

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

- 1. Date of Submission: 8/4/2008
- 2. Agency: Small Business Administration
- 3. Bureau: Disaster Assistance
- 4. Name of this Capital Asset: ODA: Disaster Credit Management Modernization (DCMM)
- 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 028-00-01-05-01-5001-00
- 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Operations and Maintenance
- 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2001 or earlier
- 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:

DCMM is the Office of Disaster Assistance (ODA) initiative to modernize and strengthen the data and information technology available to support and sustain its objectives of providing an expedited response to disasters; improving the quality and timeliness of disaster loan processing; managing with high quality information; and reducing the cost of personnel, training, overtime, and travel. Disaster Credit Management System (DCMS) is an integrated IT system implemented to satisfy the DCMM initiative. It is a system to process, service and track disaster loan applications and facilitate disbursements. DCMS is primarily in a steady state. The agency approved the DCMM project in 1998, beginning with a process evaluation and re-engineering effort. DCMS began in FY00 with an alternative analysis and awarding a contract for development and integration. DCMS was put into production in Nov 2004.

Prior to DCMS implementation, the disaster loan making process was labor intensive and paper driven. The only automation was a file tracking system, created in 1990, and user developed spreadsheets. DCMS directly supports SBA Strategic Goal 3 to restore homes and businesses affected by disaster. DCMS supports and reduces application processing, approval and funding times.

In June 2006, GAO Audit recommendations and SBA Administration mandated that ODA provide disaster victims a process to apply for disaster loan assistance online. This sub-system of DCMS was placed in production in August 2008. This allows ODA to improve customer service, achieve outcome goals, reduce costs to taxpayers and allow for more automation of processes and workflow.
- 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 6/5/2008
- 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
- 11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?
- 12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? No
 - a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes
 - b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No
 - 1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? No
 - 2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? No
 - 3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? No

If "yes," check all that apply:

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)

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.) No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? Yes

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Effective

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 3

17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) Yes

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFIA compliance area? No

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

2. If "no," what does it address?

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

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

| | |
|----------|------------|
| Hardware | 0.000000 |
| Software | 0.000000 |
| Services | 100.000000 |
| Other | 0.000000 |

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

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

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

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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.

| Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| <i>(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| | PY-1 and earlier | PY 2008 | CY 2009 | BY 2010 | BY+1 2011 | BY+2 2012 | BY+3 2013 | BY+4 and beyond | Total |
| Planning: | 1.022 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Acquisition: | 20.33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition: | 21.352 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Operations & Maintenance: | 25.0741 | 10.9209 | 12.3872 | 12.7247 | | | | | |
| TOTAL: | 46.4261 | 11.1209 | 12.3872 | 12.7247 | | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above. | | | | | | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs | 6.25 | 2.08 | 2.266 | 2.334 | | | | | |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs: | 91 | 25 | 26 | 26 | | | | | |

Note: For the multi-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No

a. If "yes," How many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

In September 2006, a new SBA Administration changed the operating priorities for ODA. This delayed the execution of the Electronic Loan Application (ELA) project. The project started in August 06 with requirement gathering. This process was stopped in September 06 and resumed in late February 07. ELA went into production in August 2008. The hosting costs for this effort is reported in the Hosting Exhibit 300.

Also, in order to facilitate Agency reporting of hosting costs, the current hosting contract costs were eliminated from the Exhibit for BY2009. The new Exhibit includes hosting costs from FY2007 and forward, while FY2005 and 2006 are included in this Exhibit. Based on the additional hardware for DR and ELA and the poor performance of the current hosting provider, it was decided to re-complete the hosting contract. This is also addressed in the new Exhibit.

In FY08, in conjunction with the Hosting move and DR upgrade and to facilitate the ELA development efforts, we upgraded the operating system, database and application software. This effort was completed in April 2008, when the new hosting site was brought on line.

All these changes implemented in the past FY has increased maintenance costs for additional hardware, software and staff. This increase is reflected in costs for FY09, BY10, and future periods. FY09 and BY10 are based on actual contract labor hour costs. The current prime-contract vehicle expire in FY11 and future labor rates are unknown. Future periods are estimated at a 3% increase annually.

