



*Building Rural America*  
**National Association of Credit Specialists**  
of the  
**USDA – Farm Service Agency**  
Information Technology Committee

**2012 NACS Information Technology Resolutions**

Resolution 1-

**CONCERN:** 3 FLP Exhibit 5 is not on the FSA website to advise applicants of all the information needed to submit an application in addition to the forms. This can mislead applicants since the forms are listed but not the additional information.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Add 3 FLP Exhibit 5, to the USDA FLP Website under the “Farm Loan Application Forms” tab.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** In most cases applicants do not have to complete all items on Exhibit 5. However, we agree that it would be helpful to have this exhibit available to the public with a watermark that states “sample”. In that case, it would not be the official Exhibit 5 in the file and could help the applicant begin gathering the information necessary to complete an application.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** Agree with the suggestions from NTO. No follow up needed.

Resolution 2 -

**CONCERN:** According to the National office borrowers with direct and guaranteed loan information can have two different mail codes, but not two county codes (case numbers). When PLP guaranteed loans were centralized, the PLP servicing office was instructed to use their county code for the borrower case number regardless of the property location. Many borrowers now have two case numbers (one with direct activity and one with guaranteed).

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Precise, step by step instructions are needed for establishing and/or maintaining case number and mail codes for borrowers having guaranteed and direct activity. A report is needed to determine which borrowers have more than one case number.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** A borrower who has both direct and guaranteed loans will always use the same county code in their case number, regardless of the office that maintains or services the loans. The county code identifies where the borrower's operation is geographically located. The mail code identifies the FSA office servicing the loans. A borrower could have their direct loans serviced by one service center, and their guaranteed loans serviced by a different service center. While this is not ideal, it is possible.

States can run GLS report code 2213, "Borrowers Having Direct & Guaranteed Loans Detail Report" to identify borrowers having both direct and guaranteed loans. From that report they can identify borrowers who may have two different county codes and reconcile those accounts by correcting the case number in whichever system contains the wrong county code.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: This resolution is resolved with the usage of GLS report 2231.

Resolution 3 -

CONCERN: Currently basic information (address, birthday, marital status, etc.) for guaranteed borrowers must be updated in SCIMS and GLS. This is a duplication of work.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Link SCIMS to GLS so there is truly one point of entry.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: It is agreed that this is a necessary change in GLS. A Request for Automation (RFA) is pending and is dependent on the availability of funds.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: No funds to implement at this time.

Resolution 4 -

CONCERN: FSA needs automation of more of the application process as the cumbersome number of forms required, need to be hand completed or individually printed out. This results in duplicate entry of data for both the applicant and FSA.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: The data captured and stored in SCIMS, DLM, and FBP is available and could be used to populate and print out all loan application, loan processing and loan closing forms. Overall this would be a time saving, resource saving and cost saving implementation. Forms should be designed so they will work with an automated system and not require changes every few months.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: While we certainly understand this concern, we are unable to accommodate the request. It was decided a few years ago that pre-filled data forms would not be used in DLS. Given the frequency of handbook and form changes, it was determined that the benefits of pre-filled forms were outweighed by the difficulty and expense associated with maintaining this information. Also, with the shrinking IT budgets and the multitude of IT initiatives currently pending, it will not be possible to consider this request anytime in the foreseeable future.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Not considered a priority at this time. The changes to the forms and automated system would be costly.

Resolution 5 -

CONCERN: It would be helpful if a Farm Business Plan balance sheet would automatically populate with the customers loans and balances based on the date we select as a balance sheet date. It would also be helpful if the actual income and expense schedules could populate with the actual payments made from NITC/DLM.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** The information that is in DLM loan schedule should be automatically populated into the FBP loan schedule.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** The Web Equity application does not allow loan schedule information from other applications, NITC/DLM, to flow directly into the Balance Sheet or Income/Expense screens in the FBP. The programming changes needed would be cost-prohibitive to consider.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** This would be a feature similar to the hyperlink in eDALR\$. However, when changes/updates are made to FBP that are specific to FSA, it is very expensive. The eDALR\$ program is a different package and more flexible for updates.

