FITARA 8.0

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT
AND REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 26, 2019

Serial No. 116–40

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Reform

⁂

Available on: *http://www.govinfo.gov*
http://www.oversight.house.gov or
http://www.docs.house.gov

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland, *Chairman*

CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of
    Columbia
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI, Illinois
JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland
HARLEY ROUDA, California
KATIE HILL, California
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
JOHN P. SARBANES, Maryland
PETER WELCH, Vermont
JACKIE SPEIER, California
ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois
MARK DESAULNIER, California
BRENDA L. LAWRENCE, Michigan
STACEY E. PLASKETT, Virgin Islands
RO KHANNA, California
JIMMY GOMEZ, California
ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan

JIM JORDAN, Ohio, *Ranking Minority Member*
JUSTIN AMASH, Michigan
PAUL A. GOSAR, Arizona
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
THOMAS MASSIE, Kentucky
MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina
JODY B. HICE, Georgia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin
JAMES COMER, Kentucky
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas
BOB GIBBS, Ohio
RALPH NORMAN, South Carolina
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana
CHIP ROY, Texas
CAROL D. MILLER, West Virginia
MARK E. GREEN, Tennessee
KELLY ARMSTRONG, North Dakota
W. GREGORY STEUBE, Florida

DAVID RAPALLO, *Staff Director*
WENDY GINSBERG, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
YVETTE BADU-NIMAKO, *Director of Policy and Counsel*
JOSHUA ZUCKER, *Assistant Clerk*
CHRISTOPHER HIXON, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

————

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Gerald E. Connolly, Virginia, *Chairman*

Eleanor Holmes Norton, District of Columbia,
JOHN SARBANES, Maryland
JACKIE SPEIER, California
BRENDA LAWRENCE, Michigan
STACEY PLASKETT, Virgin Islands
RO KHANNA, California
STEPHEN LYNCH, Massachsetts
JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland

Mark Meadows, North Carolina, *Ranking
    Minority Member*
THOMAS MASSIE, Kentucky
JODY HICE, Georgia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin
JAMES COMER, Kentucky
RALPH NORMAN, South Carolina
W. STEUBE, Florida

(II)

C O N T E N T S

_____

*Written opening statements and statements for the witnesses are available
on the U.S. House of Representatives Document Repository at: https://
docs.house.gov.*

No additional documents were entered into the record during this hearing.

FITARA 8.0

Wednesday, June 26, 2019

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 4:07 p.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Gerald E. Connolly (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Connolly, Norton, Khanna, Meadows, Massie, Grothman, and Jordan.

Mr. CONNOLLY. The subcommittee will come to order. And without objection, the chair is authorized to declare a recess of the committee at any time.

This subcommittee is convening our eighth biannual hearing to assess FITARA, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, and other information technology laws.

I want to recognize our two witnesses on the first panel. Very brief—I'm going to recognize myself very briefly for an opening statement.

FITARA, from our point of view, is a tool that can be used for change agents within Federal agencies to come into the 21st century to make ourselves more efficient, to achieve economies, to improve productivity and morale while also better serving the American people. Not doing that has huge costs including compromising data, big data bases that we are charged as the Federal Government with protecting. And so after we passed FITARA, we wanted to make sure that what happened to FITARA was not what happened with Clinger-Cohen, its predecessor law, where both authors of the legislation left Congress, and there was really nobody who felt they were vested in making sure that law did what it was intended to do. We wanted to make sure that did not happen.

And so I think by now it's pretty clear that our committee is as committed as ever to insisting on implementation of the law. We create a scorecard working with GAO that's designed to incentivize that cooperation and that reform so that we can achieve all of the valued goal, as I just enunciated. It's not designed to burn a scarlet letter on an agency's back or a CIO's back. It is designed to be a tool to incentivize change for the good. And that's the spirit in which we are going to have today's hearing.

We are glad that there are agencies that are showing steady progress. And we believe that there are some agencies that would show even more progress had they not fallen back on the CIO reporting sequence in the organization chart or if they had, in fact,

adopted that as a reform. We want to see a reporting sequence that makes sure that the chief CIO is reporting to the boss. And that's our goal. And you get scored on that if you're not doing it.

So anyway, we're going to get on with the hearing. I want to thank everyone for their patience with the House schedule, both this subcommittee and the floor votes. Sorry to keep everybody waiting, but that was beyond my control or Mr. Meadows' control.

And it now gives me great pleasure to recognize my friend, the distinguished ranking member and the former chairman of this subcommittee, and my partner in crime, Mr. Meadows.

Mr. MEADOWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your leadership. I'm going to be extremely brief because of the lateness of the hour.

Thank you both for being here. Some of you have made recommendations in terms of direct reports on CIOs. I can tell you that, having a conversation with NASA, I think they're going to address that. And so the bottom line, we're paying very close attention to it. We're working in a bipartisan fashion. We want everybody to understand the score cards are meaningful to us, and eventually they're going to be meaningful to the agencies because we're working to attach dollars both as penalties and rewards to that, because I believe that if you're getting good responses, you ought to be rewarded.

I can tell you that I took a visit over to OPM the other day. And the way that we're doing Federal benefits is archaic. We have got to change that. And I am willing—you know, this fiscally conservative Republican is willing to spend money to get it done. So this is a critical piece.

And with that, thank you both for coming to testify. Thank all the staff. Listen, I know the work gets done, many times without a lot of applause. But I want to applaud everybody who's trying to make this work. And I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the Connolly Issa bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. My friend is too kind, and I thank him.

So for our first two witnesses, we have Suzette Kent, who is the Federal chief information officer from the Office of Management and Budget. I think this is your first time before us, Ms. Kent; is that correct.

Ms. KENT. This is my second.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Second. Okay. Well, welcome back.

And Carol Harris, who, of course, is the director of IT management issues at the Government Accountability Office.

If you would both rise, please. We swear all of our witnesses in here at the committee.

And if you'd raise your right hands, do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

Let the record show that both of our witnesses answered in the affirmative. Thank you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. The microphones are sensitive, so please speak directly into them. Without objection, your full written testimony will be made part of the record, so I would ask you to verbally summarize your testimony as best you can within the five-minute window. With that, Ms. Kent, over to you.

**STATEMENT OF SUZETTE KENT, FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMA-
TION OFFICER, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET**

Ms. KENT. Thank you, Chairman Connolly, Ranking Member
Meadows, and members of the committee, thank you for having me
here today. I'm honored to be here to discuss FITARA and tech-
nology topics that are of vital importance to empowering agencies
to achieve their missions. As you open, FITARA is more than just
a law and a scorecard; it serves as a vehicle for how we commu-
nicate involving priorities and a measure to demonstrate progress.

This administration continues to emphasize the FITARA goals
through the IT modernization goal in the President's management
agenda and in the executive order on CIO authorities. Our govern-
ment's ID policies must be as nimble and iterative as the global
technology industry and the changing nature of the threat land-
scape we're addressing. This intent drove our policy updates in
2018 and 2019.

Some of those policies had not been updated in almost a decade.
We also sought to update how we measure success, so the council
provided recommendations to GAO and to this Oversight Com-
mittee around how we continue to enhance the FITARA scorecard
and continue to make it meaningful in driving progress.

Additionally, we are focused on making metrics and measures
data driven, publicly available, and continuous through the
websites. We made great strides in IT modernization in the last
two years. I'll highlight a couple of quick examples. Increasing
adoption of commercial cloud email from 45 percent to 72 percent.
That's 1.8 million mailboxes now. We closed 150 enterprise
datacenters.

All 23 civilian CFO act agencies have hit defined targets for data
ex-filtration detection and 21 have met targets on mobile device se-
curity, and our technology modernization fund projects have yield-
ed playbooks and working strategies that can be easy—easily rep-
licated to accelerate agency systems migrations.

We've updated policy on high value assets, identity and creden-
tial and access management, cloud smart, datacenter, and deliv-
ered for the first time a Federal data strategy with a one-year ac-
tion plan. And in May, various agency CIOs, OMB policy leaders,
and I met with congressional staff members of this and other com-
mittees to walk through all of those policy updates and how those
actually drive progress forward for enhancements. The recently re-
leased cloud smart strategy is a great example of how we remove
barriers.

Three key areas prevented adoption of cloud and technologies
that were addressed in the update. Security. How we move from a
perimeter-based model to a data-centric model. Procurement. Agen-
cies had to adjust to these new consumption-based models, and
most important, how we address and develop the Federal work
force to operate effectively in these new paradigms.

It also includes a directive for agencies to develop an application
rationalization road map. This road map is critical and it defines
what can move to the cloud and helps inform the datacenter needs
and helps us define those targets for what will be closed.

The CIO Council has recently released the application rational-
ization playbook to help agencies achieve this task. Since

datacenter optimization is also important to this committee, I'll briefly comment on a couple of pieces of division in the new policy. We closely studied the data collected under the original memo and working with agencies, we identified ways to streamline the closure process and clearly identify facility types that will continue to be needed for agency mission specific reasons. We included these learnings in the updated policy, which does focus on enabling aggressive closure with specific targets by agency and ensuring efficient operations where datacenters deemed to be a key mission facility that's part of that agency's mission.

Last year when I testified to this committee, I highlighted work force challenges and any technology transformation the people that are charged with acquiring, deploying, and operating in that new environment are ultimately the key to the transformation success and we must invest in providing the experiences that our work force needs to keep their skills relevant.