FTE numbers in FY08 decreased due to normal operating attrition. The slot has not been filled yet, but will be by the next fiscal year.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

| Contracts/Task Orders Table: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * Costs in millions |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Contract or Task Order Number | Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16) | Has the contract been awarded (Y/N) | If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date? | Start date of Contract/ Task Order | End date of Contract/ Task Order | Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M) | Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N) | Is it performance based? (Y/N) | Competitively awarded? (Y/N) | What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A) | Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N) | Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N) | Name of CO | CO Contact information (phone/email) | Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A) | If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N) |
| SBA-2006-C-2476M | CIO-SP2 Time and Materials | Yes | 3/27/2006 | 3/27/2006 | 3/26/2011 | 54.1228 | No | Yes | No | NA | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| SBAHQ07CO022 | HubZone Firm Fixed Price | Yes | 9/30/2007 | 9/30/2007 | 8/31/2011 | 2.0469 | No | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| SBAHQ08CO011 | Native Alaskan Time and Materials | Yes | 4/4/2008 | 4/4/2008 | 9/30/2008 | 0.2574 | No | Yes | No | NA | Yes | Yes | | | | |

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:

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done? DCMS received a 508 waiver from Agency CIO during development. DME Electronic Loan Application sub-system is 508 compliant. Remainder will be brought into compliance in the future.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 7/1/2008

1. Is it Current? Yes

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? Yes

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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 (indicators) 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 the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond the next President's Budget.

| Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------|--------|----------------|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| 2006 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Satisfaction | ACSI Survey | 66.0% | 71.0% | 57.0% |
| 2006 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | EI Disaster Loan borrowers operational 6 months after final disbursement | 92.7% | 77% | 85.8% |
| 2006 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | Disaster Loans initial disbursement within 5 days | 96.4% | 95% | 76.98% |
| 2006 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | Business Physical Disaster Loan borrowers operational 6 months after final disbursement | 92.7% | 60% | 75% |
| 2006 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Resource Time | Timeliness | EI Disaster Loans processed within 18 days | 24% within 19 days | 85% | 37.55% |
| 2006 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Resource Time | Timeliness | Business Physical Disaster Loans processed within 18 days | 23% within 19 days | 85% | 13.87% |
| 2006 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Resource Time | Timeliness | Home Disaster Loans processed within 14 days | 28% within 16 days | 85% | 96.93% |
| 2006 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Technology | Efficiency | Load levels | Load Test of the maximum number of concurrent connections with | 2,300 | 8,000 | 12,194 |

| Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--------|---|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| | | | | | the upgraded system hardware | | | |
| 2007 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Satisfaction | ASCI Survey | 57.0% | 71.5% | 66% |
| 2007 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | EI Disaster Loan borrowers operational 6 months after final disbursement | 85.8% | 78% | 80% |
| 2007 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | Disaster Loans initial disbursement within 5 days | 76.98% | 95% | 93.72% |
| 2007 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | Business Physical Disaster Loan borrowers operational 6 months after final disbursement | 75% | 65% | 62% |
| 2007 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Timeliness | Timeliness | Home Disaster Loans processed within 12 days | 96.93% within 14 days | 85% | 97.48% |
| 2007 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Timeliness | Timeliness | Business Physical Disaster Loans processed within 17 days | 13.87% within 18 days | 85% | 93.20% |
| 2007 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Timeliness | Timeliness | EI Disaster Loans processed within 17 days | 37.55% within 18 days | 85% | 89.13% |
| 2008 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Satisfaction | ASCI Survey | 66% | 72.0% | Results based on independent survey not completed yet |
| 2008 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | EI Disaster Loan borrowers operational 6 months after final disbursement | 80% | 80% | Results based on independent survey not completed yet |
| 2008 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | Business Physical Disaster Loan borrowers operational 6 months after final disbursement | 62% | 70% | Results based on independent survey not completed yet |
| 2008 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Mission and Business Results | Disaster Management | Disaster Repair and Restore | Disaster Loans initial disbursement within 5 days | 93.72% | 95% | 98.86% through June 30, 2008 |
| 2008 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Timeliness | Timeliness | Business Physical Disaster Loans processed within 16 days | 93.20% within 17 days | 85% | 88.60% through June 30, 2008 |
| 2008 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Timeliness | Timeliness | Home Disaster Loans processed within 10 days | 97.48% within 12 days | 85% | 91.62% through June 30, 2008 |
| 2008 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Processes and Activities | Cycle Time and Timeliness | Timeliness | EI Disaster Loans processed within 16 days | 89.13% within 17 days | 85% | 87.83% through June 30, 2008 |
| 2008 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Technology | Efficiency | Accessibility | ELA System Availability | Not available - new system | 98.0% | |
| 2009 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Satisfaction | ASCI Survey | Results based on independent survey not completed yet | 72.0% | |
| 2009 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Technology | Efficiency | Accessibility | ELA System Availability | 99.5% | 99.5% | |