#### Resolution 6 -

**CONCERN:** Form FSA-2040 is cumbersome and time consuming to complete. The information is already in the farm business plan projections.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Populate the 2040 form from the Farm Business Plan data.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** This recommendation has been under consideration for some time. A Proposed Rule has been published and comments received on a revision of the use of proceeds. The Proposed Rule's comments are currently under consideration; a Final Rule will be published after the comments have been evaluated regarding the use of proceeds. Due to the changes in policies for the use of proceeds and a lack of funding, we will not be able to populate FSA-2040 with data from the Farm Business Plan at this time. We will keep this change request for future consideration.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** Committee will follow-up on this revision and implementation.

#### Resolution 7 -

**CONCERN:** When information on graduation reviews and YEAs are put into the FBP, the information does not flow over to DLS & the info and dates have to be input again. This re-entering of dates leaves room for errors and takes more time.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Have the Credit Presentation for YEA/Graduation Reviews flow into the DLS program, avoiding duplication of work

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** Currently DLS does use the FBP Credit Presentation date that is selected by a user to populate the completion date for most of the routine servicing review workflows. DLS Routine Loan Servicing is a work tracking and management system to assist Field Offices in scheduling and monitoring their required reviews. Use of FBP and DLS together provides a more complete picture of what is being completed and how long it took to finish the task.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** The updates in DLS are necessary to schedule future servicing.

Although the completion needs to be input in DLS, there is a drop down bar that populates the date completed (similar to Loan Approval in DLM). An enhancement to FBP to schedule future servicing while in the Credit Presentation, and have this info flow into DLS, would be helpful. It is understood this would be a costly enhancement that cannot be implemented at this time.

#### Resolution 8 -

CONCERN: The 15 minute inactivity lockout on computers requires multiple logins during the day. Recent PII training stated the required time was 30 minutes; not 15.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Set the inactivity lockout time to 30 minutes as allowed by the Department.

FCAO RESPONSE: USDA's policy is a 15 minute inactivity lockout; FSA policy for this control (NIST AC-11) is to comply with USDA's policy. This setting is controlled by ITS on FSA's behalf, and therefore cannot be changed.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: No follow up needed.

#### Resolution 9 -

CONCERN: FSA currently has no methodology by which to accept electronic funds as a means for payment. All loan payments and other fee payments must be paid by check.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Develop a system by which customers can use EFT as a method to make loan payments and the payment of other fees (credit report fees, lien search fees, continuation fees) to FSA.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: The Agency does not currently have the ability to do this for direct loans; we will explore for the future subject to funding limitations. Lenders may currently submit their guaranteed fees to FSA by way of Pre-Authorized Debit (PAD).

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: During our follow-up, it was mentioned that OTC.net is as close to EFT as the agency will allow. No lending institution would likely enable an electronic payment method as mentioned as the loan official may need to dictate how and where funds are applied. A previously mentioned "pay.gov" website for payment submission was deemed to have too many legal issues, per the agency attorney.

#### Resolution 10-

CONCERN: The last page of "Form FSA-2028, Security Agreement" does not print the entity name above the first signature line. This requires the document to be saved as a Word document and corrected, which can be very time-consuming.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Correct the document to place the entity name above the signature line.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: With Version 8.0 of the FBP, tentatively due for release in spring 2013, the security agreement will be converted from Crystal Reports to the Microsoft Reporting

Services and there will not be a printing problem. Until the new version is implemented, if the report does not print correctly, the user should export the file, using the "Export Report" icon to either Adobe Acrobat or Rich Text format and the report will format and print correctly.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: This will be resolved with the new release of FBP.