Next month we will be celebrating the graduation of our first Federal cyber rescaling academy and we will have kicked off our second cohort. These initiatives are a way that we're investing in our current, dedicated, and qualified Federal employees to both enhance their careers, but simultaneously address our work force gaps in the technology area.

As the reskilling model proves itself, we hope to replicate it for other skill areas and we endeavor to make this approach a standard operating procedure, not just a onetime special project.

So in closing, our continued coordination with Congress is key to making government modern, secure, and mission ready. We know that the American people expect our Nation to be a world leader on every front including technology and cybersecurity.

In this discussion today, we know that agencies are making progress, but modernization and battling cybersecurity threats are a continuous journey and there's much more to do. With the support of Congress, we will continue to raise the bar in agency performance, and overall empower agencies to leverage technology to enable their mission, to improve the citizen services and be effective stewards of taxpayer money.

Thank you for the opportunity today, and I look forward to answering your questions.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Ms. Kent. And when you go back to OMB, you're going to be able to say, I'm the one person in this White House who went to a hearing on impeachment and subpoenas and nothing like that was discussed at all.

Ms. KENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Ms. Harris?

STATEMENT OF CAROL HARRIS, IT MANAGEMENT ISSUES, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Ms. HARRIS. Chairman Connolly, Ranking Member Meadows, and members of the subcommittee. I'd like to thank you and your staff for your continued oversight on IT management and cybersecurity with this eighth set of grades.

Overall, five agencies' grades went up, four went down, and 11 remained the same. HHS and NASA's overall grades were lowered because their CIOs no longer report to the head or deputy of the

agency. This is also the first time in which four agencies received two grades, which we prepared at your request in response to changes to OMB's datacenter initiative.

I'd like to briefly comment on this and other selected areas of your scorecard. I'll first start with the dashboard portfolio stat areas. Thirteen agencies' grades were increased by this committee as a way to recognize a significant progress made in these areas governmentwide since scorecard 1.0 4 years ago. This progress would not have happened to this extent without your scorecard in oversight.

I'll turn to FISMA next, which is now included in the scorecard methodology. It's inclusion had a generally negative effect as there were 12 agencies with either a D or an F. Only one agency, NSF, received an A and four received a B.

Next, Incremental Development. This area now captures projects that are not primarily software development in nature such as a non-IT acquisition with the tech component. This change, which was previewed in scorecard 7.0 was suggested by the CIO Council and makes this area more comprehensive. As a result, we saw ten agencies grades in this area decrease while three agencies went up.

And last, with respect to datacenters, you asked us to show a set of overall grades that use the datacenter grades from 7.0 as well as another set that excluded these grades entirely. If datacenter grades were included, HUD and EPA's overall grades would increase and VA and SSA's grades would decrease. The reason for the two sets of grades relates to OMB's changes to its datacenter optimization initiative.

Among other things, OMB's guidance revises the classification of datacenters and datacenter optimization metrics. For example, OMB will no longer require agencies to maintain inventories of their smaller nontiered datacenters which make up about 80 percent of the government's facilities. If these changes are implemented as is, the committee will lose the ability to track and measure progress in this area since the initial scorecard because the baseline for comparison will have changed.

Moreover, the changes will likely slow down or even halt important progress agencies should be making to consolidate, optimize, and secure their datacenters.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my comments on the overall scorecard. I look forward to your questions.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you so much. Let me begin. Ms. Harris, we're here to talk about the implementation of a law, correct?

Ms. HARRIS. Correct.

Mr. CONNOLLY. When it comes to datacenters, what is the language of the law?

Ms. HARRIS. The language says that agencies should have a comprehensive datacenter inventory.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And what's the goal besides an inventory?

Ms. HARRIS. The goal is to consolidate.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Correct. That's the verb. We say I believe in the law, consolidation, and optimization, but consolidation goes first and it means something presumably other than optimization, would you agree——

Ms. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY [continuing]. since we use both words?

Ms. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Ms. Kent, one of the concerns we have, although your memo delivered to us on June 25 adds some clarity that may be reassuring, but since we got a hearing, our concern is that when OMB gives guidance on optimization and exempts 80 percent of the datacenters from specific inventory plans, you are—you're skirting the intent of the law.

The intent of the law was always to identify how many datacenters we had, which was a struggle, and then cut them in half and then cut them in half again. That was the goal. It was set by your predecessor in the early years of the Obama Administration, actually. In those days I think we thought we had 1600, and so the goal was initially by the administration cut it to 800 and my bill said, no, we're going to do that again, cut it to 400. And that's what we put—we didn't put that number, but that's—that was what we incorporated into FITARA.

What we discovered was that, of course, what we got really good at was identifying more. And so we didn't have 1600, we had whatever it was, Ms. Harris, 12,000, 14,000, and so at some point we thought, well, good that you're getting better at counting, but the goal here is to be more efficient, move to the cloud, don't have all these little stovepipes all over the place, and I know you share that goal.

So I want to give you the opportunity to talk about, well, what is it that OMB is doing in emphasizing optimization and exempting from, sort of, our audit here 80 percent of the datacenters that exist because we're afraid that whatever your intent, the consequence is we won't capture that and we will not effectuate the savings the law was intended to encourage.

Ms. KENT. Thank you for your question, sir, and the opportunity to talk about it. And first statement of intent is to comply with the law.

Mr. CONNOLLY. We are relieved.

Ms. KENT. You referenced changing various numbers over points and time, and that was one of the components of the analysis was that there were things that had been included that included rate things for printers and weather stations and things that weren't necessary—MRI machines weren't actually classified as a datacenter, so some of the things are trying to address what actually operates as a datacenter and we intend to close. And that is very specific in the new guidance.

But we also understand and very clearly from talking with agencies, there are some reasons where we will continue to operate a datacenter, a super computer site, something that is needed for resiliency, special needs of agencies that we believe are very important and we want to ensure those are being operated efficiently and securely with the intent of this committee.

But we also found out something else that's included in the cloud strategy. One of the barriers to making progress from closing those remaining datacenters and the IT dashboard has the target, by Fiscal Year for each of the agencies that was developed at the agency level, but in some cases, the application rationalization work is not complete. So they don't have an identified target for whether it's

moving to the cloud or what we're going to do with it, so that's the part of the application rationalization playbook that's included in cloud and you will hear some agencies, they've met their target, they've done a fantastic job, but other agencies have more work to do.

Mr. CONNOLLY. How long have you worked in government?

Ms. KENT. Sixteen months today.

Mr. CONNOLLY. All right. So sometimes with the best of intentions and trying to be flexible, we send signals we did not intend to send and that's our concern. We don't want a rigid, mindless mentality, and you've—everything you said I can agree with and I know Mr. Meadows could too, but both of us come from private sector backgrounds and I also come from a public sector management background and I'm a big believer and I think—I know Mr. Meadows is too, in setting metrics because that's goal setting.

So at the end of the day, yes, we want to be flexible, but what we felt—and I still do feel, we've got to set metrics. So Agency X, we all agree you've got 340 and after some consultation and all that, the goal is to reduce a hundred of them because the others you need or cut it in half.

Once we do that, let's set that and hold people to that metric and we're willing to work with you on that. What we obviously don't want is a circumvention and a dilution of the goal and we're nervous optimization gives a lot of wiggle room.

And it's easy for somebody to say I have 3,420 of them and I need every one of them. Every one is precious, and we're not going to change a thing. Or wait you out because, after-all, you've used this weaker word optimization, which doesn't really require me to do something specific and so I know that's not your intent, but you hear my concern and my experience is, sometimes you've got to give very clear direction and set very explicit metrics in order to accomplish something.

Ms. KENT. I hear your concern. I look forward to continuing to talk with the committee because I think we are being extremely explicit and actually in the opening of the guidance, it specifically says, any plans to open new or expand have to be approved by OMB as well as the closure intent is part of their strategic planning and reporting in the capital planning process.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And as I said at the beginning, I'd be more worried but I think your memo of June 25 does, I agree, it's reassuring in some ways.

Ms. KENT. Thank you, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Not 100 percent, but maybe we're all on the same page. So all right. I saw you shake your head in agreement about the CIO reporting to the boss and I want to give you an opportunity given your title and your position to maybe talk about that. I think, again, both Mr. Meadows and I know Mr. Hurd if he were here and Ms. Kelly if she were here, our experiences, especially in bureaucracies—and I don't mean that in a pejorative way, but big, large organizations who you report to matters a lot.

Ms. KENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. If you report to the deputy assistant under widget manager in the bowels of the basement, everyone can figure that out and it's how fascinating you've got an opinion about what I

should do with my IT, but I'm going to listen to him because he's the assistant secretary or the secretary or whatever he is.

When you report to the boss and everyone knows you report to the boss, that carries weight and we want to empower a CIO to have that relationship and to carry that kind of weight and make those kinds of decisions. I think Ms. Harris indicated that in the case of two agencies had they done that, they would have had A scores. Is that correct?

Ms. HARRIS. Yep. That's correct.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yes. So we're missing an opportunity here. How can we better encourage that org chart and that hierarchy of efficient responsibility so that we're all doing better?

Ms. KENT. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on that. We do share that concern and are very focused on not just the reporting relationship from the perspective of reporting to the boss, but ensuring that we have technology as a mission enabler and they are absolutely clear with the direction from the top about what the priorities are and what set out to be accomplished by that agency.

