

## OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

The sixth iteration of OGR’s IT scorecard continues to grade agencies implementation of the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform provisions (FITARA)<sup>1</sup> and Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016 (MEGABYTE).<sup>2</sup> In addition, this scorecard incorporates a new area on the Modernizing Government Technology (MGT) act,<sup>3</sup> lowers the overall grades of those agencies whose CIOs don’t report appropriately, and previews an additional area related to the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA).<sup>4</sup>

These areas were selected by the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (OGR) staff because (1) they represent major legislative requirements, (2) the data are generally publicly available and regularly updated, (3) implementation would improve IT acquisitions and operations, and (4) GAO may have completed or ongoing work to verify reporting in these areas. The staff selected specific scoring methodologies for each of the areas from a wide range of options and then tasked GAO to collect and score the information according to OGR’s direction. The resulting “A” through “F” grades are displayed below.

A	B	C	D	F		
0	3	12	8	1		
	Ed.	DOC↓	HHS↑	DHS↓	SBA↓	DOD
	GSA	DOI	HUD	DOJ↓	State↓	
	NSF↑	DOL↑	NASA	NRC↓	Treas. ↓	
		DOT↑↑	SSA	OPM↓	USDA↓	
		Energy↑	USAID↓↓			
		EPA	VA↓			

Since the prior scorecard in November 2017, 5 agencies increased their letter grade, 8 remained the same, and 11 decreased. Most of the decreases are due to a change in the grading methodology. In particular, the overall grade of 9 agencies (USDA, HHS, DHS, DOJ, DOL, State, Treasury, NRC, and USAID) was lowered because the associated CIO does not report to the head of the agency. However, the addition of the MGT area also impacted several agencies. Notably, there are 3 agencies whose grades were lower because of MGT and lowered because of CIO reporting (HHS, DOJ, and USAID). For example, in the absence of the methodology changes, HHS would have raised their grade from a D to an A; however, their grade only increased to a C due to the downward impact of the MGT and CIO reporting changes. Overall, in the absence of changes to the methodology, there would have been 3 As (HHS, GSA, and USAID), and 5 Bs (DOC, Ed., DOJ, DOI, and NSF).

On a more positive note, since the last scorecard, three more agencies CIOs (HUD, NSF, and SBA) now report directly to the head or deputy of their respective agency, which changed their prior “-” suffix to a “+.”

<sup>1</sup>Title VIII, Subtitle D of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, Pub. L. No. 113-291.

<sup>2</sup>Pub. L. No. 114-210 (July 29, 2016); 130 Stat. 824.

<sup>3</sup>Title X, Subtitle G of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-91.

<sup>4</sup>The Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA 2014) (Pub. L. No. 113-283, Dec. 18, 2014) partially superseded the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (FISMA 2002), enacted as Title III, E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2946 (Dec. 17, 2002).

# OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

## Agency CIO Authority Enhancements (Incremental Development)

FITARA requires CIOs to certify that IT investments are adequately implementing incremental development.

**Why it's important:** Agencies have reported that poor-performing projects have often used a “big bang” approach—that is, projects that are broadly scoped and aim to deliver functionality several years after initiation. Consequently, OMB has required agencies’ investments to deliver functionality every 6 months. Congress, OMB, and GAO’s work support the use of incremental development practices.

**Calculation:** The percentage of an agency’s software projects which planned to deliver functionality incrementally (every 6 months).