#### Resolution 11 -

CONCERN: Entering all of the farms that a customer operates into FBP "Income and Expense -Rent- Land/Animals" can be very time consuming when there are multiple landlords. This increases the chance for errors in data entry inputs.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Allow the data from the Producer Farm Data Report from Farm Records to populate into FBP "Income and Expense- Rent- Land/Animals".

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: The Web Equity application does not allow information from outside sources like the Producer Farm Data Report, to flow directly into the Income/Expense screens in the FBP. This is a programming design and cannot be changed.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: No follow up needed.

#### Resolution 12 -

CONCERN: Form FSA-2026, Promissory Note, is manually completed by Agency employees. Installments are manually calculated. This can lead to errors in completion of this legal document.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Automate Form FSA-2026, Promissory Note, to calculate the payment. Allow for the user to change the fields if an alternative payment structure is necessary. Allow this form to have the capability to be prefilled similar to the data filled forms option available in GLS.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: We do not support this proposal. Automation resources are extremely limited and internal reviews have not identified this issue as a significant concern. Payments on promissory notes should be manually completed by Agency employees based upon the payment schedule arrived at when completing farm plans, eDALR\$ plans, deferrals, etc.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: This is considered low-priority with such limited funds for IT enhancements.

#### Resolution 13 -

CONCERN: Finance Office will no longer be sending out payment reminders to borrowers to states that opt out.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Develop a system within Hyperion where the county office can easily go in

and print out the payment reminders needed each month so that the letters are automatically prefilled with the borrowers address and payments.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: DAFLP is allowing requesting county offices to "opt out" of receiving FLOO payment reminders. These offices are required to manually distribute the payment reminders to customers. For all other county offices, FLOO will continue to distribute payment reminders to our customers. Long term, DAFLP will explore solutions to see how and what can be used to generate payment reminders on demand. Due to budgetary constraints, development of such a system would be based on available funding.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Unable to explore new systems due to funding. Will follow up as budget allows.

#### Resolution 14-

CONCERN: In DLM while viewing the "FBP loan Schedule," the undisbursed amounts of the FSA loans is not included in the loan schedule. When viewing this screen it would be helpful to know what the undisbursed amount is without having to go into the check request page of DLM.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a section on the DLM /FBP loan schedule to show the undisbursed amount on each FSA loan.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: This recommendation to enhance DLS Customer Management has merit. However, due to lack of funding we will not be able to implement at this time. We will keep this change request for future development efforts.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Cannot implement at this time due to budget.

#### Resolution 15 -

CONCERN: When entering a status report, lenders do not have a separate field to enter protective advances such as forced place insurance and property taxes.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Create a separate field in LINC for entry of protective advances on status reports.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: The Semi-Annual Status report in GLS and LINC contains a field for emergency advances only. Protective advances such as taxes and insurance should be reported using the Default Status Report.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Sharon Sach stated that on loans that are fully advanced, the protective advances are "dumped" into the interest accrued field, and the lender must continually report this for it to show up on subsequent reports. If the loan is paid down enough, the lender would report the advance as principal and FSA may not even know it was a protective advance.

#### Resolution 16-

**CONCERN:** When one check is submitted and must be split between two programs, there is no methodology in NRRS to enter the check once and split it. For example: Customer writes one check for both an FSFL annual installment and an FLP annual installment. The check number is entered once and a program selected. Both programs cannot be selected.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Make changes to NRRS to allow for a check to be split between two separate programs.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** The same check number can be entered on multiple receipts but we can look at this for a possible future enhancement to NRRS.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** At this point, enter same check for separate receipts. Will discuss further in the future.

#### Resolution 17 -

**CONCERN:** There is only one general checklist for all loans in DLM. Many of the categories do not apply to certain loan types. This is time-consuming to populate the N/A items

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Have one checklist for FO and OL loans and a separate checklist for youth loans.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** The automation of the checklist has already been developed to avoid the situation you have described. The checklist can be completed with "N/A (all)", "Complete (all)" or "Per Package (all)" in order to tailor the checklist to the specific loan request.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** The automation mentioned was an improvement. Although the concern is not fully addressed, the funds for checklist enhancements/separate checklists for Y-OL, and now Streamlined and Micro Loans, is likely not in the budget.