We shared your concerns with the agencies that moved backward, we had direct conversations with them as well, and appreciate your continued support in emphasizing that both through law, through guidance, and through an executive order, directives have been issued. We're going to continue those conversations and I do believe, though, that in—it's a conversation with GAO and some of the scorecard reporting relationships, there are agencies who have made recent changes. They recognize the intent. I've had opportunity to be with at least three of those agencies in conversations with the Secretary and the CIO with clarity around priorities, budget, and resource needs. So we will continue to focus on it, your support in those that moved backward is much appreciated.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, and I have overstayed my welcome. So I know my friend, Mr. Meadows, has, in fact, directly engaged in one of these questions to good effect. Mr. Meadows?

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, thank you for continuing to make this a priority. I know this is not our first, second, or third FITARA hearing. It won't be our last and for both of you, thank you for your testimony.

Obviously Ms. Harris, thank you for continuing with your fine folks at GAO to guide us through on what we believe is—will ultimately be a good tool. I don't know that we're there yet. I think my perspective is that it's a work in progress and even with the way that we changed the grading just recently to make sure that some of the unintended consequences are not there.

So Ms. Kent, one of the areas that we've got to be aware of is, as we start to see how agencies game the system, and I say game the system in that, you know, it's basically figuring out how the scorecard works and how you can either underreport or overreport to create a better grade and so we're trying to address that.

Getting back to the point that the chairman made just a few minutes ago as it relates to datacenters, so I'll give you the cheat sheet. There is nothing more important to him than getting rid of datacenters and he can look at all the scores on this FITARA scorecard and if you're messing up on datacenters, you're going to have

a problem. All right? So I just—Ms. Harris, would you agree with that?

Ms. HARRIS. I would absolutely agree with that.

Mr. MEADOWS. And so in doing that, here's what I would ask for greater clarification than what we have. The word "optimization" when we look at that, you know, you can optimize this and it doesn't necessarily mean that we're changing anything and so here's what I would ask is, if you could provide this committee with some—and GAO with guidance on what optimization actually means. I mean, are we looking at 70 percent capacity on servers? Are we looking at redundancy of X percentage? What does it mean because what it means to one agency will be very different than—and, actually, probably, should be different for some agencies.

You certainly want redundancy in some areas of the government with greater—with the need for greater reliability than others. That being said, we need to define that and make sure that Ms. Harris and her team has the proper input.

One of the concerns is that the quality of the data that we continue to get is a hodge podge, and so I need to make sure that that gets prioritized, if you can, and if you're running into a problem, here's, I think, the chairman and I would agree, you just call us, we'll be glad to raise it to the very highest levels within those agencies.

I know when Ms. Harris the other day mentioned the direct report for the NASA administrator, I'm one of the few that have had the privilege of knowing the previous NASA administrator under the previous administration and thinking incredibly highly of him and what he was able to accomplish.

I also have a personal relationship with the new NASA administrator and so I sent him a text and just said, listen, this is not good. You're getting dinged on the scorecard. He responded back promptly, we're going to take care of it and those are the kind of things that I think all of us just want to see, is just that willingness to say, golly, we didn't know it was a problem, especially when you have a transition from administration to administration, but that's the other key point, I guess.

And what I would love to see from you, Ms. Kent, is the processes in place that when we change an administration, we don't go backward. I think there's a real—and it's not a ding on this administration or the prior administration that have, you know, been able to deal with FITARA, but it's a real problem that we are going to have going forward is the minute you get a new political appointee in there, if they don't realize that it's a big deal, then we're going to have the same thing with somebody that's here for 16 months saying, golly gee, I didn't know it was a problem.

So is that something that you can work with the committee in terms of establishing those for us?

Ms. KENT. Yes, it certainly is. And I appreciate our ongoing discussions. The phone call from Members of Congress certainly seems to assist in getting action and we would very much like to talk through the details on the guidance on what we are holding agencies accountable when we say optimization. It's some of the things that have been part of the baseline and been defined, and I would add one more point on the CIOs. We're at a point today as reflected

in the scorecard for the first time where we have 22 of 24 that are actually permanent and not acting, and that is—as you look over the history of the scorecard, that's an important accomplishment.

Mr. MEADOWS. And that's to be applauded. It truly is.

Ms. KENT. And it let's us move forward as you have said and have some consistency as we go forward, so I do look forward to taking those followups back to this committee.

Mr. MEADOWS. I yield back.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend and I reiterate his offer. Another way of putting it as, he and I are Alphonse Gaston and I'm not going to say which is which, but it's all good.

The gentlelady from the District of Columbia, our friend, Eleanor Holmes-Norton.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a timely hearing given what we learn was the state of IT, of technology in the Federal Government, how behind the Government of the United States was, so I'm interested in how we're doing in catching up.

Now it looks like we made a decent start, 90 million in funds allocated during that first year, so the first thing I'd want to know since this is so new is, examples of modernization projects that have been done. What have you done with the money particularly given reductions in appropriations which perhaps we could help get if we could have some examples, good examples that speak to the public and speak to the Congress about what you've done with the pretty good start. You had $90 million in the fund I'm interested in is the technology modernization fund.

Ms. KENT. I'd be very excited to share some of those successes with you and I'll frame a couple of things. Just in the time since the board has started, so a little over a year, we looked at over 50—or approximately 50 proposals that would have totaled almost $600 million. Now, as you pointed out, we only funded a very small set of approximately—that represented $90 million and those were projects that had not only agency benefit, but all of government benefit and I'd like to tell you the—share the success stories of a couple.

You will hear later from USDA, one of the initiatives that they undertook was consolidation of multiple portals for farmers.gov to provide an enhanced services for things that had been spread out and created an environment that was not only the most effective from customer service, but from—or farmer facing, but from a maintenance perspective, more costly and less efficient.

In the case of HUD, they have eight applications that are cobalt applications that are core applications to their mission and they brought forward two of those as a pilot to learn both the tools, the process, and the playbooks to convert that from cobalt to java and not disrupt the business. And that's a really exciting part of what they are achieving is, they've been able to take 1.2 million lines of code and convert it and not disrupt the business.

Ms. NORTON. Is this a competitive process? Is this based on who will cost you less while saving you some money in this fund? How do you judge?

Ms. KENT. That's a great question.

Ms. NORTON. They compete against one another, or how?

Ms. KENT. So in what was actually laid out in the law, there were specific intents—modernization, implementation of shared services, work force transformation, large broad scale transformation. There was also a very important component that the benefits from the initiative could pay back the funds that they received, so not every project actually has—and they have to pay it back in a very specified timeframe under a definition of——

Ms. NORTON. Are they doing that, by the way?

Ms. KENT. They are doing that. They are doing that. As I said, we started a year ago and this is the first time we will have money coming back on schedule as planned——

Ms. NORTON. Your appropriations——

Ms. KENT. I'm sorry?

Ms. NORTON [continuing]. fail, though, tremendously from that healthy $100 million in that first year to only $25 million in 2019, so giving—excuse me?

Ms. KENT. Yes, ma'am. It certainly has moved.

Ms. NORTON. That's a huge reduction. I'm not sure why, but I'd like, since this was supposed to be a full cost recovery fund, how does that work and are you concerned about the funds' ability to remain solvent?

Ms. KENT. It is full cost recovery and I appreciate Congressman—Chairman Connolly's support for the technology modernization fund. We did request additional funds because we saw the worthiness of all these projects coming forward and in many cases with the agencies and I would invite you to speak with our team at USDA in the next panel. The agencies were able to accelerate things that they would not be able to do in normal course of business and they have a payback plan.

And one of the other very large benefits that we saw and I know that Department of Energy, USDA, HUD, and GSA have shared is that it brought the CIO and CFO communities very close together because they had to reconcile the spend and the payback plan and what the benefits look like in a way that they have never been tasked to do before to ensure that it is cost recoverable, so we've very much appreciate——

Ms. NORTON. Do you think you can remain solvent?

Ms. KENT. Yes, we can remain solvent with that amount. It limits what we can do——

Ms. NORTON. I see.

Ms. KENT [continuing]. and the projects we can—we absolutely have the plan for solvency, but it limits the number of projects and the acceleration of modernization that we can do going forward.

Ms. NORTON. That's my concern, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you.

And if I could, just before I call on you, Mr. Grothman, if I may, just quick, Ms. Harris, the fund that Ms. Kent and Ms. Norton were just talking about Congress created. Originally we had pretty large amounts of money in mind. That got whittled down and whittled down and whittled down in order to be able to sell the idea of the authorization.

Do you believe that we have critical mass that this fund as currently funded is viable or, put differently, can actually make a dif-

ference, be the catalyst we intended it to be for people to retire legacy systems?

Ms. HARRIS. I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman. With fewer funds to award, the TMF cannot recover as much in their administrative fees. So when Ms. Norton is asking about solvency, we have preliminary analysis that shows that the office's operating cost through Fiscal Year 2020 will exceed the administrative fees to be collected from these awarded projects. So our suggestion and—is for the TMF fund to be fully funded at that $438 million level to continue the good work that Ms. Kent is elaborating on.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I think that this is something we can find some common ground on, and we need to work in the next budget cycle hopefully together so we have a number we can all agree on that is meaningful, gives us the criticality we need, and that can incentivize agencies to do the very thing you were describing, Ms. Kent.

