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Leveraging Best Practices and Reform Initiatives Can Help Agencies Better Manage Investments

Statement of David A. Powner, Director Information Technology Management Issues
In an effort to consolidate the growing number of federal data centers, OMB launched a consolidation initiative intended to close 40 percent of government data centers by 2015, and in doing so, save $3 billion. GAO reported that agencies planned to close 1,055 data centers by the end of fiscal year 2014, but also highlighted the need for continued oversight of these efforts. Among other things, GAO recommended that OMB improve the execution of important oversight responsibilities, with which OMB agreed.

To better manage the government’s existing IT systems, OMB launched the PortfolioStat initiative, which, among other things, requires agencies to conduct annual reviews of their IT investments and make decisions on eliminating duplication. GAO reported that agencies continued to identify duplicative spending as part of PortfolioStat and that this initiative has the potential to save at least $5.8 billion by fiscal year 2015, but that weaknesses existed in agencies’ implementation of the initiative’s requirements. Among other things, GAO made several recommendations to improve agencies’ implementation of PortfolioStat requirements. OMB partially agreed with these recommendations, and most of the other 20 agencies commenting on the report also agreed.
Chairman Udall, Ranking Member Johanns, and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am pleased to be here today to discuss how best practices and major information technology (IT) reform initiatives can help the federal government better acquire and manage IT investments. As reported to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), federal agencies plan to spend at least $82 billion on IT in fiscal year 2014. Given the scale of such planned outlays and the criticality of many of these systems to the health, economy, and security of the nation, it is important that OMB and federal agencies provide appropriate oversight and transparency into these programs and avoid duplicative investments, whenever possible, to ensure the most efficient use of resources.

However, as we have previously reported and testified, federal IT projects too frequently fail and incur cost overruns and schedule slippages while contributing little to mission-related outcomes.\(^1\) During the past several years, we have issued multiple reports and testimonies on best practices for major acquisitions and federal initiatives to acquire and improve the management of IT investments.\(^2\) In those reports, we made numerous


recommendations to federal agencies and OMB to further enhance the management and oversight of IT programs.

As discussed with subcommittee staff, I am testifying today on the results and recommendations from our selected reports on how best practices and IT reform initiatives can help federal agencies better manage major acquisitions and legacy investments. All work on which this testimony is based was performed in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards or all sections of GAO's Quality Assurance Framework that were relevant to our objectives. Those standards and the framework require that we plan and perform our audits and engagements to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives; the framework also requires that we discuss any limitations in our work. We believe that the information, data, and evidence obtained and the analysis conducted provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our objectives. A more detailed discussion of the objectives, scope, and methodology of this work is included in each of the reports on which this testimony is based.\(^3\)

Information technology should enable government to better serve the American people. However, despite spending hundreds of billions on IT since 2000, the federal government has experienced failed IT projects and has achieved little of the productivity improvements that private industry has realized from IT. Too often, federal IT projects run over

budget, behind schedule, or fail to deliver results. In combating this problem, proper oversight is critical.

Both OMB and federal agencies have key roles and responsibilities for overseeing IT investment management and OMB is responsible for working with agencies to ensure investments are appropriately planned and justified. However, as we have described in numerous reports, although a variety of best practices exist to guide their successful acquisition, federal IT projects too frequently incur cost overruns and schedule slippages while contributing little to mission-related outcomes.

Agencies have reported that poor-performing projects have often used a “big bang” approach—that is, projects that are broadly scoped and aim to deliver capability several years after initiation. For example, in 2009 the Defense Science Board reported that the Department of Defense’s (Defense) acquisition process for IT systems was too long, ineffective, and did not accommodate the rapid evolution of IT. The board reported that the average time to deliver an initial program capability for a major IT system acquisition at Defense was over 7 years.

Each year, OMB and federal agencies work together to determine how much the government plans to spend on IT projects and how these funds are to be allocated. As reported to OMB, federal agencies plan to spend more than $82 billion on IT investments in fiscal year 2014, which is the total expended for not only acquiring such investments, but also the funding to operate and maintain them. Of the reported amount, 27 federal

---


agencies\(^6\) plan to spend about $75 billion, $17 billion on development and acquisition and $58 billion on operations and maintenance (O&M).\(^7\) Figure 1 shows the percentages of total planned spending for 2014 for the $75 billion spent on development and O&M.

**Figure 1: Percentages of Planned IT Spending for Fiscal Year 2014**

- **$17.2 billion**
  - Development
  - 23%

- **$57.9 billion**
  - Operations and maintenance
  - 77%

Source: GAO analysis of OMB data.