#### Resolution 18 -

**CONCERN:** The FBP Loan Schedule in DLM does not reflect the payment due date, whether the loan is ahead or behind schedule, and if past due, the amount past due.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Change the FBP Loan schedule in DLM to better reflect the information on the 540 report.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** The FBP Loan Schedule function was not developed to give the user a current accounting of a given loan, rather it was developed to provide the interest break down needed so that the potential liability could be entered in FBP when an account had an active deferral. The DLS Customer Profile "Outstanding Debt- Direct" section is a better source for the information

requested in this resolution and the functionality is already in place.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Committee believes the enhancement would have merit, but understands it was not the intended purpose the Loan Schedule to provide this information.

Resolution 19 -

CONCERN: When a borrower pays in full or the debt otherwise satisfied, the case does not leave the DLS dashboard until any past due work items are ended.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: All work items except for Security Instruments should be ended automatically when the debt is paid in full or satisfied by adding a Paid in Full and/or Satisfied by Approved Debt Settlement radio button.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: This recommendation to enhance DLS has merit. However, due to lack of funding we will not be able to implement at this time. We will keep this change request for future development efforts.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Cannot implement at this time due to budget. Will follow up in the future.

Resolution 20 -

CONCERN: The Borrower Mortgage Monitoring Report is not a useful tool under DLS -SI tab for loan managers. To properly utilize this report to its fullest, we need a place to enter the tax parcel number so that taxes can be checked in each county using this report and the field office does not have to keep any manual ledgers for tracking taxes.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add an additional tab in DLS under SI to allow for the tracking of real estate tax payments.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: This recommendation to enhance DLS has merit. However, due to lack of funding we will not be able to implement at this time. We will keep this change request for future development. In the interim, there is the Custom Reminders functionality currently available in DLS to provide for this type of specific work items tracking and monitoring on a per customer basis.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Cannot implement at this time due to budget. Will follow up in the future.

Resolution 21 -

CONCERN: It is very cumbersome to have to look up the full Social Security Number each time a FLP payment is received in NRRS.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a SCIMS hyper-link in NRRS-FLP which should open to allow the last 4 numbers of the social security to be entered.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: When a FLP payment is received in the county office DLS should be checked prior to applying the payment in NRRS. The employee is able to get the full ID number from DLS.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Discussed further during follow-up call. The double-checking of loan numbers/payment amounts in DLS was strongly encouraged by NTO, and the SSN is available there. A more efficient payment system for FLP which could be processed through DLM/DLS could be seen in the future.

Resolution 22 -

CONCERN: FSA actions on the accounts of Active Duty military members have limitations. Conversely there are additional actions that must be taken by FSA staff. It is difficult to manually track these accounts.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Place a code on the 540 report (suggest ADM, Active Duty, Military) by the borrowers name thereby alerting the FSA personnel that the farmer is on Active Duty and certain actions are taken and others delayed due to the fact the borrower is on Active Duty military.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: Finance Office does not have the capacity or the budget to add new account flags. Subject to budget constraints and availability of resources we will consider tracking these accounts in DLS.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Unable to implement at this time due to budget.

Resolution 23 -

CONCERN: Check requests are currently completed in DLS-LM; however, there is no way to record the use of funds, the person authorizing the transaction and the person completing the transaction. Offices are still maintaining this information on a manual bases which consumes resources (time, paper, etc).

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Expand the check request function in DLS-LM to include fields to record the use of funds, the authorizing official and the processing official. This will allow a quicker review method of funds used on an active not fully advanced loan and on previous loans that have been fully advanced.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: The National Office is currently implementing an enhancement within DLS that will address at least part of this concern. It will notate the authorized official who processed the request. The enhancement is in the development stage. We will look at further enhancements to address the use of funds record as automation resources become available.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: This issue is being partially addressed with DLS enhancement. Will follow up on further enhancements.