| Performance Information Table | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------|--------|----------------|
| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
| 2010 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Satisfaction | ASCI Survey | 72% | 72% | |
| 2010 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Technology | Efficiency | Accessibility | ELA System Availability | 99.5% | 99.5% | |
| 2011 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Customer Results | Customer Benefit | Customer Satisfaction | ASCI Survey | 72% | 72% | |
| 2011 | Restore homes and business affected by disaster | Technology | Efficiency | Accessibility | ELA System Availability | 99.5% | 99.5% | |

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 5.00
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment? Yes

| 3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s): | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|---|
| Name of System | Agency/ or Contractor Operated System? | Planned Operational Date | Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems) |

| 4. Operational Systems - Security Table: | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Name of System | Agency/ or Contractor Operated System? | NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low) | Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N) | Date Completed: C&A | What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A) | Date Completed: Security Control Testing | Date the contingency plan tested |
| Disaster Credit Managment System (DCMS) | Contractor and Government | High | no | 9/15/2006 | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53 | 7/17/2008 | 9/19/2008 |
| Electronic Loan | Contractor and | High | no | 9/30/2008 | FIPS 200 / NIST | 7/17/2008 | 6/30/2009 |

| 4. Operational Systems - Security Table: | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Name of System | Agency/ or Contractor Operated System? | NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low) | Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N) | Date Completed: C&A | What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A) | Date Completed: Security Control Testing | Date the contingency plan tested |
| Application (ELA) | Government | | | | 800-53 | | |

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? Yes

a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? Yes

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? Yes

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

DCMS is a High Security Categorization system. NIST 800-53 requires that many of the security controls for a High system be automated. We may need to purchase software for many of these vulnerabilities. We have identified some software and an alternative analysis is underway for other. Final costs have yet to be determined. Order of magnitude estimate for budget purposes is no more than \$100K.

In FY08 we upgraded the operating system, database software and the software underlying the COTS application, along with moving to a new hosting location, upgrading Disaster Recovery equipment, and creating a new sub-system (ELA). Because of all these changes, the agency is in the process of completing a C&A. Currently, we are working under an Interim Authority to Operate. The full C&A is scheduled to be completed by the end of the fiscal year.

The ELA is a sub-system of DCMS.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

All users of the system and their transactions are monitored daily through manual review of audit logs. We make no distinction in this regard to ODA employees or contractors. ODA has implemented TripWire to continuously monitor security baseline settings and raise an alert when changes occur. Users access the system through defined roles that restrict them to the level of data required to complete their job. The project has three security experts on staff. One is an ODA employee and the other two are contractors. One contractor is a PMP and has a CISSP certification. The second has a Masters degree in Security Informatics.

We have constructed a detailed Continuous Monitoring Plan that supports and conforms to the intent of control SA-9 of NIST SP 800-53. It includes requirements that contractors provide evidence, on demand, of 70 security controls required by the Statement of Work in their contract. An enhancement to control SA-3 has been made to contractually obligate service providers to adhere to the provisions of NIST 800-53 and our Continuous Monitoring Plan.

| 8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table: | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| (a) Name of System | (b) Is this a new system? (Y/N) | (c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N) | (d) Internet Link or Explanation | (e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N) | (f) Internet Link or Explanation |
| Disaster Credit Management System (DCMS) | No | Yes | http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/foia_dcms.pdf | Yes | http://www.sba.gov/aboutsba/sbaprograms/foia/pas/index.html |
| Electronic Loan Application (ELA) | Yes | Yes | Sub-system of DCMS and included in that PIA http://www.sba.gov/idc/groups/public/documents/sba_program_office/foia_dcms.pdf | No | Sub-system of DCMS and included in that SORN |

Details for Text Options:
Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.
Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.
Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and

technology layers of the agency's EA.

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

a. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

SBA EA Transition Plan

Table 8: DCMM Initiative Detail

This investment is identified with the following six-digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture: 112-000

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. 112-000

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:

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.egov.gov>.

