The twelfth iteration of the Committee on Oversight and Reform’s (COR) IT scorecard continues to grade agencies implementation of key pieces of IT legislation:

- Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform provisions (FITARA),¹
- Modernizing Government Technology (MGT) act,² and

The COR staff selected these because:

- they represent major legislative requirements,
- the data are generally publicly available and regularly updated,
- implementation would improve IT acquisitions and operations, and
- GAO may have completed or ongoing work to verify reporting in these areas.

In addition, the staff selected specific scoring methodologies for the areas from a wide range of options and then tasked GAO to collect and score the information according to COR’s direction. The resulting grades are in the table to the right.

Since the December 2020 Scorecard, 4 agencies’ grades increased, 2 decreased, and 18 remained unchanged. These changes resulted in most agencies receiving a passing C or higher grade, with DOJ receiving a D. GSA was the single agency to receive an A for this iteration.

With this iteration, the overall methodology remained largely the same. There is one notable but minor update. The calculation for the data center grade provides a mid-year balanced assessment against the annual goals. This updated resulted in two agencies (VA and NASA) receiving higher data center grades, although it did not impact agencies’ overall grades.

---
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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. As previously mentioned, new data collection by OMB for the FY 2023 submission may impact future grading methodology for this category.

Calculation:
The portion of an agency’s projects that have at least one associated activity that plans to deliver functionality in approximately 6 months.

Data source:
Data feeds on OMB’s IT Dashboard as of July 26, 2021.

Highest-rated agencies: Nine agencies received an A for this portion of the scorecard. These agencies’ projects were delivering functionality in an incremental fashion.

Lowest-rated agencies: Four agencies (DOD, DOT, NASA, and SSA) received failing grades.

GAO reports: In a November 2017 report (GAO-18-148), GAO reported that agency CIOs certified 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, 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. As of July 2021, federal agencies took action to implement 15 of the 19 recommendations.

---

In the tenth iteration of the scorecard, agency grades were impacted by an updated incremental development grading methodology. This update was necessary because the prior methodology relied upon data that are no longer available. The 2023 budget submission may also impact the methodology for this grade because additional data related to incremental development could be made available.
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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. 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: Agencies are ranked by the portion of their major IT investments rated “red” or “yellow” (by dollar). The 8 agencies with the highest portion are given an A, the next 6 a B, the next 6 a C, the next 3 a D, and the final 1 an F (a total of 24 agencies).

Data source: Data feeds on OMB’s IT Dashboard as of July 26, 2021.

Highest-rated agencies: DOC, Education, HHS, DOJ, DOL, GSA, NSF, and USAID all received A grades for this portion of the scorecard. For example, NSF reported 100% of its IT spending on major investments as at risk and received an A in this metric.

Lowest-rated agencies: Conversely, NASA received an F, because it reported none of its major investments as at risk.

GAO reports: OMB and the agencies have taken steps to improve the ratings on the Dashboard and have addressed 19 of the 25 recommendations that GAO made in its June 2016 report (GAO-16-494). That report found that agencies underreported the risk of almost two thirds of the investments it reviewed.

5“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.
The 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 cost savings and avoidances are divided by its total IT budget for the most recent 3 fiscal years. As with the Transparency and Improved Risk Management grade, the 8 agencies with the highest ratio receive an A, then 6 Bs, 6 Cs, 3 Ds, and 1 F.

**Data sources:** Data feeds on OMB’s IT Dashboard as of July 26, 2021.

**Highest-rated agencies:** DOC, HHS, DOL, State, GSA, NASA, OPM, and SSA received A’s for this portion of the scorecard. These agencies all reported significant cost savings and avoidances. For example, HHS reportedly saved or avoided more than 5 billion dollars through its PortfolioStat effort since 2012.

**Lowest-rated agencies:** HUD continued to receive an F, because it has reported $7 million saved or avoided through PortfolioStat since 2012.

**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.

---

Prior scorecards relied on agency JSON files as the data source. The change to OMB’s IT Dashboard data feeds is due to several agency JSON files contain errors. The change in data source resulted in minor percentage changes to the portfolio review results, while the overall agency grades remained identical to the results with JSON files as the source.
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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 and the agencies worked to close several thousand data centers and saved nearly $4.1 billion from fiscal years 2016 through 2020. Moving forward, OMB has set a goal of saving $664.7 million dollars in fiscal year 2021 and 2022.

**Calculation:** Each agency’s progress towards meeting goals set by OMB are calculated, weighted, and averaged according to the committee’s priorities. The weights are: savings (30%), closures (30%), virtualization (20%), and energy metering (20%). Notably, the committee decided not to include uptime or utilization in its calculation due to data reliability concerns. These percentages are generally calculated by dividing the current value by the goal. For mid-year scorecards, the calculation provides a balanced assessment that divides the current value by half of the annual goal.²

**Data source:** Agencies’ quarterly data center submissions to OMB, as posted on the Dashboard as of June 10, 2021.

**Highest-rated agencies:** Eighteen agencies received A grades.

**Lowest-rated agencies:** DOI’s F was the lowest grade. Although it had met 96% of it closures goal and 100% of its virtualization goal, the agency met 0% and 33% of its savings and energy metering goals respectively.

**GAO reports:** In a series of reports ([GAO-17-388], [GAO-17-448], [GAO-18-264], [GAO-19-241], [GAO-20-279], [GAO-21-212]), GAO noted the potential for billions of dollars in savings. Most recently, GAO found that agencies continued to report progress, but identified oversight and cybersecurity risks that needed to be addressed.