And finally, just both of you, on—I know this is on behalf of Mr. Hurd as well as all of us, but one of the things we encountered was agencies saying, well, we're creating a fund within our agency to be able to capture the savings effectuated in FITARA, but our lawyers are telling us we can't use them, we can't put money in them because that's an appropriations function.

Now, some agencies I don't think seem to have that problem but others do. Just real quickly, do you both believe that we need to fix that legislatively, or can that be done administratively with guidance from OMB?

Ms. KENT. We believe in some of the cases it has to be fixed legislatively and there is wording proposed at the committee level. We had proposed some blanket language that would apply to all agencies. That has been turned down multiple times. So we have gone very specifically to individual agencies, and in some cases, through those committees, that has been approved.

We have some requests and education is one of those directly at the committee level for various technical enablement of those funds for agencies who don't have a similar vehicle or need to fund or operate out of that working capital account.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Ms. Harris.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I think——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Could you speak up?

Ms. HARRIS. Yes. Mr. Chairman, when MGT was passed, I mean, the intent was that that transfer authority would be there. So while I'm not a lawyer, it kind of boggles the mind that you would need additional legislation in order to offer that transfer authority so that MGT could be——

Mr. CONNOLLY. I know Mr. Hurd would share your view and so do I. And I don't speak for Mr. Meadows, but he's here. He can speak for himself. But our view is the law is the law. We passed the law. It's quite clear what the intent is. And to have a sudden hurdle from inside agency attorneys saying, well, no, you can't do that, certainly thwarts the intent of the law, that that may not be their purpose but that's the effect. And so we will do what we have to do, but we would share, I think, your initial reaction, Ms. Harris.

Mr. Meadows, did you want to comment on that?

Mr. MEADOWS. Well, I just agree. And What I'd like to do——

Mr. CONNOLLY. You do agree?

Mr. MEADOWS. I do agree.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yes.

Mr. MEADOWS. And, Ms. Kent, what I would like to do—I think congressional intent was clear. I think general counsels in different agencies maybe are a little unclear in what we believe we were clear about. And so in doing that some guidance I think would go a long way, and if we need to do a little research and a little push on our end to support that, I'm willing to do that.

Ms. KENT. I'd be happy to share the specific examples with you and appreciate your support.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yep. That would be very helpful. I thank my friend.

Mr. Khanna, the gentleman from California.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you. Well, first, Chairman Connolly, I want to recognize your leadership for having the FITARA guidelines become law and really bring some accountability to technology in government. And I want to recognize our ranking member, Representative Meadows, for also his understanding on technology.

You know, I represent Silicon Valley, and probably the biggest thing that surprised me when I got to Congress is some of the technological illiteracy in this place. There was one hearing, I'm not going to mention the Member, who held his up his iPhone and started berating the Google CEO telling him how he couldn't track the iPhone. And the Google CEO was patiently explaining that Apple made the iPhone.

I appreciate, Ms. Kent, your leadership coming from a technology background. When I'm pressed to say what part of the administration I liked, I often cite you and Matt Lira. And I appreciated your work on the IDEA Act, which coincides with FITARA and was bipartisan legislation that we all passed. And I would like to know what is the status of the implementation guidelines for that legislation?

Ms. KENT. Thank you for your question, sir, and thank you for your kind comments. I'd very much like to tell you about where we are with the IDEA Act, and I was honored to be there with you when that was signed at the end of the year.

Our immediate action with all of the agencies was to take the specific items that were laid out in the IDEA Act and determine both the timeline and what things needed to be done centrally and what things needed to be done by the agency specifically.

We met with the agencies and outlined those pieces. Some components were actually part of work that was already underway, things like the inventory that you required and the definition or the intent for a plan for how those would be handled. I know that the report for digital signature acceptance has just come in.

So we aligned those things with what was already in place. We also had some items that you will see in some of the budget requests that are coming forward that has to do with those forward implementation plans. And we look to do those in the future.

I would share one really interesting outcome of the IDEA Act. In inventorying the websites and determining a plan forward, it was very enlightening because many of the agencies said we need to

consolidate this set of websites. So we actually looked at them from priority and a user-centered approach of what was highly used, what was highly valued. And then those things that didn't have the user traffic, wasn't delivering specific services, other reasons, we're actually pursuing a plan to consolidate and close those.

So we are moving forward with many aspects of the implementation, they are included in the activities going on now. And there are some pieces for which agencies needed additional resources, and you'll see those reflected in their 2020 budgets.

Mr. KHANNA. Great. Let me ask you one final open-ended question. I don't think anyone on the committee would disagree that the U.S. Government is the most powerful institution created in human history. And it was the U.S. Government actually that helped fund a lot of Silicon Valley. And so it's mind boggling me that this incredibly powerful institution has technology platforms or acquisition platforms that aren't up to now what many companies do in Silicon Valley.

What do you think Congress can do in supporting FITARA and the IDEA Act to help continue to get us to a place where the U.S. Government should be the model for innovation?

Ms. KENT. Your question actually aligns with part of the reason that I'm here and actually believing that same thing, that we should have the capabilities in the Federal Government that are available across many other industries and set the basis of expectations for our citizens.

So when we talk about particularly modernization and cybersecurity as part of the FITARA Act those are the key components of how we actually make this transformation. Elements of the IDEA Act give us a prioritization to be able to actually take action and shut down and close the websites and rethink how we deliver services.

The connected government and delivering mobile and digital services help make those things a priority. Those signals both through the FITARA scorecard and specific legislation are helpful. I would also say though when you look across at the agency activity for IT budgets we do—and it's—this committee has talked about it frequently—we spend quite a bit on maintenance of those legacy systems.

So tools like the Technology Modernization Fund and modernization initiatives that are outside of that basic maintenance helps us drive faster and gives us a way—otherwise agencies are moving in small increments for what they can divert out of that maintenance path, and that's not a good solution either.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the gentleman.

And now the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Grothman.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Thank you.

And I'd like to thank both of you for coming over here. I know you have such a busy day, but I know it's something Congress has been waiting for, so thanks for coming over.

Health and Human Services and NASA changed their reporting structures, right, so that the CIOs no longer report directly to the head or even the deputy head of the agency. Can you comment as to why that was done and what your general opinion of it is?

Ms. KENT. I can comment from my conversations regarding that. I would direct you specifically to the agency heads as to why they made that decision. You know, what NASA shared had decisions that were not necessarily related to the activities of the CIO. I think that's in conflict with what we expected. And as you may have seen in the HHS side they had lots of different moves going on at the time. I am continuing my conversation with them regarding that approach.

Mr. GROTHMAN. It just seems odd.

Ms. KENT. And we agree, and that is not the intent. So we will continue the conversations until we are back in a place that is reflective of what is expected.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. Ms. Harris?

Ms. HARRIS. I mean, the only thing I would add, sir, is in the case of HHS that reporting relationship was not codified in their policy. So at the time the acting CIO also was dual hatted as the acting chief or the chief technology officer, and so in that role as a chief technology officer he had that direct reporting relationship to the Secretary. And so when he put on the hat of CIO he also had that relationship to the Secretary.

But since he has now vacated that CIO position because that relationship wasn't codified in policy it went away, and so that really drives the important point that this relationship needs to be set in stone in policy so that we can maintain that continuity regardless of who is in the office.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. Let me give you kind of a broad-based question here. From your perspective—first of all, how long have you both had your positions? I should know that and I don't.

Ms. KENT. Sorry. Could you repeat the question?

Mr. GROTHMAN. How long have you had your position?

Ms. KENT. Sixteen months.

Ms. HARRIS. Since 2012.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. From your perspective what worries you the most about IT management, say the last six months?

Anything?

Maybe nothing. It runs like a clock.

Ms. HARRIS. I think from my perspective when you take a look at the spend of the $90 billion each year on IT, 80 percent of that spend is on legacy IT. We need to focus on decreasing that number and reinvesting that money into modernizing our aging systems.

Mr. GROTHMAN. It's kind of a shocking number, isn't it?

Ms. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. If it was done right, how much do you think you could save?

Ms. KENT. It is. And I think I just commented on modernization that reflects a similar view. I would also state that when you look at our entire set of modernization goals, both transformation of the legacy systems and the ability to sustain current environment while you're making that transformation and then continued focus, you said, you know, what are the priorities, it is always cyber, and ensuring that we are prioritizing our activities there based on the changing nature of the threat environment and where we see that volume and where we see those types of threats and ensuring that we are prioritizing that.

So when the majority of an agency budget goes to maintaining status quo that means that agency CIOs have to be incredibly crystal clear on the priority for those funds and their internal resources that are focused on the transformation in cybersecurity.

Mr. GROTHMAN. When we talk about legacy systems what percent of the systems that you're familiar with—I mean, you said how much more money we're spending on the legacy systems, but what percent of this—even compared to the private sector, and you must deal with that somewhat, what percent do you think we have in the government you'd call up to date or the same type of systems you'd find in a modern American corporation?

Ms. HARRIS. Sir, we don't have that information. We have not done work to look at the percentage of what's legacy and what's development in the private sector. So I wish I could answer it, but I don't have that information.

Mr. GROTHMAN. You guys, can I ask one more question?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Of course.

Mr. GROTHMAN. That's a surprising answer. I feel I've got to ask another question. Do you ever look into and see, you know, compare like where you are compared to major American corporations, you'd have people begin to work with you and say, holy cow, I can't believe you still have this stuff sitting around here? Does that thing ever go on? Or do you have people leave your organization to the private sector and say, hey, wow, you want—you can't believe what I found out here? There's no comparison or no looking around or no comparing? You don't do that?