Agency	Software projects	Incremental software projects	May 2018	Nov. 2017	June 2017	Dec. 2016	May 2016	Nov. 2015
USDA	51	41	80%	79%	83%	69%	71%	68%
DOC	125	113	90%	83%	78%	77%	83%	78%
DOD	26	2	8%	8%	8%	37%	41%	8%
Ed.	37	37	100%	100%	84%	58%	55%	31%
Energy	13	10	77%	100%	90%	60%	100%	50%
HHS	83	82	99%	91%	85%	70%	71%	80%
DHS	34	30	88%	83%	80%	48%	40%	45%
HUD	11	10	91%	92%	89%	0%	0%	30%
DOI	17	16	94%	94%	83%	75%	78%	0%
DOJ	11	11	100%	92%	80%	100%	100%	0%
DOL	26	24	92%	67%	45%	100%	75%	60%
State	13	13	100%	100%	94%	27%	33%	29%
DOT	17	9	53%	50%	35%	9%	10%	15%
Treas.	72	59	82%	60%	55%	74%	70%	63%
VA	99	98	99%	99%	99%	100%	100%	99%
EPA	25	23	92%	92%	92%	100%	100%	92%
GSA	36	36	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
NASA	3	-	0%	0%	0%			
NSF	9	9	100%	100%	100%			
NRC	8	8	100%	100%	100%			100%
OPM	18	18	100%	100%	100%	83%	83%	50%
SBA	4	2	50%	100%	43%	50%	100%	25%
SSA	15	13	87%	69%	23%	42%	41%	35%
USAID	3	3	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	

**Data source (monthly):** Data feeds on OMB’s IT Dashboard as of May 2018.

**Highest-rated agencies:** Fifteen agencies received “A” grades for this portion of the

scorecard. Eight of these agencies reported that all of their projects planned to deliver functionality incrementally.

**Lowest-rated agencies:** Four agencies received failing grades. Notably, NASA reportedly had no projects planning to deliver functionality incrementally and DOD only had 2 of 26.

**GAO reports:** In a November 2017 report ([GAO-18-148](#)), GAO reported that agency CIOs certified only 62 percent of major IT software development investments as implementing adequate incremental development in fiscal year 2017, as required by FITARA. GAO made 19 recommendations to 17 agencies and OMB, to improve reporting accuracy or policies. Most agencies generally agreed with the recommendations or had no comments; however, OMB disagreed with several of GAO’s conclusions, which GAO continued to believe were valid.

# OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

## Enhanced Transparency and Improved Risk Management (OMB’s IT Dashboard)

FITARA requires OMB to publicize detailed information on federal IT investments and requires agency CIOs to categorize their major IT investments by risk.<sup>5</sup> Additionally, in the case of major IT investments that rate an IT investment as high risk for 4 consecutive quarters, the law requires that the agency CIO conduct review aimed at identifying and addressing the causes of the risk.

**Why it’s important:** OMB’s IT Dashboard is a public website (<https://itdashboard.gov/>) that enables federal agencies, industry, the general public and other stakeholders to view details of federal IT investments. For each major investment, the responsible agency CIO submits an assessment of risk and the investment’s ability to accomplish its goals. This calculation rewards the agencies that are reporting more risk, because the string of high-profile federal IT failures demonstrates that increased attention is needed in this area.

**Calculation:** The five agencies with the most reported risk (the portion of investments rated “red” or “yellow,” by dollar) are given an “A,” the next five a “B,” etc... (note: there are only 4 “F” grades as only 24 agencies were evaluated).

**Data source (monthly):** Data feeds on OMB’s IT Dashboard as of May 2018.

**Highest-rated agencies:** Five agencies—Energy, HHS, HUD, NSF, and USAID—received “A” grades for this portion of the scorecard. For example, HHS reported 84% of its IT spending on major investments (\$2.7 billion) as either “yellow” or “red.”

**Lowest-rated agencies:** Conversely, four agencies (USDA, Transportation, NASA, and OPM) received failing grades. However all of these agencies reported at least some of their major IT investments as “red” or “yellow” (an improvement from prior years).

**GAO reports:** While OMB and the agencies have taken steps to improve the ratings on the Dashboard, GAO found in June 2016 ([GAO-16-494](#)) that agencies underreported the risk of almost two thirds of the investments it reviewed.