---

²A mid-year calculation was introduced with this iteration. As a result, two agencies (VA and NASA) received increased data center grades, overall grades were not impacted.
Modernizing Government Technology Act (MGT)

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 Modernization 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 2021 or 2022, a C if it has a department WCF or equivalent, a D if it has some other IT-related funding method, and an F otherwise.

**Data source:** Agencies’ responses to COR’s questions on the MGT Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treas.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highest-rated agencies:** Three agencies (DOL, GSA, and SBA) received an A by creating separate accounts within departmental working capital fund that are managed by the CIO.

**Lowest-rated agencies:** Two agencies (VA and OPM) received a D because they do not have a MGT WCF or another means of transferring funds at the department-level.

**GAO reports:** Most recently, GAO reported (GAO-19-471) that federal agencies needed to develop modernization plans for critical legacy systems and made 8 related recommendations in a sensitive version of the report. The 8 agencies agreed with GAO’s findings and recommendations, and 7 of the agencies described plans to address the recommendations. GAO has also reported on key operating principles for effectively managing working capital funds based on a review of government-wide guidance on business principles, internal controls, managerial cost accounting, and performance management (GAO-15-56).
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Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA)

Congress enacted the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA)\(^8\) to improve federal cybersecurity and clarify government-wide responsibilities. The act promotes security tools with the ability to continuously monitor and diagnose the security of federal agencies, and provide improved oversight of security programs. The act also clarifies and assigns additional duties 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 the assessments of agencies’ Inspectors General (IG) and cross-agency priority (CAP) cybersecurity goals, which are each half of the grade. For example, if an agency’s average IG assessment were 2.4 out of 5 (48% - an F) and the agency met all 10 CAP goal metrics (100% - an A), The A and F would be averaged to a C for this area.

Data source: OMB’s fiscal year annual report to Congress with IGs’ most recent FISMA reports (2020) and quarterly cybersecurity CAP goals as reported on the IT Dashboard (2021 Q2).

Highest-rated agencies: GSA and NSF received A grades because their IG’s annual assessment averaged 4 of 5 (80%) and 4.4 of 5 (88%) respectively, and both agencies met all 10 CAP goal metrics (100%).

Lowest-rated agencies: One agency (DOC) continued to receive an F because its IG’s annual assessment averaged 2 of 5 (40%) and the agency did not fully met any of its CAP goal metrics. Seven agencies (Energy, HUD, DOI, State, VA, EPA, and NASA) received D 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 most recent March 2021 update (GAO-21-119SP).

---

Transition off GSA’s expiring telecommunications contracts (EIS)

GSA is responsible for contracts that provide telecommunications services for federal agencies. In preparation for the May 2023 expiration of current telecommunications programs, including one called Networx, GSA has developed a successor program, known as Enterprise Infrastructure Solutions (EIS).

Why it’s important: Previous delays during the transition to Networx resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in missed savings.

Calculation: This area rounds each agency’s transition percentage complete, which measures how many services each agency has moved off the expiring contracts, weighted for complexity. It compares that weighted percentage against GSA’s upcoming goal of reaching 50% by mid-2021. In other words, 45% or greater get an A, 40% to 44% get a B, 35% to 39% get a C, 30% to 34% get a D, and lower than 30% get an F.


Highest-rated agencies: Ten agencies (USDA, HHS, DOJ, DOL, Treasury, VA, NSF, NRC, SSA, and USAID) received an A by having at least a 45% on GSA’s weighted percentage metric. Additionally, these ten agencies achieved GSA’s March 2021 50% transitioned goal.

Lowest-rated agencies: NASA and OPM received an F by transitioning less than 30% of their services, with 20.1% and 21.7% respectively.

GAO reports: GAO reported (GAO-20-155) that 19 selected agencies plan to fully transition to EIS before current contracts expire in May 2023. However, 11 agencies did not plan to fully transition by the GSA’s September 30, 2022, milestone. The majority of the selected agencies also did not meet GSA’s milestones for completing critical contracting actions in 2019. In addition, five selected agencies—DOC, HHS, State, VA, and NASA—had partially implemented established planning practices that can help agencies successfully transition their telecommunications services to new contracts. GAO made 25 recommendations to DOC, HHS, NASA, State, and VA, to fully implement the established transition planning practices. The agencies concurred with all of the recommendations.

---

*Although GSA’s March 2021 goal of having reached 50% of the transition has past, this iteration of the scorecard maintains a calculation based on the mid-2021 goal.*
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, 16 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: Agencies structured so that the CIO reports to the agency head or deputy receive a “+” and those that do not receive a “-.” The committee also gave partial credit to 5 agencies based upon their recent actions (noted by the absence of a “+” or “-”). The committee lowered the overall grade of agencies by one letter if they received a “-” in this area.

Data source: Organization charts on agencies’ websites, www.cio.gov, leadership directories, and GAO’s tracking of agencies efforts to address GAO-18-93.

Resulting grades: Nineteen agencies’ overall grades received a “+” or “-” mark. Specifically, 16 agencies received “+” marks and 3 agencies received “-” marks. The remaining 5 agencies (HHS, DHS, State, Treasury, and USAID) received no mark.

GAO reports: In August 2018, GAO reported (GAO-18-93) that the policies of the 24 agencies did not fully address the role of their CIOs consistent with laws and guidance. GAO attributed these shortcomings to weaknesses in OMB’s guidance, and made recommendations to OMB and each of the 24 agencies to improve the effectiveness of federal CIOs.