Ms. KENT. I would comment, I don't know that there's an exact number, a comparison per se to a single sector, but I would mention two things that we are looking at. One of the policies that we've used as a driver and a filter for how we prioritize legacy system transformation as well as website transformation has been high-value assets and looking at those things that are of critical importance to agencies and insider infrastructure and ensuring that we put resources there first.

The other thing that we've done is from a customer experience perspective actually looked at the citizens that we're serving and had dialogs around what they expect. And that actually does give a comparison in many cases across industry because their expectations are set on what they experience in their normal lives, whether it's from their financial institution or a retail business that they're shopping with.

So we have used that user-centered design and customer expectations to drive back into the way that we are looking at delivering services, both from a digital and mobile capability standpoint.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. Well, again, thanks. Thanks for coming over here. I appreciate the chair letting me take so much of other people's time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Not at all. Thank you, Mr. Grothman.

And, Mr. Grothman, if I may followup on your question, I think we could afford, Ms. Harris, to be a little more forthright. I think you're letting yourself off the hook a little bit by saying, I don't know, I mean, I'm not in the private sector. I mean, there are things we do know.

For example, I always ask—and you probably do too, Mr. Mead-ows—when I speak to a private sector group, it's a trick question. I go, well, how many CIOs do you have? And they always look at you no matter how big they are like what a trick—well, what do you mean? We have one. Well, how many does the Federal Government have?

When we began FITARA with 24 agencies we had 250 people with the title CIO, and that means no one is in charge, no one can be held accountable, nobody is exactly responsible. And that's a big difference, I would say, Mr. Grothman, between the private sector and the public sector where we can learn from the private sector.

Likewise, we were celebrating a little while ago the transition from COBOL. I can't think of a private sector company that still has COBOL, let alone would be celebrating in 2019 the transition from it to something else. So I think there are some things that we clearly can observe and learn from and benefit from in the private sector. Moving to the cloud is another one.

So it is instructive, and hopefully we cannot necessarily entirely mimic the private sector, but there's a lot of management practices we could learn from. And having the CIO report directly to the Secretary of the agency is also something quite common in the private sector. The CIO is not buried in the bowels of the organization, somebody who is a key part of the management team, because everyone understands the key role of IT in the enterprise.

Ms. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, I want to thank you both so much for coming. We're going to continue this dialog. I am pleased, Ms. Harris, that MeriTalk did a study—a survey rather of 200 CIOs mostly in the public sector, and they found that 70 percent said that FITARA was, in fact, from their point of view, a useful kind of nudge for change within the agencies, and that's kind of good to hear. And I see you shaking your head. Would you confirm that yourself or——

Ms. HARRIS. Well, I think that's very encouraging because I will say that the progress that has been made since the inception of the score—well, the FITARA but then also with your continued oversight with the scorecard 1.0 now to 8.0 how it has evolved and how it has kind of raised the level of improvements across the board has been tremendous from transparency in the dashboard to portfolio stats in the savings. It's all, you know, because of the tremendous oversight from your committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, we want to thank GAO also for always being innovative in looking at how best we can make that scorecard a useful tool. So thank you and to your colleagues.

Mr. Meadows.

Mr. MEADOWS. I just want to make one point. The staff just let me know when we look at the transition fund, you know, it passed the House today with only 35 million. And when we look at this it's—you know, we may represent two different District 11s, but we are together on this particular issue, and so what we need to do is work in a bipartisan way to get that up to a number that actually is meaningful. Thirty-five million sadly is a rounding error when it comes to addressing this problem.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I'm so glad you brought that up, Mr. Meadows, because I had an amendment to add $15 million to that $35 million to just get a respectable number. And unfortunately that was not ruled in order. It was subject to a point of order up in Rules, so we were not able to do it.

Mr. MEADOWS. You have better connections with the Speaker than I do.

Mr. CONNOLLY. But we will work on it together.

Thank you both so much for being here today. And, Ms. Harris, I promised you'd make your plane. You're going to make your plane.

Thank you.

Ms. HARRIS. Thank you.

Ms. KENT. Thank you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And now we're ready for our second panel: Gary Washington, Chief Information Officer of the United States Department of Agriculture; Jason Gray, Chief Information Officer of the United States Department of Education; and Eric Olson, Chief Information Officer from the Department of Treasury.

If you would stand and raise your right hand, we'll be sworn in. Thank you. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

I thank you. And let the record show that our witnesses answered in the affirmative.

The microphones, as I said, are sensitive, so if you can speak directly into them like I'm doing, you can be heard. Everybody has five minutes to summarize their testimony. Your full statement will be entered the into the record as submitted.

And, Mr. Washington, why don't we begin with you and your five-minute statement. Welcome.

STATEMENT OF GARY WASHINGTON, CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WASHINGTON. Thank you, Chairman Connolly, Ranking Member Meadows, and the members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to update you today on the United States Department of Agriculture's progress on implementation of FITARA. I am Gary Washington, the Chief Information Officer of USDA. I would also like to thank you for your ongoing support and commitment to improve information technology management across the Federal Government.

Secretary Perdue's vision is to make USDA the most efficient, effective, customer focused, and best managed department in the Federal Government. Central to that goal is focusing on enterprise-based approaches to management and decision-making. We have taken many steps to achieve that goal including the implementation of the FITARA Information Technology Management Maturity Model, and we continue to make progress.

As evidenced by the latest FITARA scorecard and the progress we have made over the past year, I am pleased that USDA have moved up an entire letter grade on the scorecard, and I hope that we will be doing as well or better than our friends here at Department of Education next year.

I know we have a lot further to go, but every day I am seeing the positive impact that FITARA has on our Department, and I would like to discuss some of that progress today. Since my last appearance before the subcommittee, USDA partnered with the White House Office of American Innovation and the General Services Administration Center of Excellence to improve the management of information technology at USDA.

This effort accelerated IT modernization across the Department, improving leadership alignment, quality, and efficiency of IT, including decreasing the number of chief information officers, CIOs, from 22 to one, closing 28 to 39 data centers resulting in a cost savings and avoidance of $42.1 million and closing 2,255 data centers overall.

We have enrolled 13 agencies into USDA cloud program resulting in a net cost avoidance of $12.1 million, improving our megabytes score from an F to an A on the 7.0 scorecard by implementing a number of effective processes and procedures to improve software management.

We've also petitioned our existing working capital fund to receive technology modernization funding and making significant improvements in cybersecurity with 96 percent of USDA systems having authorities to operate as opposed to 74 percent in Fiscal Year 2017.

Additionally, end-user equipment and hardware will be centrally managed by the Office of Chief Information Officer using an IT service management system with asset management as a core function. We will onboard the inventory for all the USDA mission areas and offices as part of an enterprise end-user consolidation initiative scheduled to be completed by the end of Fiscal Year 2020.

And our Digital Infrastructure Services Center will be responsible for the central inventory and management of all infrastructure components of USDA, which includes network and system hosting. The system hosting would be accomplished by the end of Fiscal Year 2020 through the data Center Optimization Initiative and Cloud Adoption Centers of Excellence.

The network transition to the new General Services Administration enterprise infrastructure solutions contract will ensure accurate inventory of our network infrastructure. I would like to emphasize the strong engagement and support for those efforts from our USDA leadership, namely the secretary and deputy secretary who I report directly to on IT matters. I believe we have an effective reporting structure and involvement in IT management and modernization issues at the highest level.

In closing, USDA has consistently proven itself as a leader in embracing FITARA. We want to continue to implement FITARA across USDA and integrate it into our daily processes and IT modernization activities even further than we have today. We recognize there is more work to be done, and we continue to tackle those challenges.

I truly appreciate the attention the committee has brought to this issue and your ongoing support of our efforts to change the way the Federal Government thinks about and manages IT.

I look forward to answering any questions you may have. Thank you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Washington.

Mr. Gray.

STATEMENT OF JASON GRAY

Mr. GRAY. Thank you, Chairman Connolly, Ranking Member Meadows, and members of the subcommittee for this opportunity to talk about the progress the U.S. Department of Education has made in implementing the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act.

I recognize the great privilege and honor of being invited to appear here today. Never in my life could I have imagined having opportunities I've had to speak before the U.S. Congress. Thank you.

I'd also like to thank you for your continued commitment to improving information technology management. My responsibility is to ensure the availability of IT with appropriate controls and to ensure the integrity in how we use it under the leadership of Secretary DeVos and in collaboration with the Office of Federal Student Aid and my office we have achieved a number of improvements in recent years.

Mr. GRAY. There are two areas that I would like to highlight today, cybersecurity is one focus area of FITARA, which encourages agencies to proactively address cybersecurity risk and compliance with Federal Information Security Modernization Act.

To address the cybersecurity challenge, OCIO developed our own cybersecurity risk scorecard based on the National Institute's of Standards and Technical cybersecurity framework. The implementation of a scorecard improved our focus and alignment with OMB requirements for sound risk management practices for protecting our systems and networks.

The scorecard also provided a specific path for the Department system owners and security officers to identify, prioritize, and mitigate risks. From September 2018 to June 2019, the Department has mitigated and closed over 2,300 plans of actions and milestones representing a 72 percent reduction in vulnerabilities than the Department systems.