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | FEA SRM Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component (a) | Service Component Reused Name (b) | Service Component Reused UPI (b) | Internal or External Reuse? (c) | BY Funding Percentage (d) |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Data Exchange | Support the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications; includes verification that transmitted data was received unaltered | Back Office Services | Data Management | Data Exchange | | | No Reuse | 15 |
| Data Warehouse | Support the archiving and storage of large volumes of data | Back Office Services | Data Management | Data Warehouse | | | No Reuse | 15 |
| Data Integration | Support the organization of data from separate data sources into a single source using middleware or application integration as well as the modification of system data models to capture new information within a single system | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Data Integration | | | No Reuse | 1 |
| Enterprise Application Integration | Support the redesigning of disparate information systems into one system that uses a common set of data structures and rules | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Enterprise Application Integration | | | No Reuse | 20 |
| Instrumentation and Testing | Support the validation of application or system capabilities and requirements | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Instrumentation and Testing | | | No Reuse | 4 |

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:

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.egov.gov>.

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | FEA SRM Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component (a) | Service Component Reused Name (b) | Service Component Reused UPI (b) | Internal or External Reuse? (c) | BY Funding Percentage (d) |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Software Development | Support the creation of both graphical and process application or system software | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Software Development | | | No Reuse | 15 |
| Change management | Control the process for updates or modifications to the existing documents, software or business processes of an organization | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Change Management | | | No Reuse | 2 |
| Configuration Management | Control the hardware and software environment, as well as documents of an organization | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Configuration Management | | | No Reuse | 1 |
| Document Imaging and OCR | Supports the scanning of documents | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Document Imaging and OCR | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Information Retrieval | Allow access to data and information for use by an organization and its stakeholders | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Retrieval | | | No Reuse | 6 |
| email | Support the transmission of memos and messages over a network | Support Services | Collaboration | Email | | | No Reuse | 1 |
| Computer / Telephony Integration | Support the connectivity between server hardware, software and telecommunications equipment into a single logical system | Support Services | Communication | Computer / Telephony Integration | | | No Reuse | 1 |
| Access Control | Support the management of permissions for logging onto a computer, application, service, or network; includes user management and role/privilege management | Support Services | Security Management | Access Control | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Cryptography | Support the use and management of ciphers, including encryption and decryption processes, to ensure confidentiality and integrity of data | Support Services | Security Management | Cryptography | | | No Reuse | 2 |
| Identification and Authentication | Support obtaining information about those parties attempting to log on to a system or application for security purposes and the validation of | Support Services | Security Management | Identification and Authentication | | | No Reuse | 1 |

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
 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.egov.gov>.

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | FEA SRM Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component (a) | Service Component Reused Name (b) | Service Component Reused UPI (b) | Internal or External Reuse? (c) | BY Funding Percentage (d) |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | those users | | | | | | | |
| Remote Systems Control | Support the monitoring, administration and usage of applications and enterprise systems from locations outside of the immediate system environment | Support Services | Systems Management | Remote Systems Control | | | No Reuse | 10 |

a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

b. 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.

c. '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.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:
 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 (a) | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Software Development | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Dependent Technologies | Java Servlets |
| Software Development | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Dependent Technologies | VB Scripts |
| Data Exchange | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | SOAP |
| Data Exchange | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | XMI |
| Data Exchange | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Java Database Connectivity (JDBC) |
| Data Exchange | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Object Linking and Embedding (OLE) |
| Data Exchange | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Open Database Connectivity (ODBC) |
| Software Development | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Reports 10 |
| Access Control | Component Framework | Security | Certificates / Digital Signatures | FIPS 186 |
| Cryptography | Component Framework | Security | Certificates / Digital Signatures | Secure Sockets Layer (Verisign Certificates) |
| Cryptography | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | Secure Shell |
| Cryptography | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | winMagic |
| Software Development | Component Framework | User Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | JSP |
| Software Development | Component Framework | User Presentation / Interface | Static Display | HTML |
| Information Retrieval | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | Hylafax |
| Email | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | Microsoft Outlook |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Other Electronic Channels | System to System |
| Computer / Telephony Integration | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Other Electronic Channels | URL |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Other Electronic Channels | Web Service |
| Computer / Telephony Integration | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Web Browser | Internet Explorer |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Intranet | Internet Standards (TCP/IP) |
| Access Control | Service Access and Delivery | Delivery Channels | Virtual Private Network (VPN) | ATT VPN Client |
| Remote Systems Control | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Hosting | IBM - AOD |
| Identification and Authentication | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Legislative / Compliance | Security (SOPs, Rules of Behavior, SSP, NIST guidelines) |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | File Transfer Protocol (FTP) |