Agency	Majors (\$)	\$ at risk	May 2018	Nov. 2017	June 2017	Dec. 2016	May 2016	Nov. 2015
USDA	633	41	6%	10%	38%	47%	48%	39%
DOC	1,151	951	83%	82%	86%	79%	79%	74%
DOD*	10,731	2,754	26%	26%	36%	24%	24%	20%
Ed.	422	315	75%	18%	5%	1%	6%	2%
Energy	460	385	84%	14%	12%	21%	8%	4%
HHS	2,840	2,655	93%	43%	14%	12%	13%	11%
DHS	2,071	819	40%	38%	48%	50%	47%	40%
HUD	39	39	100%	75%	75%	79%	73%	74%
DOI	398	142	36%	20%	74%	81%	81%	72%
DOJ	652	207	32%	27%	58%	8%	7%	9%
DOL	170	89	53%	43%	62%	55%	61%	14%
State	596	401	67%	71%	42%	37%	37%	2%
DOT	1,848	303	16%	12%	16%	14%	14%	24%
Treas.	1,544	435	28%	24%	40%	12%	12%	8%
VA	1,158	278	24%	41%	79%	79%	15%	19%
EPA	74	39	52%	61%	75%	83%	76%	62%
GSA	290	155	53%	38%	0%	40%	43%	44%
NASA	263	9	4%	0%	21%	0%	0%	0%
NSF	58	58	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NRC	40	10	25%	21%	51%	67%	61%	57%
OPM	305	36	12%	47%	6%	49%	49%	43%
SBA	57	11	20%	21%	35%	5%	5%	47%
SSA	124	58	47%	52%	0%	15%	15%	10%
USAID	23	23	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%

\*DOD’s data are as-of October 2017, the last time a complete set of CIO ratings data were available.

<sup>5</sup>“Major IT investment” means a system or an acquisition requiring special management attention because it has significant importance to the mission or function of the government; significant program or policy implications; high executive visibility; high development, operating, or maintenance costs; an unusual funding mechanism; or is defined as major by the agency’s capital planning and investment control process.

# OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

## Portfolio Review (PortfolioStat)

FITARA requires OMB to develop and most agencies to implement a process to review agency IT investment portfolios in order to, among other things, increase efficiency and effectiveness, and identify potential waste and duplication. In developing the process, the law requires OMB to develop standardized performance metrics, to include cost savings, and to submit a quarterly report on Congress on cost savings.

**Why it's important:** To better manage existing IT systems, OMB launched the PortfolioStat initiative, which requires agencies to conduct an annual, agency-wide IT portfolio review to, among other things, reduce commodity IT spending and demonstrate how their IT investments align with the agency's mission and business functions.

**Calculation:** Each agency's total PortfolioStat savings divided by its total IT budget for the most recent 3 fiscal years. Similar to the Dashboard grade, the five agencies with the highest percentage are given an "A," the next five a "B," and so forth.

**Data source (quarterly):** The President's Budget and each agency's cost savings file, as posted on its website as of May 2018.

### Highest-rated agencies:

Five agencies—DOC, HHS, Treasury, NASA, and USAID—received "A" grades for this portion of the scorecard. Notably, HHS's reported PortfolioStat savings rose from \$148 million in November 2017, to \$4.3 billion in May 2018, which raised their grade from an "F" to an "A" in this area.

**Lowest-rated agencies:** Four agencies—DOD, HUD, NRC, and OPM—received failing grades. However, all of these agencies have now reported some cost savings through this effort.

**GAO reports:** In April 2015, GAO reported ([GAO-15-296](#)) that agencies continued to identify duplicative spending as part of PortfolioStat, but decreased their planned savings from \$5.8 billion to \$2.0 billion through fiscal year 2015. GAO made recommendations to improve federal implementation of the PortfolioStat initiative.