CONCERN: The recent changes to NRRS were great except for one point in the process when it

becomes confusing. When you have entered the payment and selected the loan you have two options: "Save" and "Save & Return to Borrower Selection". If you are done with the payment then you must select "Save & Return." and on the next screen you have the "Submit" and "Validate" options. The choice of "Save & Return..." is misleading and causes confusion.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Modify the "Save & Return to Borrower Selection" to "Save & Return for selection or Submission of Payment"

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** The National Office has not been aware of any confusion with the current options, and due to lack of funding we will not be able to implement at this time. However, we will keep this change request for future development efforts.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** With limited funds, we agree this is not seen as a necessary enhancement at this time.

Resolution 25 -

**CONCERN:** If we have range or pasture loss due to a disaster and our customer's feed costs increase by 30% they are eligible for an EM loan based upon this increase in feed costs. FBP allows for calculations of crop/production loss but only has a place to enter the amount you've calculated separately for the increase in feed cost. This opens the potential for errors in calculation.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Add the increased feed cost calculations in the EM Credit Presentation in FBP.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** We understand that EM calculations can be cumbersome and the automation does not fully support the process. However, we are planning program changes such as the recent clarification to the pasture calculation process to accommodate the wide-spread severe drought conditions. In addition, while we anticipate increased EM volume in FY 2013, the increase does not fully justify dedicating our limited automation resources to this enhancement.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** With budget restrictions, this is considered a low priority request considering the EM process has recently been simplified. Future enhancements will address the pasture calculation process to accommodate the Fast-Track EM designation process.

Resolution 26 -

**CONCERN:** Loan closings can be held up when a check is ordered without a bank account being tied to the loan resulting in a paper check being mailed.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Produce a warning in DLM check request when money is ordered and no account has been linked to the borrower's loan.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** We understand the concern, but believe the solution proposed would not significantly improve the timeliness of loan closings and it would consume limited

automation resources. Utilization of the DLM Checklist (EFT Information section) will ensure that the user certifies and validates the EFT information before the loan is obligated or closed. If that process is not followed, a warning message at check request would not be a significant time saver. Even in emergency cases EFT processing may take up to 10 business days to complete, which would be comparable to receiving a paper check.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Discussed with NTO and clarified that the main concern is not that of delayed loan closings, but ordering funds from an unlinked account. A warning flag on the check request screen would prevent this mistake. NTO indicates that the “GLS Electronic Funds Transfer Block”/NITC programs where bank account information is input, does not “speak” to DLM/DLS, and this would be costly to implement. A follow up call on this issue is scheduled in February per NTO request. Since these are transactions not performed outside of the field offices, they are looking for further clarification on the issue. Committee believes this is a concern worth addressing in the future as funds are available for enhancements.

Resolution 27 -

CONCERN: Environmental information is not collected for subordination, thereby leaving significant work unaccounted for.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add this to the DLS information collected and reported.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: This recommendation to enhance DLS has merit. However, due to lack of funding we will not be able to implement at this time. We will keep this change request for future development efforts. In the interim, there is the Custom Reminders functionality currently available in DLS to provide for this type of specific work items tracking and monitoring on a per customer basis.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Unable to implement at this time due to budget.

Resolution 28 -

CONCERN: A payoff notification, signed by two office employees, is required to be completed to provide payoff amounts. An automated payoff statement is generated by the DLS.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: 4-FLP, Exhibit 26 should be obsolete and a notification statement be issued from DLS that contains similar information.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: Depending on the account situation, the field office may need to verify information from more than once source or system; therefore it would not be possible to eliminate this requirement. It is important to ensure that all required sources are checked for complete payoff information, as in the case when an equity receivable exists on the account. The field office is required to contact the Finance Office for the total payoff amounts as it cannot be calculated by DLS.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: NACS needs to continue to work with Finance Office and PDEEDS to develop a single source for County Office to pull up an accurate payoff. When this is done, incorporate

that information into an automated format that can be simply signed and forwarded to our borrowers.