However, this $75 billion does not reflect the spending of the entire federal government. We have previously reported that OMB’s figure understates the total amount spent in IT investments.\(^8\) Specifically, it does not include IT investments by 58 independent executive branch agencies, including the Central Intelligence Agency, or by the legislative or judicial

\(^6\)The 27 agencies are the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Justice, Labor, State, Transportation, the Treasury, and Veterans Affairs; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection Agency, General Services Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Archives and Records Administration, National Science Foundation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Personnel Management, Small Business Administration, Smithsonian Institution, Social Security Administration, and U.S. Agency for International Development.

\(^7\)According to the analytical perspectives associated with the President’s fiscal year 2014 budget, the remainder is comprised of classified DOD IT investments.

branches. Further, agencies differed on what they considered an IT investment; for example, some have considered research and development systems as IT investments, while others have not. As a result, not all IT investments are included in the federal government’s estimate of annual IT spending. OMB provided guidance to agencies on how to report on their IT investments, but this guidance did not ensure complete reporting or facilitate the identification of duplicative investments. Consequently, we recommended, among other things, that OMB improve its guidance to agencies on identifying and categorizing IT investments.

Further, over the past several years, we have reported that overlap and fragmentation among government programs or activities could be harbingers of unnecessary duplication.9 Thus, the reduction or elimination of duplication, overlap, or fragmentation could potentially save billions of tax dollars annually and help agencies provide more efficient and effective services.

OMB has implemented a series of initiatives to improve the oversight of underperforming investments, more effectively manage IT, and address duplicative investments. These efforts include the following:

- **IT Dashboard.** Given the importance of transparency, oversight, and management of the government’s IT investments, in June 2009, OMB established a public website, referred to as the IT Dashboard, that provides detailed information on 760 major IT investments at 27 federal agencies, including ratings of their performance against cost and schedule targets. The public dissemination of this information is intended to allow OMB; other oversight bodies, including Congress; and the general public to hold agencies accountable for results and performance. Among other things, agencies are to submit Chief Information Officer (CIO) ratings, which, according to OMB’s instructions, should reflect the level of risk facing an investment on a

---

scale from 1 (high risk) to 5 (low risk) relative to that investment’s ability to accomplish its goals. Ultimately, CIO ratings are assigned colors for presentation on the Dashboard, according to the five-point rating scale, as illustrated in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (by agency CIO)</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-High risk</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Moderately high risk</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Medium risk</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Moderately low risk</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Low risk</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OMB’s IT Dashboard.

As of April 2014, according to the IT Dashboard, 201 of the federal government’s 760 major IT investments—totaling $12.4 billion—were in need of management attention (rated “yellow” to indicate the need for attention or “red” to indicate significant concerns). (See fig. 2.)
• **TechStat reviews.** In January 2010, the Federal CIO began leading TechStat sessions—face-to-face meetings to terminate or turnaround IT investments that are failing or are not producing results. These meetings involve OMB and agency leadership and are intended to increase accountability and transparency and improve performance. Subsequently, OMB empowered agency CIOs to hold their own TechStat sessions within their respective agencies. According to the former Federal CIO, the efforts of OMB and federal agencies to improve management and oversight of IT investments have resulted in almost $4 billion in savings.

• **Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative.** Concerned about the growing number of federal data centers, in February 2010 the Federal CIO established the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative. This

---

**Figure 2: Overall Performance Ratings of Major Investments on the IT Dashboard, as of April 2014**

- **$2.0 billion**
  - 42 investments (5%)

- **$10.4 billion**
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- **$28.9 billion**
  - 559 investments (70%)
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Source: OMB’s IT Dashboard.
initiative’s four high-level goals are to promote the use of “green IT”\textsuperscript{10} by reducing the overall energy and real estate footprint of government data centers; reduce the cost of data center hardware, software, and operations; increase the overall IT security posture of the government; and shift IT investments to more efficient computing platforms and technologies. OMB believes that this initiative has the potential to provide about $3 billion in savings by the end of 2015.

- PortfolioStat. In order to eliminate duplication, move to shared services, and improve portfolio management processes, in March 2012, OMB launched the PortfolioStat initiative. Specifically, PortfolioStat requires agencies to conduct an annual agency-wide IT portfolio review to, among other things, reduce commodity IT\textsuperscript{11} spending and demonstrate how their IT investments align with the agency’s mission and business functions.\textsuperscript{12} PortfolioStat is designed to assist agencies in assessing the current maturity of their IT investment management process, making decisions on eliminating duplicative investments, and moving to shared solutions in order to maximize the return on IT investments across the portfolio. OMB believes that the PortfolioStat effort has the potential to save the government $2.5 billion over the next 3 years by, for example, consolidating duplicative systems.