Agency	Total 3 FY budgets	PortfolioStat savings	May 2018	Nov. 2017	June 2017	Dec. 2016	May 2016	Nov. 2015
USDA	6,258	118	1.9%	1.3%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.6%
DOC	8,207	1,897	23.1%	18.7%	18.7%	10.0%	4.8%	4.8%
DOD	105,500	905	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	0.4%
Ed.	2,096	66	3.2%	1.3%	1.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%
Energy	6,034	160	2.6%	1.2%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.3%
HHS	17,041	4,305	25.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
DHS	20,227	1,540	7.6%	7.3%	6.2%	6.8%	4.1%	4.2%
HUD	1,045	5	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.1%
DOI	3,506	247	7.1%	6.8%	6.8%	5.8%	5.4%	4.8%
DOJ	8,381	476	5.7%	5.2%	5.1%	3.7%	3.2%	2.4%
DOL	2,127	132	6.2%	1.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
State	6,948	209	3.0%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
DOT	9,209	361	3.9%	2.6%	2.6%	0.1%	0.5%	0.5%
Treas.	13,410	1,592	11.9%	12.0%	6.0%	5.3%	5.3%	4.9%
VA	14,339	606	4.2%	4.5%	4.3%	2.5%	1.6%	1.1%
EPA	1,143	40	3.5%	3.4%	3.3%	3.0%	3.0%	2.7%
GSA	2,097	187	8.9%	8.4%	7.7%	5.4%	5.4%	4.0%
NASA	4,901	699	14.3%	9.9%	8.1%	4.5%	3.2%	3.6%
NSF	340	31	9.0%	2.7%	2.7%	2.3%	2.3%	1.7%
NRC	456	7	1.6%	1.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	2.5%
OPM	433	5	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SBA	297	10	3.4%	2.9%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
SSA	5,109	521	10.2%	9.4%	9.2%	7.3%	7.2%	5.7%
USAID	515	66	12.7%	15.4%	15.4%	6.3%	6.0%	4.3%

# OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

## Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative (DCOI)

FITARA requires agencies (with a few caveats) to provide OMB with a data center inventory, a strategy for consolidating and optimizing the data centers (to include planned cost savings), and quarterly updates on progress made. The law also requires for OMB to develop a goal of how much is to be saved through this initiative, and provide annual updates on cost savings achieved.

**Why it's important:** Concerned about the number of federal data centers and recognizing the potential to improve the associated efficiency, performance, and environmental footprint, OMB established the federal data center consolidation initiative, with a goal of saving \$2.7 billion.

**Calculation:** This calculation combines data center savings, metrics, and closures. Savings and metrics are each part half of the grade, and the result is adjusted up if an agency had closed more than 50% of its total data centers (▲). For example, GSA met its planned savings goal (A), but failed to meet 3 metrics (D). The resulting B was adjusted to an A because GSA achieved more than 50% of its planned closures.

**Data source (quarterly):** Agencies' quarterly data center submissions.

Agency	Percent of goal realized	Metrics	May 2018	Nov. 2017	June 2017	Dec. 2016	May 2016	Nov. 2015
USDA▲	52% (24)	●●●●●	D	D	D	D	D	F
DOC	100% (95)	●●●●●	C	C	C	A	A	A
DOD	20% (1,800)	●●●●●	F	F	F	D	C	F
Ed.▲		●●●●●	A	A	A	A	B	F
Energy		●●●●●	F	F	F	B	C	F
HHS	100% (78)	●●●●●	C	F	F	F	F	F
DHS	100% (155)	●●●●●	C	C	C	A	A	A
HUD		●●●●●	A	A	A			
DOI	16% (88)	●●●●●	F	F	F	F	F	F
DOJ▲	99% (66)	●●●●●	B	B	C	A	A	A
DOL	87% (24)	●●●●●	C	F	F	F	F	F
State	100% (17)	●●●●●	C	C	C	F	F	C
DOT	100% (30)	●●●●●	C	F	F	F	F	F
Treas.▲	100% (86)	●●●●●	B	B	B	C	D	
VA	12% (66)	●●●●●	F	F	F	D	F	F
EPA		●●●●●	C	C	C	F	F	F
GSA▲	100% (8)	●●●●●	A	A	B	D	F	D
NASA▲	100% (15)	●●●●●	B	B	B	A	F	F
NSF▲		●●●●●	A	B	B	A	B	A
NRC▲	100% (1)	●●●●●	B	C	F	A	B	F
OPM	21% (22)	●●●●●	F	D	F	F	F	F
SBA	100% (1)	●●●●●	C	C	F			
SSA	0% (165)	●●●●●	D	C	C	A	F	F
USAID		●●●●●	B	B	B			

Note: OMB did not set a savings goal for 6 agencies (Ed., Energy, EPA, NSF, and USAID)

**Highest-rated agencies:** Four agencies—Education, HUD, GSA, and NSF—received “A” grades. Education and HUD have no agency-run data centers and were rewarded with an “A.”

