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

THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MET AT THE TOWN AND COUNTRY RESORT IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA ON JUNE 24, 2013, TO REVIEW RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP.

THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS ARE RECOMMENDED FOR ADOPTION:

Resolution 1

CONCERN:
FSA-2065 Annual Statement of Account is mailed to both the borrowers and to the FSA servicing office. The copy mailed to the FSA office is costly, requires much filing time and is unnecessary.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Store the information contained in FSA-2065 Annual Statement of account in a Hyperion Report and eliminate the mailing of the file copy to the FSA servicing office.

Resolution 2

CONCERN:
Many offices are requiring the RD 1940-20 form as part of a complete application on proposals that are evaluated as CATEXs.   This form is only required for Environmental Assessments. So the customer is being required to complete more paperwork than required and the office is wasting time. This is a training issue that can be easily over come with a better description on the check list.

eCFR Reference below:

"(c) Form FmHA or its successor agency under Public Law 103-354 1940-20, Request for Environmental Information, will be used for obtaining environmental information from applicants whose proposals require an environmental assessment under the requirements of this subpart."

http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?c=ecfr&SID=4a0f7ab35e07b3b50a885ebda0633e45&rgn=div6&view=text&node=7:13.1.1.1.1.2&idno=7#7:13.1.1.1.1.2.1.39.13

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Revise the Check List in 3-FLP Exhibit 5 Item 19 to read: RD-1940-20, "Request for Environmental Information" (For Class I or II EA only).

Resolution 3

CONCERN:
NRRS only allows a credit report fee of $99 or less. When processing credit report fees for an entity and all members, the fee collected can easily exceed $99.00.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Change the software to allow more than a $99.00 credit report fee to be processed.

Resolution 4

CONCERN:
We are relying on Customer Profile in DLM to alert us of debt forgiveness.   All Past Debt Forgiveness does not appear in current/past debt from NITC nor does it show up under the heading of Previous Debt Forgiveness-Direct because older loan history has been purged from the system. Even though it has been purged, the loans written off do appear with a fully paid code under Past Debt Information-Direct. Not everyone will be able to recognize fully paid codes that should be investigated to find out what it means. Since nothing showed up in current/past debts in NITC and Previous Debt Forgiveness-Direct, the loan officer could potentially make an applicant a Term Loan which would be an illegal loan. There needs to be a more reliable system to show previous debt forgiveness.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
When fully paid codes involving Loss To The Government show up on previous debt, it should cause the Previous Debt Forgiveness field to be populated with the loans that were written down/off.

Resolution 5

CONCERN:
Farm Business Plan allows you to input a crop share in the crop schedules for when a borrower only receives a percentage of the crop. However, the livestock schedules do not allow for a similar type of entry method. Many livestock producers lease cattle on a share basis, where the borrower may only receive a percentage of the calf crop instead of the entire calf crop. Currently, the only way to input this forces you to either leave an ending inventory, which is not an actual ending inventory, or you must do the calculation before inputting which will not accurately represent the actual number of calves raised.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
The Livestock Sales schedule in the farm business plan should allow for a percentage input to accurately represent when a borrower has lease cows on shares.

Resolution 6

CONCERN:
Payment reminder letters are sent to borrowers from FLOO in St. Louis. These letters provide the borrower with the address of where to send the payment. However, the letter does not direct them to whom to make the check payable.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Add a statement in the body of the letter similar to the following: Please make checks payable to USDA - Farm Service Agency.

Resolution 7

CONCERN:
According to the National Office, when payments are applied in the FLPIDS/DLS-DRT-Special Servicing system and there is a loan being rescheduled/reamortized, the system works on an "account level", rather than the loan that is being rescheduled/reamortized. For example, a restructure of only one of the borrower's loans (an FO) was in process when the borrower brought in a payment for one of his operating loans. The payment was applied to his operating loan in NRRS. When the special servicing transaction was initiated in DLS-DRT on the FO loan for the restructure, the county office got an "error" message of "payoff: accrual date provided by the user cannot be before Loan/DSA cash or non-cash payment date xx/xx/xxxx."

