Soil Surveys	Increase to 134 Soil Surveys	134 est.
2006	Mission and Business Results	Conservation, Marine and Land Management	Digital Soil Surveys made available, number	361 Digital Soil Surveys	Make available 300 digital soil surveys	320 digital soil surveys est.
2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Hours spent on data collection per sample segment	4.1 hours	Reduce to 2.4 hours per sample segment	2.40 hours est.
2006	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Soil Surveys published per million dollars	62 Soil Surveys	Increase to 77 Soil Surveys	77
2006	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Acres mapped per million dollars	480,000 acres	increase to 487,736 acres	541,000 acres
2007	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Average number of visits per day to PLANTS web site	25,294 visits per day	Increase visits per day to 27,800	TBD in Oct 2007

2007	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	New Soil Surveys released to public	134 Soil Surveys	Increase to 140 surveys	TBD in Oct 2007
2007	Mission and Business Results	Conservation, Marine and Land Management	Digital Soil Surveys made available, number	300 Digital Soil Surveys	Make available 250 digital soil surveys	TBD in Oct 2007
2007	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Hours spent on data collection per sample segment	2.4 hours	Reduce to 2.0 hours	TBD in Oct 2007
2007	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Soil Surveys published per million dollars	77 Soil Surveys	Increase to 125 Soil Surveys	TBD in Oct 2007
2007	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Acres mapped per million dollars	487,736 acres	Increase to 500,000 acres	TBD in Oct 2007
2008	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Average number of visits per day to PLANTS web site	27, 800 visits per day	Increase visits per day to 30,600	TBD in Oct 2008
2008	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	New Soil Surveys released to public	140 Soil Surveys	Increase to 145 surveys	TBD in Oct 2008
2008	Mission and Business Results	Conservation, Marine and Land Management	Digital Soil Surveys made available, number	250 Digital Soil Surveys	Make available 50 digital soil surveys	TBD in Oct 2008
2008	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Hours spent on data collection per sample segment	2.00 hours	Reduce to 1.90 hours	TBD in Oct 2008
2008	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Soil Surveys published per million dollars	125 Soil Surveys	Increase to 133 Soil Surveys	TBD in Oct 2008
2008	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Acres mapped per million dollars	500,000 acres	Increase to 505,051 acres	TBD in Oct 2008
2009	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Average number of visits per day to PLANTS web site	30, 600 visits per day	Increase visits per day to 31,000	TBD in Oct 2009
2009	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	New Soil Surveys released to public	50 Soil Surveys	Increase to 60 surveys	TBD in Oct 2009
2009	Mission and Business Results	Conservation, Marine and Land Management	Digital Soil Surveys made available, number	15 Digital Soil Surveys	Make available 20 digital soil surveys	TBD in Oct 2009
2009	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Hours spent on data collection per sample segment	1.90 hours	Reduce to 1.80 hours	TBD in Oct 2009
2009	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Soil Surveys published per million dollars	125 Soil Surveys	Increase to 133 Soil Surveys	TBD in Oct 2009
2009	Technology	Operations and Maintenance Costs	Acres mapped per million dollars	500,00 acres	Increase to 550,000 acres	TBD in Oct 2009

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 does not presently have an EA Transition Strategy. This investment will be identified in the USDA EA Transition Strategy when it is forwarded to OMB February 2007 in the Annual OMB EA Assessment.

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
Geospatial navigation services	Provides backdrop and navigational layers for multiple applications	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange	005-53-01-11-01-1000-00-117-057	No Reuse	0
Natural Resource Data Gateway Services	Provides mechanism for distributing standard datasets from the Geospatial Data Warehouse and Data Marts	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange	005-53-01-11-01-1000-00-117-057	No Reuse	0
Natural Resource Data Web Services Framework	A framework for establishing web services to natural resource data in data marts	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange	005-53-01-11-01-1000-00-117-057	No Reuse	0
Natural Resource Data Warehousing	A framework for establishing data warehouses for natural resource data	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange	005-53-01-11-01-1000-00-117-057	No Reuse	0
Natural Resource Data Marting	A framework for establishing data marts for natural resource data	Data Management	Data Exchange	Data Exchange	005-53-01-11-01-1000-00-117-057	No Reuse	0
eAuthentication	Single Sign-On Authentication Service	Security Management	Identification and Authentication	Identification and Authentication	005-03-02-01-01-8003-00-404-140	Internal	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)
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Test Management	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and	Database / Storage	Storage	

Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Data Mart	Service Interface and	Interoperability	Data Transformation	

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)

NRCS uses FirstGov and Geospatial OneStop to provide access to natural resource information

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)?

yes

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)

Browser versions include Microsoft Internet Explorer 6.0 and higher, Netscape 7.0 and higher, and Mozilla Firefox 1.0 and higher. These versions of browsers are considered sufficiently broad to ensure equitable and timely access to government information and services with reasonable security and development effort and cost.

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?

2004-09-15

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
----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---

2 - Distributed Databases	Provide data at two main data centers. All data stored and controlled at local or state levels would be merged into a larger data warehouse at one of the two main data centers. Data would be replicated at each data center.	21040356	28316120

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 and Alternative 2 are very similar in terms of risk-adjusted NPV with Alternative 1 appearing to be slightly more attractive. Alternative 1 was significantly less expensive but had much more risk creating more uncertainty around the estimated NPV. In the qualitative analysis, the risk of having a single point of failure in Alternative 1 is too significant at this time. Therefore, Alternative 2 was selected with Alternative 1 being an option for review in the future.

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

(long text - 2500 characters)

Alternative 2 provides reduced risks of having data unavailable. NRCS relies on its data assets on a daily basis for mission critical activities and functions. Having all data located at two geographically separated data centers mitigates risks associated with natural or human catastrophic events that could impact a single data repository. Consolidating data enables immediate access to the data globally. There are significant benefits in being able to access data on demand without waiting extended periods that can not be measured quantitatively.

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?

2006-08-21

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)

Under the Security area of risk, all hardware and software infrastructure was transferred to OCIO-ITS along with respective security components for those items. This transfer implements a portion of the mitigation strategy for NRCS that was cost prohibitive on its own. This transfer provides some separation of duties between development and production. In addition, NRCS management is reviewing a reorganization plan that would provide separation of development duties from operation duties for NRCS employees and contractors. Under the Privacy area of risk, additional risk from unauthorized disclosure of data has been identified in light of recent security breaches. NRCS has either implemented or is in the process of implementing new mitigation strategies to address this risk including updated policy statements ensuring that all employees, partners, and contractors are aware of privacy issues and have taken mandatory training. These policy statements will also require encryption of privacy data on local storage devices and encryption of any privacy data included in emails.

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)

The cost of risk was calculated by identifying 15 areas of risk (such as schedule, feasibility, security, and technical obsolescence). For each risk category a criticality (1-3), a probability (1-5), and risk cost category were selected. Criticalities and Probabilities were combined to determine the risk priority. There were 7 risk cost categories ranging from under \$5,000 to \$2,000,000. Each risk was

assigned a cost category corresponding to the cost to the program if the risk was encountered. The midpoint of category was multiplied by the risk probability to determine the risk for each category. The sum of the risks for each category was applied to the cost estimate for the program to generate the risk adjusted cost. The total risk cost estimated using this approach was \$1,488,075. The risk in one area with a total estimated cost of \$23,750 could not be managed or mitigated, so it was accepted. The risk in 6 areas with a total risk cost of \$429,450 could be mitigated; the mitigation is complete. The risks in 8 areas with a total risk cost of \$1,034,875 are being managed on an on-going basis, and the cost is covered by funds in the O&M part of the investment schedule.