**Lowest-rated agencies:** Five agencies received failing grades. For instance, DOD reportedly saved 20% of its goal and didn't meet any optimization metrics.

**GAO reports:** In a series of reports ([GAO-17-388](#), [GAO-17-448](#), and [GAO-18-264](#)), GAO described the potentially billions of dollars in savings. Most recently, GAO found issues in agencies' planned savings and limited progress on optimization metrics. GAO made related recommendations which agencies generally agreed with.

# OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

## Software Licensing (included in both FITARA and MEGABYTE)

FITARA requires GSA to enhance use of software license agreements across all executive agencies. More recently, the “Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016” (known as “MEGABYTE”)<sup>6</sup> required OMB to issue a directive to every executive agency CIO to, among other things, establish a comprehensive, regularly updated inventory of software licenses and analyze software usage to make cost-effective decisions.

**Why it’s important:** Agencies could potentially achieve hundreds of millions of dollars in government-wide savings, federal agencies should apply better management of software licenses and the Office of Management and Budget should issue a directive to assist agencies in doing so.

**Calculation:** An agency receives a “C” if it has a comprehensive, regularly-updated inventory of software licenses. Those agencies receive an “A” if their inventory is used to make cost-effective decisions.

**Data source (quarterly):** GAO’s recommendation follow-up activities.

**Highest-rated agencies:** Eight agencies received an “A” grade and two agencies received a “C” grade.

**Lowest-rated agencies:** 14 agencies received failing grades, although each of them had efforts underway to create and use an inventory.

**GAO reports:** Most recently, GAO reported ([GAO-14-413](#)) that better management of software licenses was needed to achieve significant savings. GAO made related recommendations and most agencies generally agreed with the recommendations or had no comments.

Agency	Complete inventory	Inventory used to make \$ decisions	May 2018	Nov. 2017	June 2017	Dec. 2016	May 2016	Nov. 2015
USDA	●	●	A	A	F			
DOC	●	●	F	F	F			
DOD	●	●	F	F	F			
Ed.	●	●	A	A	C			
Energy	●	●	F	F	F			
HHS	●	●	A	F	F			
DHS	●	●	F	F	F			
HUD	●	●	F	F	F			
DOI	●	●	F	F	F			
DOJ	●	●	C	F	F			
DOL	●	●	C	C	F			
State	●	●	F	F	F			
DOT	●	●	A	F	F			
Treas.	●	●	F	F	F			
VA	●	●	A	A	F			
EPA	●	●	F	F	F			
GSA	●	●	A	A	A			
NASA	●	●	A	A	F			
NSF	●	●	F	F	F			
NRC	●	●	F	F	F			
OPM	●	●	F	F	F			
SBA	●	●	F	F	F			
SSA	●	●	F	F	F			
USAID	●	●	A	A	A			

Not previously graded

Key: ● = agency has satisfied GAO’s related recommendation  
 ● = agency has partially satisfied GAO’s related recommendation

<sup>6</sup>Pub. L. No. 114-210 (July 29, 2016): 130 Stat. 824.

## OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

### Modernizing Government Technology Act (MGT) – **NEW AREA**

The Modernizing Government Technology (MGT) Act authorizes agencies to establish working capital funds (WCF) for use in transitioning from legacy IT systems, as well as for addressing evolving threats to information security. These working capital funds allow agencies to reinvest savings into modernization or cybersecurity initiatives. The law also created the Technology Management Fund within the Department of the Treasury, from which agencies can “borrow” money to retire and replace legacy systems as well as acquire or develop systems.

**Why it’s important:** Federal legacy IT investments are becoming increasingly obsolete: many use outdated software languages and hardware parts that are unsupported. For example, some federal agencies reported using some system components that are at least 50 years old.