The NTO advised us that the DRT system looks at ALL payments on ALL loans. In order for the rescheduling transaction to continue to be processed on the farm ownership loan, a problem case had to be submitted to finance office to REVERSE the payment made to the operating loan. After the overnight process was complete, the 1M transaction was completed and the payment was then reapplied to the operating loan.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
When processing the 1M transactions during rescheduling/reamortizing loans, the transaction should only affect the loan being rescheduled (not all of the loan accounts), so any payments on other loans will not affect the reschedule/reamortization transaction.

Resolution 8

CONCERN:
In FBP, categories of collateral such as machinery/equipment or raised/purchased breeding livestock one must select the box for each item to be used as collateral. For customers with a large number of equipment items or several different categories it can be time consuming to go through and click each box.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Add a "select all" feature that would select all of them to go to the Security Agreement. (When budget allows)

Resolution 9

CONCERN:
On DLM checklist for each section there is a Select All, N/A all or Per Package button. This now requires it to be done for each section.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Make a per package button at the top that applies it to each section.

Resolution 10

CONCERN:
When a jointly payable check is applied into NRRS and a receivable is established, the only means for the refund is via a paper check which causes delays.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Allow the refund to be done via EFT if an account has been established for that producer.

Resolution 11

CONCERN:
On the FLP 540 report in data mart, total columns do not currently calculate for Payment Status, Total Other Borrowers, or Total Borrowers Past Due.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Provide totals for these items.

Resolution 12

CONCERN:
2-FLP par. 108 L and M state that no guaranteed OL shall be made to any applicant after the 15th year that an applicant receives a direct or guaranteed OL. In the case of a Line of Credit, each year in which an advance is made counts towards the 15 year term limit. The eligibility report assumes that an advance was made each year the LOC was outstanding, however there may not have actually been advances each of the years a LOC was outstanding

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Add a column under the Lender Status Reports section of the FSA Loan View screen to bring forward the Last Advance Date to readily assist and save time when making eligibility decision.

Resolution 13

CONCERN:
Paper Checks are processed if a loan is not linked in EFT.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Flag a loan on the check request screen if the loan is not linked to an EFT account to avoid erroneously processing a paper check. This would not inhibit a paper check from being issued if that is the desired result.

THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS ARE RECOMMENDED FOR NON-ADOPTION:

Resolution 14

CONCERN:
Saving NRRS receipts to local or shared drives is a duplication of work. Receipts can be searched and found through the NRRS search function. This process of saving receipts is time consuming and uses valuable server space.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Discontinue the requirement to save NRRS receipts.

EXPLANATION FOR NON-ADOPTION BY THE COMMITTEE:
This appears to be a State-specific issue and not a National Handbook concern.

Resolution 15

CONCERN:
In DLS Bankruptcy Action Pending (BAP), you have to input the date of FSA notification prior to the date that BAP was filed. This does not allow you to correctly account for the actual date that BAP was filed due to the date of filing being prior to the date of FSA notification.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Change Special Servicing (SS) to either have the date of filing entered prior to the date of FSA notification or allow a date prior to FSA notification to be entered for date of filing.

EXPLANATION FOR NON-ADOPTION BY THE COMMITTEE:

This information can be added in comment section and has no bearing on tracking information in DLS.

Resolution 16

CONCERN:
In some cases the Income & Expense Trends & Ratio & Analysis does not have enough columns to efficiently analyze an operation. This is especially needed when completing servicing and there are multiple projected plans. At that point all your historical years won't fit.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Add additional columns to Income & Expense Trends, Balance Sheet Trends and Ratios & Analysis.

EXPLANATION FOR NON-ADOPTION BY THE COMMITTEE:

5 year history is adequate and information is sufficient and can be readily modified for multiple plans.

Resolution 17

CONCERN:
Anytime changes are made to the income and expense you have to pull up the ratio's screen.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Add the ratios to the bottom of the income and expenses and trends in FBP so that each time income & expenses are changed it will calculate and show the ratios.

EXPLANATION FOR NON-ADOPTION BY THE COMMITTEE:
This information is readily available in FBP.

Resolution 18

CONCERN:
DLS (DLM) cannot process input of a repayment date of 18 months from date of note.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
A fix should be provided in DLS (DLM) to accept input of a payment date up to (but not to exceed) 18 months from date of the note.

Respectfully submitted by the 2012/2013 Information Technology Committee,

_____   _____
LeAnn Gibbs, Zone A, Chairperson   Kaitlynn Steckman, Zone B

_____   _____
Betty Garrett, Zone C   Tammy Jones, Zone D