#### Resolution 29 -

**CONCERN:** The Finance Office receives and applies payments on customer's accounts. They do not inform the county office of payments received.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Finance Office should be required to contact the county office prior to processing any payments.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** The suggested notification would increase the burden on limited Finance Office resources without any significant benefit to the Agency as County offices send payments from borrowers to the Finance Office. Offset payments are applied as they are received and are available for county office review.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** We agree the burden outweighs the benefits to this resolution. If there are questions on payments for a customer's account they can be found in DLM Customer Profile or NITC.

#### Resolution 30 -

**CONCERN:** There is a delay of at least 24 hrs when linking a loan to EFT before a check request can be processed without a paper check being automatically issued.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** The EFT system should be updated to allow real time linking.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** Both transactions can be processed the same day. According to our current system (GEFTB), when an account is linked in EFT, it is processed immediately; however, when a check request is entered into the system, it is processed nightly through PLAS. However, we are currently exploring avenues and processes to make our system more efficient and cost effective, but due to budget constraints we are unable to implement those processes.

**IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE:** There is not a delay in ordering funds other than the over-night update. Linking a loan to an account is an immediate process and funds can be ordered at that time without a paper check being issued. Will follow up on future system efficiency processes.

#### Resolution 31-

**CONCERN:** When Projected Income & Expense plans are duplicated and moved to actual for completion of a YEA, the scheduled debts do not move, only the info at the summary level will move over.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:** Allow the scheduled debt info from the beginning balance sheet flow over with the conversion of projected to actual.

**NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE:** Projected Income & Expense have a linkage in the programming to

bring over detail from the Balance Sheet loan schedule. Once the Income & Expense is moved to Actual, the programming no longer allows direct linkage to the Balance Sheet detail screen. This is a design feature built into the application.

A suggestion for a work around is to attach a Balance Sheet to the duplicated Income & Expense before the plan is moved to Actual. The loan schedule that is displayed will be a copy of the attached Balance Sheet loan schedule screen, but it does allow a user to change the amounts on each individual debt to reflect the actual amounts paid for the year.

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: No follow up needed. A workaround is available.

Resolution 32 -

CONCERN: The EFT system requires a 14 day validation on a manual validation before a check request can be processed or a paper check will automatically be issued. Currently, check requests are processed in DLM with a warning screen which tells the user to confirm the loan has been linked to a valid account. The EFT system can accept check requests but does not know if the account is valid or if the loan has been linked. This causes many problems which results in paper checks being issued.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Fully link EFT & DLM so that a check request will not process if the account is not valid or the loan hasn't been linked, or if there are discrepancies in the information so that a paper check will not automatically be issued.

NATIONAL OFFICE RESPONSE: The 14-day timeframe is established between the agency and financial institution based on EFT regulatory guidelines. EFT is a self-certifying system to minimize discrepancies in processing. However, the system is not intended to hinder the lending process by disallowing the processing of a transaction due to an error in processing the EFT, thus creating a paper check if the account is not linked properly. We are in the process of researching other avenues to make our system more efficient and cost effective. Based on current budget constraint we are not able to develop those processes this FY. You may find this link helpful [http://fsaintranet.sc.egov.usda.gov/fcad/Manuals/CLP Phase 1 training.pptx](http://fsaintranet.sc.egov.usda.gov/fcad/Manuals/CLP_Phase_1_training.pptx)

IT COMMITTEE RESPONSE: Similar to Resolution 26. We continue to be in contact with Courtney Dixon and NTO on this issue. Although unsure why the process takes 14 days, it is the timeframe that is established at this time. We agree that the check request should not be stopped if requested to an unlinked account, but suggest the warning flag to prevent unintentionally-issued paper checks.