**Calculation:** An agency receives an “A” if it has an MGT-specific WCF with a CIO in charge of decision-making, a “B” if it plans to setup an MGT WCF in 2018 or 2019, a “C” if it has a department-level WCF, a “D” if it has some other IT-related funding method, and an “F” otherwise.

**Data source:** agencies’ responses to OGR’s oversight letters.

**Highest-rated agencies:** 3 agencies received “B” grades: DHS, DOL, and SBA.

Agency	Plans to setup an MGT WCF	Has dept. WCF(s)	Other funding method	May 2018	Nov. 2017	June 2017	Dec. 2016	May 2016	Nov. 2015
USDA	No	Yes		C					
DOC	No response			F					
DOD	No response			F					
Ed.	Maybe	No		D					
Energy	No	Yes		C					
HHS	No	Yes		C					
DHS	Yes 2019	No		B					
HUD				C					
DOI	No	Yes		C					
DOJ	No response			F					
DOL	Yes	Yes		B					
State	No	Yes		C					
DOT	No	Yes		C					
Treas.	Maybe	Yes		C					
VA	No	No	Yes	D					
EPA	No	Yes		C					
GSA	No	Yes		C					
NASA	Maybe	Yes		C					
NSF*	No	No	Yes	D					
NRC*	No	No	Yes	D					
OPM	Unclear	No		D					
SBA	Yes 2018	No		B					
SSA	No	Yes	Yes	C					
USAID	Unclear	No		D					

Not previously graded

**Lowest-rated agencies:** 3 agencies (DOC, DOD, and DOJ) received failing grades because they did not respond to the committee’s request for MGT-related information.

**GAO reports:** Most recently, GAO reported ([GAO-16-468](#)) that federal agencies needed to address aging legacy systems and made related recommendations. Most agencies generally agreed or had no comments on the recommendations. Previously, GAO has also noted ([GAO-15-296](#)) that agencies had saved more than \$1 billion through portfolio-management efforts and could save billions more. GAO made recommendations to DOD and OMB aimed at improving the tracking and reporting of savings.

## OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

### Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) – PREVIEWED

Congress enacted the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA)<sup>7</sup> to improve federal cybersecurity and clarify government-wide responsibilities. The act is intended to promote the use of automated security tools with the ability to continuously monitor and diagnose the security posture of federal agencies, and provide for improved oversight of federal agencies' information security programs. In particular, the act clarifies and assigns additional responsibilities to entities such as OMB and DHS.

#### Why it's important:

The increasingly sophisticated threats and frequent cyber incidents underscore the urgent need for effective information security.

**Calculation:** This area combines agencies' Inspector General (IG) assessments and cross-agency priority (CAP) cybersecurity goals. IG assessments and cyber goals are each half of the grade. For example, NSF's average IG assessment was a 4 out of 5 (80% - a "B") and the agency met 6 of 9 CAP goal metrics

Agency	Average FISMA IG assessment	CAP goal metrics met	May 2018	Nov. 2017	June 2017	Dec. 2016	May 2016	Nov. 2015
USDA	2 of 5 (40%)	5 of 10 (50%)	F					
DOC	2.6 of 5 (52%)	2 of 10 (20%)	F					
DOD	Not publicly reported							
Ed.	2.2 of 5 (44%)	5 of 10 (50%)	F					
Energy	3.2 of 5 (64%)	1 of 10 (10%)	D					
HHS	2.2 of 5 (44%)	2 of 10 (20%)	F					
DHS	3.4 of 5 (68%)	3 of 10 (30%)	D					
HUD	2.2 of 5 (44%)	9 of 9 (100%)	C					
DOI	3 of 5 (60%)	6 of 10 (60%)	D					
DOJ	3 of 5 (60%)	5 of 10 (50%)	D					
DOL	2.8 of 5 (56%)	5 of 9 (56%)	F					
State	1.4 of 5 (28%)	5 of 10 (50%)	F					
DOT	2 of 5 (40%)	2 of 10 (20%)	F					
Treas.	3 of 5 (60%)	2 of 10 (20%)	D					
VA	3 of 5 (60%)	1 of 10 (10%)	D					
EPA	3 of 5 (60%)	3 of 10 (30%)	D					
GSA	3.2 of 5 (64%)	6 of 10 (60%)	D					
NASA	2 of 5 (40%)	3 of 10 (30%)	F					
NSF	4 of 5 (80%)	6 of 9 (67%)	C					
NRC	3.8 of 5 (76%)	6 of 10 (60%)	C					
OPM	2.6 of 5 (52%)	9 of 10 (90%)	C					
SBA	2.2 of 5 (44%)	3 of 9 (33%)	F					
SSA	2.2 of 5 (44%)	8 of 9 (89%)	C					
USAID	3.2 of 5 (64%)	6 of 9 (67%)	D					