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

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 (a) | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name) |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | Hyper Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP) |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | Hyper Text Transfer Protocol Secure (HTTPS) |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | Internet Protocol (IP) |
| Cryptography | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | IP Security (IPSEC) |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | Transport Control Protocol (TCP) |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Supporting Network Services | Border Gateway Protocol (BGP) |
| Data Exchange | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Supporting Network Services | Domain Name System (DNS) |
| Email | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Supporting Network Services | Internet Message Access Protocol / Post Office Protocol (IMAP / POP3) |
| Email | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Supporting Network Services | Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) |
| Software Development | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | PL/SQL |
| Data Integration | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | RPC |
| Enterprise Application Integration | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | webMethods 6.5 |
| Data Integration | Service Interface and Integration | Interface | Service Description / Interface | Web Services Description Language (WSDL) |
| Enterprise Application Integration | Service Interface and Integration | Interface | Service Description / Interface | WebTS (API) |
| Data Integration | Service Interface and Integration | Interoperability | Data Format / Classification | eXtensible Markup Language (XML) |
| Data Warehouse | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Oracle 10g |
| Data Warehouse | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Oracle Lite |
| Data Warehouse | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage | SAN - IBM Shark |
| Information Retrieval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Application Servers | Kofax 6 (ACIS) |
| Information Retrieval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Web Servers | Apache |
| Information Retrieval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Web Servers | Internet Information Server (on Scan Servers) |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) | Ethernet |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) | VLAN |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | DSL |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | Gateway |
| Access Control | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | Juniper NetScreen Firewall |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | Network Interface Cards (NIC) |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | T1/T3 |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | Transceivers |
| Document Imaging and OCR | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Peripherals | Scanners (Canon, Kodak) |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Wide Area Network (WAN) | Frame Relay |
| Software Development | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Integrated Development Environment | Oracle Forms |
| Software Development | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Integrated Development Environment | Visual Basic |
| Enterprise Application Integration | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Integrated Development Environment | webMethods 6.5 |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | CVS |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | PVCS |
| Change Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | TeamTrack (Serena) |
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | Tripwire |

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:
 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 (a) | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Instrumentation and Testing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | Mercury LoadRunner |
| Instrumentation and Testing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | Mercury WinRunner |
| Instrumentation and Testing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management | Quick Test Pro |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | Solaris 10.0 |
| Data Exchange | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Dependent Platform | Windows 2003 |
| Software Development | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Independent Platform | Java TM2 1.4.2 |

a. 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

b. 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.

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No

a. If "yes," please describe.

Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)

Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

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.

- 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 8/9/2005
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

Overall Risk database is reviewed and updated monthly. Significant changes were made in Jan 06 and Aug 07. Some changes occurred during planning and after BTIC approval of mandated hardware upgrade. Additional changes have been made during the Electronic Loan Application planning and design phases.

A Risk Management Plan was developed in 2002 and used during the development of DCMS. This was written with some simplified processes since a public facing web access was not part of the initial mandatory design requirements. However now that the DME project will allow public access to portions of the DCMS system, we have begun a full re-evaluation of the plan. A more detailed Risk Management Plan is being developed during the DME project and replaces all current operating plans.

- 2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

- 1. Was an operational analysis conducted? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed. 3/21/2008
 - b. If "yes," what were the results?

As of March 21, 2008, 164 action items were completed as part of the Administrator's ACE Campaign. The ACE Campaign analyzed the loan making process from a strategic perspective, using Lean Six Sigma methodology to complete any items or changes. Not all of the items had IT components. However, many did have implications to the DCMS system. This campaign included representatives from all ODA internal stakeholders and some Agency stakeholders

The DCMS Operations Center does continuous monitoring of the system and its assets. SBA has implemented computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) to manage preventive maintenance and service call workload. The DCMS Operations Center is a user of this system. The system allows management to measure operating performance and outputs against established goals. Service call history along with other diagnostic tools help managers proactively identify and correct deficiencies in advance of breakdown, reducing unexpected downtime and repair costs.

The DCMS Operations Center management conducts a review of contractor activity against SLA's semi-annually.