We use the scorecard to provide monthly briefings to the secretary, deputy secretary, and senior leaders. With their support and with the hard work off our system and security personnel, we were able to raise our FITARA security score two letter grades to a C in December 2018. The Department, along with the majority of its peers, started with a FITARA cybersecurity score of F in 2018.

Another area of focus is IT modernization, which is in line with the Department's focus on creating and managing a more modern and secure IT environment and is consistent with the themes and principles outlined in the cross-agency priority goal on IT modernization found in the President's management agenda.

In 2017, we began an exhaustive review of our IT portfolio to ensure that IT systems, applications, and services are secure, appropriately governed, and modernized to meet the needs of today's economy with an eye toward tomorrow opportunities.

To this end, OCIO worked with key stakeholders across the agency and industry experts to complete a comprehensive analysis of our business missions and the IT assets supporting them. As a

result of those efforts, we developed a detailed visualization or map of the Department's IT inventory, which we analyzed to determine the Department's needs and to build our five-year IT modernization plan and strategic road map.

The effort provides greater transparency across the Department enabling us to work with business owners, to identify opportunities, to leverage shared and cloud services, automate manual business processes, reduce cybersecurity risk, and consolidated cloud service providers. We are working with the Office of Management and Budget and Congress to obtain appropriations language that would allow us to transfer funds to a working capital fund, which would support the Department's future modernization initiatives and accomplish the goals and objectives of the Modernizing Government Technology Act.

We requested this transfer authority in the Fiscal Year 2020 budget, and the Treasury Department has committed to activating an account for the Department once the transfer authority has been granted by Congress.

I recognize our areas for improvement, we must continually monitor and assess our IT management and service delivery practices and policies. We are taking actions in areas where we are not fully meeting our milestones.

One such area is CIO and CAO collaboration on the review and approval acquisition strategies and plans. OCIO is partnering with contracts and acquisition management to establish touch points between the IT life cycle management process and the acquisitions process to ensure the CIO has the opportunity to review all approve all acquisition strategies and plans that contain IT.

Secretary DeVos and the Department take FITARA implementation seriously, we believe our progress demonstrates that. Thank you for your time today, and I look forward to responding to your questions.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you so much, Mr. Gray.

Mr. OLSON.

STATEMENT OF ERIC OLSON, CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Mr. OLSON. Thank you, Chairman Connolly, Ranking Member Meadows, and members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to testify on Treasury's implementation of FITARA. My name is Eric Olson and it is my honor and privilege to serve as the chief information officer for the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

Information technology is at the core of what Treasury does. We represent the third largest civilian agency in terms of overall IT budget, and plan to spend approximately 4.8 billion on IT in Fiscal Year 2019.

Managing a large IT portfolio with the scale in complexity of Treasury is a very challenging endeavor, and we are grateful for the financial and human resources we have been provided to accomplish our mission. We recognize our responsibility for the stewardship of these resources, and we take this responsibility very seriously. We appreciate that FITARA was enacted to assist us to perform this responsibility.

Our key guiding principle for modernization is to drive the greatest amount of resources toward mission enablement and digital transformation. This requires pursuing enterprise initiatives and shared services so that we can reduce duplication and leverage economies of scale. At the same time, we encourage our bureaus to focus on transforming mission outcomes by adopting practices from the private sector that have proven successful in delivering digital transformation, such as cloud-based services, agile development, and low code platforms.

I would like to briefly summarize some of our recent accomplishments and how they fit into the larger approach for Treasury IT modernization. On the heels of Congress' enactment of the Tax Cut and Jobs Act, the IRS recently completed a successful tax filing season that was annealed in large part by the successful delivery of one of the largest and most complex IT implementations every undertaken by the Treasury Department.

Implementation of tax form required the modification of hundreds of applications across the IRS and the Bureau of Fiscal Service. This recent accomplishment demonstrates Treasury's ability to deliver change at scale on an accelerated timeframe. Treasury continues its pursuit of enterprise-wide services. Recently Treasury delivered an expansive upgrade to its enterprise H.R. system, an enterprise-wide service that supports the nearly 100,000 Treasury employees.

Treasury is also in the process of implementing a cloud-based talent management system that will deliver a common platform for employee training, performance management, and succession planning. These initiatives demonstrate Treasury's ability to use its franchise fund to achieve some of the benefits of what an IT working capital fund might achieve.

In addition to the successes I mentioned earlier, I would like to report on how Treasury is implementing FITARA. In some areas of the FITARA scorecard Treasury has scored well, for example, data center consolation and portfolio review. We have worked hard in these areas and we are proud of our results. In other areas, although we have worked hard, we recognized there is room for improvement.

FITARA recognizes the importance of agency CIOs having a substantial role in agency IT decisions. I meet regularly with Secretary Mnuchin on major IT investments, cybersecurity risk, and opportunities to pursue Treasury-wide initiatives. I believe this increased engagement with Treasury senior leadership has produced notable results in the delivery of the IRS modernization plan and the delivery of technology to support tax reform, among other things.

On cybersecurity, we fully appreciate the threat posed by well-resourced and highly motivated adversaries and are committed to mitigating risk posed by such actors. While we cannot completely eliminate risk, we acknowledge our supreme responsibility to proactively address cybersecurity risk to the greatest degree possible. Toward that end, we operate a comprehensive cybersecurity program focused on risk mitigation. Our strategy is to make investments and capabilities that materially reduce our risk and reduce the cost of our compliance.

We are grateful to Congress for the support of our cybersecurity enhancement account, which is focused on identifying and funding projects that have the greatest Treasury-Wide impact in these and other important areas.

In closing, we recognize and embrace our responsibility to be a good steward of IT resources. We understand and embrace the language intended in FITARA. We share the common goal of Treasury IT modernization. And we value the collaboration with Congress to jointly achieve these goals.

Thank you, once again, for the opportunity to testify today.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Olson.

Ms. Harris, did you want to comment? And I'm sorry if I led you astray, I was simply reassuring you, you're going to make your flight at 10 o'clock.

Ms. HARRIS. I see. I apologize for——

Mr. CONNOLLY. No, forgive me if I misled.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Meadows, I'll now turn my comments to the Departments of Agriculture, Education, and Treasury. These agencies collectively plan to spend $7.5 billion on IT this year, for each of them, roughly 80 percent of their IT spend is on operational systems. Both USDA and Treasury have an overall C-grade on this scorecard, while Education is at a B+. Education has also sustained this overall B+ grade over the last four scorecards.

Some positive areas to highlight for all three, the vast majority of their IT projects use an incremental approach. They also have comprehensive software license inventories and use them to make decisions and save money. USDA and Treasury have also closed more than 50 percent of their total data centers and exceeded their savings goals. Education closed all of their data centers and moved to the cloud years ago.

For all three agencies, the progress to improve their IG assessments of cybersecurity is rather low. In the case of USDA and Treasury, they also self-reported low numbers in meeting OMB's 10 cyber metrics. The combination of the two is a reason for their low grades in this area. Education, on the other hand, self-reported meeting all 10 of OMB's cyber metrics, and as a result, raised their grade in this area to a C. I'd also like to note that if USDA and Treasury CIOs reported to the head of their agencies, their overall grade would increase to a B.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my comments on the results of these three agencies.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank you. Thank you so much. And it is heartening to hear the progress. I would just say, and you can confirm this, Mr. Gray. As I understand it, you now have zero data centers?

Mr. GRAY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And that you went from paying $12 per gigabyte of storage to a few cents?

Mr. GRAY. Actually, sir, we are currently focused on transition— or doing cloud consolidation, and we recently within the last three months transitioned from $1.43 per gigabyte to $0.12 a gigabyte.

Mr. CONNOLLY. So there are savings to be had in data center consolation and moving to the cloud?

Mr. GRAY. Yes. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think you're a poster child for doing that, and I thank you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Let me ask, Ms. Harris, GAO looked at best practices, and you identified FITARA requirements, one of which was—in order to get to best practices, obtains support from senior leadership.

Would it be fair to say that all three of the agencies in front of us have achieved that?

Ms. HARRIS. Well sir, I think in the case of Education that's clearly the case because of Mr. Gray's direct reporting to the Secretary. In the case of USDA and Treasury, that direct reporting is not as clear-cut. So I would say that in those two cases that senior leadership support may not be as clear as Education's.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And I think that's really particularly important in your case, Mr. Washington, because Secretary Purdue has offered himself up as the pilot for the innovation agenda that Mr. Kushner and Chris Little are organizing at the White House. And if you're going to do that, the model here is the CIO has got to report to the boss. There's kind of no getting around that, and it is the desiring goal and objective of FITARA, it's in our scorecard, and it is part of best practices GAO established.

The second is—and you can comment on that if you wish. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to not let you comment.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have all the access—I have extreme amount of access to the Secretary and the deputy secretary, and I frequently meet with the deputy secretary and speak with him about matters——

Mr. CONNOLLY. But if I may, Mr. Washington. That's good, but that could be personal.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. We're talking about an organizational chart where you have the right to go in that office because you report to him or her. And if the bureaucracy doesn't see that, it diminishes your power or your successor's power. Power, influence, the ability to make change get enforced because everyone understands you've got the ear's boss—I mean, the boss's ear. You know, that works in the private sector.

If I know, in the private sector, somebody has the ear of the CEO, so when he or she calls me, I know who that is, believe me, I'm paying attention and following up on that as a priority. And so I think that's really what we're getting at. It has to show on the organizational chart. It's great you have access, but your successor may not. And we want to institutionalize this in the formal structure of the organization.