Not previously graded

(67% - a "D"). The "B" and "D" combined into a "C" for this area.

**Data source:** OMB's annual FISMA report and quarterly cybersecurity CAP goals.

**Highest-rated agencies:** Five agencies received a "C." There were no higher grades.

**Lowest-rated agencies:** Nine agencies received "F" grades.

**GAO reports:** GAO first identified federal IT security as a government-wide high-risk area in 1997 ([GAO-HR-97-9](#)). Subsequently, GAO has updated and expanded the area (e.g. [GAO-HR-97-1](#), [GAO-03-119](#), and [GAO-15-290](#)) and continued to identify it as a high-risk area in its February 2017 update report ([GAO-17-317](#)).

<sup>7</sup>The Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA 2014) (Pub. L. No. 113-283, Dec. 18, 2014) partially superseded the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (FISMA 2002), enacted as Title III, E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2946 (Dec. 17, 2002).



## OGR Biannual IT Scorecard

### CIO Authority (CIO reporting structure)

Among other things, FITARA set out to ensure that federal Chief Information Officers (CIO) had a significant role in agencies' IT decisions.

**Why it's important:** Of the 24 major agencies, 15 CIOs report to the head of their agency (or the deputy). CIOs that do not report to the head of the agency weakens their ability to effectively manage IT. Given the history of federal IT failures, this is a concern.

**Calculation:** Those agencies where the CIO reports to the Secretary or Deputy Secretary receive a "+" and those that do not receive a "-." The committee lowered the overall grade of agencies by one letter if they received a "-" in this area.

**Data source (quarterly):** Organization charts on agencies' websites as well as [www.cio.gov](http://www.cio.gov).

**Resulting grades:** Fifteen agencies received "+" marks and nine agencies received "-" marks, which are appended to their overall grades. Four agencies have changed their reporting structure since the committee began grading this area.

Agency	CIO status	CIO reports to agency head	May 2018	Nov. 2017	June 2017	Dec. 2016	May 2016	Nov. 2015
USDA	Permanent	No	-	-	-	-		
DOC	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
DOD	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
Ed.	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
Energy	Permanent	Yes	+	+	-	-		
HHS	Permanent	No	-	-	-	-		
DHS	Permanent	No	-	-	-	-		
HUD	Acting	Yes	+	-	-	-		
DOI	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
DOJ	Permanent	No	-	-	-	-		
DOL	Permanent	No	-	-	-	-		
State	Acting	No	-	-	-	-		
DOT	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
Treas.	Permanent	No	-	-	-	-		
VA	Acting	Yes	+	+	+	+		
EPA	Acting	Yes	+	+	+	+		
GSA	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
NASA	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
NSF	Permanent	Yes	+	-	-	-		
NRC	Permanent	No	-	-	-	-		
OPM	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
SBA	Permanent	Yes	+	-	-	-		
SSA	Permanent	Yes	+	+	+	+		
USAID	Permanent	No	-	-	-	-		

Not previously graded

**GAO reports:** GAO has ongoing work for the committee on the authorities of federal CIOs.<sup>8</sup> That work is expected to be issued shortly after the committee's scorecard hearing.

<sup>8</sup><https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/2016-06-21-JEC-EEC-WH-MM-RK-GC-to-Dodaro-GAO-FITARA-Oversight.pdf>