To monitor operational cost, DCMS Ops Center management completes an EVM monthly. The results of of the cost and schedule variances are analyzed. This analysis takes into account other information, for example service call histories, performance, and SLA analysis. If any adjustments is justified, they are made based on this holistic analysis.

A formal PIR is planned for the ELA sub-system within the next fiscal year.

- c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

- a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor and Government

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

| Milestone Number | Description of Milestone | Planned | | Actual | | Variance | |
|------------------|--|------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| | | Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) | Total Cost (\$M) | Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) | Total Cost (\$M) | Schedule (# days) | Cost (\$M) |
| 1 | DCMM Development - COTS Items (HW, SW, other) | 8/31/2004 | \$5.953800 | 9/30/2004 | \$6.243296 | -30 | -\$0.289496 |
| 2 | DCMM Development - Contracted Labor | 8/31/2004 | \$5.696200 | 9/30/2004 | \$6.534525 | -30 | -\$0.838325 |
| 3 | DCMM Transition | 9/30/2005 | \$4.956484 | 9/30/2005 | \$5.341998 | 0 | -\$0.385514 |
| 4 | DCMS Operations & Maintenance | 9/30/2006 | \$18.290000 | 9/30/2006 | \$17.797540 | 0 | \$0.492460 |
| 4.1 | Hardware Upgrade | 6/12/2006 | \$6.225000 | 6/12/2006 | \$6.405000 | 0 | -\$0.180000 |
| 4.2 | Upgrade Planning | 3/10/2006 | \$0.140000 | 3/10/2006 | \$0.122000 | 0 | \$0.018000 |
| 4.3 | Upgrade Development & Testing | 5/31/2006 | \$0.846000 | 6/7/2006 | \$0.883000 | -7 | -\$0.037000 |
| 4.4 | Operations & Maintenance | 9/30/2006 | \$11.079000 | 9/30/2006 | \$10.387540 | 0 | \$0.691460 |
| 5 | DCMM Operations & Maintenance | 5/31/2008 | \$11.657300 | 5/31/2008 | \$9.272100 | 0 | \$2.385200 |
| 5.1 | Operations & Maintenance | 9/30/2007 | \$8.943300 | 9/30/2007 | \$9.150900 | 0 | -\$0.207600 |
| 5.2 | Online Application Planning | 12/31/2006 | \$0.200000 | 9/30/2007 | \$0.121200 | -273 | \$0.078800 |
| 5.3 | Online Application Hardware, Software and Other Direct Costs | | \$0.000000 | | \$0.000000 | | \$0.000000 |
| 5.4 | Online Application Hosting Costs | | \$1.914000 | | \$0.000000 | | \$1.914000 |
| 5.5 | Online Application Development & Testing | 5/31/2008 | \$0.600000 | 5/31/2008 | \$0.000000 | 0 | \$0.600000 |
| 6 | DCMM Operations & Maintenance | 9/30/2008 | \$11.120900 | 6/30/2008 | \$7.922800 | 92 | \$3.198100 |
| 6.1 | Operations & Maintenance | 9/30/2008 | \$8.994800 | 6/30/2008 | \$6.504600 | 92 | \$2.490200 |
| 6.2 | ELA Planning | 1/31/2008 | \$0.130200 | 1/31/2008 | \$0.079500 | 0 | \$0.050700 |
| 6.3 | ELA Development | 5/31/2008 | \$1.573900 | 5/31/2008 | \$0.802500 | 0 | \$0.771400 |
| 6.4 | ELA Software | 2/15/2008 | \$0.422000 | 2/22/2008 | \$0.536200 | -7 | -\$0.114200 |
| 7 | DCMM O&M Review | 9/30/2009 | \$12.387200 | | | | |
| 8 | DCMM O&M Review | 9/30/2010 | \$12.724700 | | | | |
| 9 | DCMM O&M Review | 9/30/2011 | | | | | |
| 10 | DCMM O&M Review | 9/30/2012 | | | | | |
| 11 | DCMM O&M Review | 9/30/2013 | | | | | |
| Project | | 9/30/2013 | | | | | |

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

| Milestone Number | Description of Milestone | Planned | | Actual | | Variance | |
|------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|
| | | Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) | Total Cost (\$M) | Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy) | Total Cost (\$M) | Schedule (# days) | Cost (\$M) |
| Totals | | | | | | | |