And, Mr. Olson, you indicated that you have access to Mr. Mnuchin, but again, the same thing, is it not that we haven't institutionalized this, though, so that your successors and his successors will have the same kind of relationship?

Mr. OLSON. Sir if I could elaborate a little bit on the arrangement. So by Treasury policy, I do have a direct reporting relationship to Secretary Mnuchin on all CIO matters. I do also have an operational relationship to the secretary for management, and I think that is sort of the element that is causing some confusion or some concern here.

This is what I would offer up. I think Treasury has a very robust, I'll say performance management structure. That structure, which has existed for many years, is the purview and the responsibility of the assistant secretary for management. It has served actually as enhancer to my authorities as a CIO to be plugged into that and not try to recreate, for example, my own sort of set of oversight, if you will, with all the Treasury bureau heads and Treasury IT leaders.

So it enables me actually to have very good interaction and influence with bureau heads routinely. I have the opportunity to meet with them and talk with them on technology matters.

It also brings me to the table when, for example, we're talking about a particular bureau's budget or work force issues with the bureau head, because IT doesn't live in a vacuum, there are work force issues, there are budget issues, there are procurement issues, and all those folks need to be at the table. So, you know, I do feel like I have that.

The other thing I'll say, and I mentioned this in my opening comments, is that we successfully delivered a tax filing season, it was a very complicated heavy lift. Back a year or so ago when we were sort of still interpreting the law and creating specific requirements, I started to have some concerns about our ability to deliver that on time, and I expressed those to the Secretary.

The engagement with the Secretary led to the ability, for, me to meet with IRS leadership weekly for the following year, and I'm talking about the commissioner, the deputy commissioners, the CIO, and we sat down and we reviewed the progress of tax reform implementation weekly so that we would get there. I don't believe that would have happened if the rest of the organization didn't understand my reporting relationship to the Secretary.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Good feedback. And it's also heartening that finally IRS is getting the attention it has long deserved. It has been on a starvation diet for all too long, and especially when it comes to technology, some of those legacy systems are particularly characteristic of IRS. I mean, as a Democrat, I'm sorry it took the tax bill to be the incentive to do it, but I'll take it.

In any event, thank you.

Mr. MEADOWS.

Mr. MEADOWS. I'm going to be real brief. Obviously we're looking at this. We're looking at detail. We're looking at what is being said and then what is actually being done, and I think there's a big difference between what is said and what is done, and sometimes what is said here as witnesses is not what we're hearing is being actually done at the agencies. So I guess what I would encourage all of you to do is look at your FITARA scorecard.

And, Mr. Gray, I want to say thank you. Obviously, recognizing success is one of the things that we don't do a good job of doing sometimes. And I know I've been to—I haven't been to your agency, I've been to the other two agencies, and many times it's the first time Members of Congress ever come to say thank you, and shame on us. And so I just want to say thank you for your work.

Thank you for truly the impact that you're making. And yet, we will not spend any more money on any one item than we do IT. I mean, Ms. Harris was talking about $90 billion, you know, when

you add all the factors in there, it's probably up to 110, 120 billion when you count in some of the agencies we can't talk about. When you look at what all of those components—I'm amazed at how archaic our IT system is. I mean, we're spending more than any Fortune 500 company would spend on IT, and yet, obviously—and, listen, I'm preaching to the choir, all of you get this.

And I guess what I'm saying, the big thing for me—the big thing for the chairman is data centers and making sure those are consolidated. The big thing for me is if we continue to spend operational money for COBOL and FORTRAN programmers and legacy systems that—it's just mind-boggling that we would do it and we continue to do it, not just in some of your agencies, but in other agencies across this.

And so, for me, it is, you know, really critical, Mr. Olson. I think about the IRS and the amount of data that you have, and what I would call the big mainframe IBM systems that are really programmed in such archaic language that we're having to pay a premium for the programmers because nobody programs in that language anymore.

So in terms of action items, for me, if you would get back to this committee on what is your plan to get rid of legacy systems, and what is the cost of doing it? And for some of you, you know, you've got to make sure that you're up and running, and you may even have to have a parallel system that gets built so that you can do the transfer.

I realize there are logistical problems, Ms. Harris has said sometimes it's like trying to change a tire while you're driving 55 miles an hour. For some of you it's like your driving 100 miles an hour trying to fix that flat tire, but I need a plan.

And I guess the only frustration you will find is that at the next FITARA hearing, if there is not a plan, not just from the three of you, but anybody that is listening, on how we're going to get rid of that, there's going to be a problem. I'm tired of talking about it. And I'm saying that in the nicest way that I can.

But thank you all for your work. We are making great progress. Even the Cs and the C+s and D+s and all of that, do not take the generosity of a modified scoring as oly oly oxen free. It's time that we get serious about trying to get those to at least the next level up. And I'll yield back.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the gentleman. The gentlelady from the District of Columbia, Ms. Eleanor Holmes Norton.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your calling specific agencies so that we could look beneath the surface and see how this is doing. So I'm interested in the scorecard that evaluates agencies for implementation of what is called the Federal Information Security Modernization Act, that's what we mean when we say FISMA.

And I think that this metric is particularly important to the Congress because it will enable us to evaluate agencies who have a metric of their own and then to ask the agencies to explain themselves, and that's what I'd like to begin with now.

I'm going to ask the Department of Education who received a C, the Department of Treasury who received a D, and the USDA who

received an F, to explain why and what actions you can take or have taken to improve these scores?

Mr. GRAY. Thank you for the question. Specifically, as was mentioned earlier, the Risk and Management Assessment, the RMA piece, is where agencies are assessing against metrics. We meet regularly to discuss cybersecurity as a whole. As I alluded to in my opening remarks and my written testimony, we use a cybersecurity risk scorecard that was developed that is aligned with the new cybersecurity framework, and what that does is it enables me to have near real time visibility into the cybersecurity posture of each of our systems. It reaches back to the Department of Justice in this case to pull information about my systems and I use that as——

Ms. NORTON. So did you know that—this is Mr. Gray from the Department of Education—did you know that at the time that your Department received a C? Is that what it would get today—will continue to get?

Mr. GRAY. We are striving to improve our cybersecurity scorecard and have made significant improvements. To your question about what have we done or what are we going to do?

Ms. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. Within the last three months we have made a massive IT transition to everything entirely new. When I got to the Department about three years ago, a little over three years ago now, we inherited a 10-year-old IT service contract. There was a lot of legacy and old things. We have re-competed and awarded, and within the last three months have transitioned to entirely new—new equipment, new hardware, new software, new systems, everything.

Ms. NORTON. So if you were evaluated today, you think you would do better than a C? If you were evaluated today, given the improvements you just indicated?

Mr. GRAY. We are currently stabilizing within the next two months, but absolutely. Once the stabilization is done, I absolutely expect for our scores to improve.

Ms. NORTON. The Department of Treasury, that would be Mr. Olson.

Mr. OLSON. That's correct.

Ms. NORTON. The Department of Treasury got a D. How do you explain that, and what actions have you taken to improve that score metric?

Mr. OLSON. Sure. So let's talk about the metric itself. Part of it is based on an IG audit——

Ms. NORTON. Based on what?

Mr. OLSON. IG audit that's done of our FISMA system, so we scored three out of five.

Ms. NORTON. Is that why you got a D?

Mr. OLSON. So three out of five equates to a D, and that's 50 percent of our grade. And I would the first to tell you that that's not where we need to be. It's a maturity model and, you know, part of what we've been trying to do and part of what we've been using, the cyber enhancement account, has been to make investments where we get the biggest bang for the buck to improve these kinds of things.

I actually sat down with Secretary Mnuchin to talk about our scores in this area, and he said, Eric, what's it going to take to get

to four? So, four, we have 430 systems, it's a random selection of systems in any given year. So it's like, gosh, it's an extremely heavy lift, but how can we get to four on the highest value assets. So he's asked me to put together a plan, how can we get to four if we were to be audited on our highest value assets.

The other half of the grade, which is the risk management score, as you know, this is sort of like 10 individual items, it's passed down. And some of these scores, if you don't get 100 percent, you fail. So I'm not at all quibbling with the scorecard, but I mean to say that 9 out of 10 of them are well into the high 90's, and we have a one or two percent delta, which—you know, we have got to put it over the line and we would get, you know, a much better grade.

The one area where we're doing the worst and is actually a new element that was added to the scorecard in Q–3 of 2018, and we have a lot of work to do. That has to do with bringing strong encryption to legacy—well, to high value assets, many of which in the Department of the Treasury, are legacy systems which don't lend themselves sort of architecturally elegant ways of doing that. But nonetheless, we understand the ask, we'll figure it out. But that's how I look at raising my scores.

Ms. NORTON. So it seems that you are aware.

Mr. OLSON. Very aware.

Ms. NORTON. And are taking action. And, finally, to round this out, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Representative of USDA, Mr. Washington, about what was the lowest score among the three of you here, the F score. How do you explain that? Why that score? And what actions have you taken to improve that score since you got that score—that low score?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, ma'am, we were in an environment where we had many different tools that weren't speaking the same language in terms of configuration management and patching. That's where we fell short on the——

Ms. NORTON. Do you have a variety of tools, did you say?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes, we had a variety of tools that weren't feeding the same information, that's where we fell short on a FISMA metric because it wasn't feeding the metric data properly. So what we've done since last year, we've organized the end user consolidation that's very important to us across USDA, and we're going to get down to one common tool. And all of the end user support activities will be managed by the Department. So they will have common images and patching will be done the same way and standardized across the Department of Agriculture. And we intend to have that completed before the end of Fiscal Year 2020.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's all.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you. And thank you for that line of questioning because I think that really is something we got to work on.

Mr. Olson, I just want to add, with respect to your answer. Surely—I know you do—understand the part of our intention was, if it can't be encrypted, it needs to be replaced and we're trying to incentivize the replacement of legacy systems.

Mr. OLSON. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And that's another nudge.

Mr. OLSON. Absolutely. And I think you're aware of a large modernization plan we have put in for most of that portfolio.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would just say to all three of you, you represent agencies that maintain very large data bases. And I can recall, Mr. Gray, not to cite Education, but we had a hearing on this subcommittee a number of years ago focusing on different Federal agencies, and one of them was on yours. And what really was striking was, you wouldn't think of Department of Education being a particular target for bad guys in the cyber world, but you have a data base of over 40 million Americans. Because if I applied for a student loan, you got my data. You got my financial data, my banking information, my credit cards, my credit history, my mortgage, on and on. And what could go wrong with that if that got breached?

So your being up to snuff in terms of cybersecurity is actually pretty important to the American people, and that would certainly be true—IRS has data on everybody. And USDA has all kinds of data base, of course, as well. So, you know, this cyber question is not an academic one, I know not for you, but it isn't for us either. We're very cognizant of what can go wrong if we don't accelerate this move toward updated systems.

Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Grothman, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Thank you very much. I'd like to thank the other three of you for coming over here, I know it's very busy for you and we're keeping you here a little late. So appreciate the extra effort.

We talked before about the huge amount of cost that goes into what—I think it was Ms. Harris described as legacy systems. And I wondered for each of your three agencies, if we can start with Mr. Washington, could you let us know how many of the systems in your agencies you would describe as legacy systems?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Sir, in terms of legacy systems, is it classified and is obsolete using outdate technology?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. We have less than five systems that are actually classified as old legacy systems. But we do spend about 77 percent of our portfolio in terms of O&M.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Seventy-seven percent of your money you spend on the legacy systems? You said you have five legacy systems left, of that, five of how many?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Oh, how many systems? We have—I'd have to get back to you on the exact number of systems, sir.

Mr. GROTHMAN. About.

Mr. WASHINGTON. We have about 129 systems in USDA.

Mr. GROTHMAN. So you spend 77 percent of the money on five out of like 150 systems?

Mr. WASHINGTON. On operation and maintenance. Of what we spend on our IT portfolio.

Mr. GROTHMAN. That's almost unbelievable. Could you give me the dollar numbers that go with those fantastic figures?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Say again, sir.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Like how many dollars are we talking about here.

Mr. WASHINGTON. We have approximately a $2.3 billion IT portfolio at USDA.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Two point three billion.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes sir.

Mr. GROTHMAN. And you spend like 72 percent of that on five out of a 150 systems.

Mr. WASHINGTON. No not on five—that's on O&M. On the five systems we don't spend that much money, sir.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. But you said you spent over 70 percent on five legacy systems. Is that right.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I said for operations and maintenance. On the five legacy systems, we plan to retire those this year—those this year. And I don't have the exact numbers right now, but it's not—it's a small amount of money.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. Well, it sounds kind of amazing numbers. Mr. Gray, I'll give you the same question.

Mr. GRAY. We have one legacy system at the Department, which is currently planned to be modernized through the next gen initiative that Federal Student Aid is leading.

Mr. GROTHMAN. And when will that be done?

Mr. GRAY. Excuse me.

Mr. GROTHMAN. When will that be done? When will it be modernized?

Mr. GRAY. That is a wonderful question. We currently have contracts that are under a protest, and as soon as those contract protests are resolved, we will be proceeding forward.

Mr. GROTHMAN. What's the nature of the protests?

Mr. GRAY. There's quite a number of that. I'd be happy to followup after.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. We'll give Mr. Olson the same question.

Mr. OLSON. Sure. So I'm happy to sort of comment. Within Treasury we have eight or so major bureaus, and I would probably answer that question a little bit for each one. But at the end of the day, the biggest rock in the Treasury Department is the IRS. So let's sort of talk about that one, because I think that one. It's roughly sort of an 80/20 split, maybe 85/15, depending on the year.

Mr. GROTHMAN. What is the 85?

Mr. OLSON. Eighty-five is O&M versus what we call development, maintenance, and enhancement DM&E, which is the build piece. I would offer this—there's been a lot of discussion earlier in—in the early panel about private sector companies.

I spent a lot of time talking to private sector companies, and in particular, financial services companies, and asked them this question a lot about how much do they spend on O&M, which is in the private sector they call run, and DM&E, which in the private sector they call grow. And they have another—sort of another category of spend that they call transform.

It's not necessarily bad in and of itself to have a big number in run. But you have to have strategy for making the business case to invest as much as you can in grow and transform. And I will just say, as far as the IRS goes, and the big banks that I've talked to, this particular fraction, if you will, percentage, if you will, is not unlike what the biggest banks in the countries see as far as the split between run and build.

We have a big proposal and request for funding, you know, that will be coming forward——

Mr. GROTHMAN. When you talk to other people—and I'm already past my time limit here. Do they feel you're up-to-date or do they say this is where we were 15 years ago, or what do they say?

Mr. OLSON. They, like us, have an enormously complex set of systems. So a GAO report just came out, we had, you know, the honorary of a 51-year old system. A 51-year-old system, that is the year it was put into production. It gets down to I think what's the definition of legacy. I mean, we joke sometimes in the IT business that legacy begins the day after you implement the system for the first day. You know, so the definition of legacy is something that there's a fair amount of debate on.

You know, if I were to take that 51-year-old system and tell you it's running on a mainframe that's four years old, is it a legacy system. There is a variety of——

Mr. GROTHMAN. In general, though, when you talk to people, because I'm way over, my subcommittee chair is being very gracious. When you talk to people, where do they feel about where you are?

Mr. OLSON. Oh, absolutely, they say we need to make significant changes, and we're committed to that.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Do they say, like, we are where we were 15 years ago or something. I mean, you hear some of these stories that the government is so far behind where everybody else is.

Mr. OLSON. I'm not going to debate that, but I will tell you that I met with a group of financial service CIOs from some of the country's biggest banks, and it was amazing how similar of the challenges that we have in terms of our portfolio of applications.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Olson, let me followup on your answers to Mr. Grothman, however. I think it's a little misleading to compare yourself to the private sector, we're kind of roughly the same——

Mr. OLSON. Absolutely.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Same ratio. There is no private sector company I know of——

Mr. OLSON. There is not.

Mr. CONNOLLY. [continuing]. that has a 51-year-old operating system still operating and you're dependent on.

Mr. OLSON. Well, yes. I'm not trying to defend that.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I understand. But it goes deeper, doesn't it? So I remember during the Obama years, the IRS was so starved that the average computer, the average PC. For example, was in the eight to nine year range. In the private sector any modern company is replacing computers every two or three years.

Mr. OLSON. Right.

Mr. CONNOLLY. So already we're at a huge disadvantage, and little wonder that we had a lot of hard drive crashes, because it just was out living its life span, and we were really taxing that hardware really behind its useful life.

We also had for IRS, if you wanted to archive material and be able to retrieve it, the instruction was, print and save. Now there is no private sector company that would accept that as a standard. IRS has to because we weren't allowing them to invest in their technology.

So I just wanted to clarify that in the case certainly of at least your big constituent agency, IRS, it is a victim directly of investment starvation.

Mr. OLSON. Absolutely. And I don't mean to—I think I just wanted to paint that it was a more nuanced picture, and we are trying to look at what is a very large portfolio to identify the places where we really need to make that investment and move quickly, as opposed to just painting a broad brush to what is almost a $300 billion dollars spend.

Mr. CONNOLLY. As I said earlier, I've been on this case for quite some time. And the IRS—I regret that my colleagues on the other side finally got around to wanting to do something only because they realized their tax bill was at jeopardy if they didn't because you couldn't implement it. I wish we had made those investments earlier for the sake of serving the American public with or without a tax bill.

Mr. OLSON. Agreed.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And hopefully that will be the ethos going forward. Ms. Harris, anything else for the good of the order? Anything we haven't covered that we ought to at least mention?

Ms. HARRIS. I think we've covered everything.

Mr. CONNOLLY. We've covered everything.

Ms. HARRIS. We have, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Let the record show, GAO believes we have covered everything. But, again, I want to thank you for your leadership and your incredible staff work from the very top. I mean, you know, this item has been on the high risk list for a long time.

GAO unequivocally got behind FITARA and supported the legislation and exhorted Congress to pass it, and has been with us every step of the way as we insist on its implementation.

And we couldn't have done it without you, and I think you're really one of the great heros of—if this legislation is transformative over time, GAO shares in the credit, and we thank you.

Let me see, what am I doing here? I am adjourning. Okay. I want to thank our witnesses. And without objection, all members will have five legislative days within which to submit additional written questions for the witnesses, and those questions will come from us.

And if you can get back to us in a timely fashion, through the chair, we'll distribute them to the members, should they appear.

I want to wish you all a good day. Thank you again for your patience with the House schedule. Good luck on your trip, Ms. Harris. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 5:55 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

○