Given the magnitude of the federal government’s annual IT budget, which is expected to be more than $82 billion in fiscal year 2014, it is important that agencies leverage all available opportunities to ensure that their IT investments are acquired in the most effective manner possible. To do so, agencies can rely on IT acquisition best practices and initiatives such as OMB’s IT Dashboard, and OMB-mandated TechStat sessions.

\textsuperscript{10}“Green IT” refers to environmentally sound computing practices that can include a variety of efforts, such as using energy efficient data centers, purchasing computers that meet certain environmental standards, and recycling obsolete electronics.

\textsuperscript{11}According to OMB, commodity IT includes services such as enterprise IT systems (e-mail; identity and access management; IT security; web hosting, infrastructure, and content; and collaboration tools); IT infrastructure (desktop systems, mainframes and servers, mobile devices, and telecommunications); and business systems (financial management, grants-related federal financial assistance, grants-related transfer to state and local governments, and human resources management systems).

\textsuperscript{12}OMB, Implementing PortfolioStat, Memorandum, M-12-10 (Washington D.C.: Mar. 30, 2012).
Additionally, agencies can save billions of dollars by continuing to consolidate federal data centers and by eliminating duplicative investments through OMB’s PortfolioStat initiative.

In 2011, we identified seven successful acquisitions and nine common factors critical to their success, and noted that (1) the factors support OMB’s objective of improving the management of large-scale IT acquisitions across the federal government, and (2) wide dissemination of these factors could complement OMB’s efforts. Specifically, we reported that federal agency officials identified seven successful acquisitions, in that they best achieved their respective cost, schedule, scope, and performance goals. Notably, all of these were smaller increments, phases, or releases of larger projects. The common factors critical to the success of three or more of the seven acquisitions are generally consistent with those developed by private industry and are identified in table 2.

Table 2: Common Critical Success Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program officials were actively engaged with stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program staff had the necessary knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior department and agency executives supported the programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End users and stakeholders were involved in the development of requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End users participated in testing of system functionality prior to formal end user acceptance testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and contractor staff were consistent and stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program staff prioritized requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program officials maintained regular communication with the prime contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs received sufficient funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GAO analysis of agency data.

These critical factors support OMB’s objective of improving the management of large-scale IT acquisitions across the federal government; wide dissemination of these factors could complement OMB’s efforts.

The IT Dashboard serves an important role in allowing OMB and other oversight bodies to hold agencies accountable for results and performance. However, we have issued a series of reports highlighting deficiencies with the accuracy and reliability of the data reported on the Dashboard. For example, we reported in October 2012 that Defense had not rated any of its investments as either high or moderately high risk and that in selected cases, these ratings did not appropriately reflect significant cost, schedule, and performance issues reported by GAO and others. We recommended that Defense ensure that its CIO ratings reflect available investment performance assessments and its risk management guidance. Defense concurred and has revised its process to address these concerns.

Further, while we reported in 2011 that the accuracy of Dashboard cost and schedule data had improved over time, more recently, in December 2013 we found that agencies had removed investments from the Dashboard by reclassifying their investments—representing a troubling trend toward decreased transparency and accountability. Specifically, the Department of Energy reclassified several of its supercomputer investments from IT to facilities and the Department of Commerce decided to reclassify its satellite ground system investments. Additionally, as of December 2013, the public version of the Dashboard was not updated for 15 of the previous 24 months because OMB does not revise it as the President’s budget request is being created.

We also found that, while agencies experienced several issues with reporting the risk of their investments, such as technical problems and delayed updates to the Dashboard, the CIO ratings were mostly or completely consistent with investment risk at seven of the eight selected

15 GAO-14-64; GAO-13-98; GAO-12-210; GAO-11-262; and GAO-10-701.
16 GAO-12-210.
17 GAO-14-64.
Additionally, the agencies had already addressed several of the discrepancies that we identified. The final agency, the Department of Veterans Affairs, did not update 7 of its 10 selected investments because it elected to build, rather than buy, the ability to automatically update the Dashboard, and has now resumed updating all investments. To their credit, agencies’ continued attention to reporting the risk of their major IT investments supports the Dashboard’s goal of providing transparency and oversight of federal IT investments.

Nevertheless, the rating issues that we identified with performance reporting and annual baselining, some of which are now corrected, serve to highlight the need for agencies’ continued attention to the timeliness and accuracy of submitted information, in order to allow the Dashboard to continue to fulfill its stated purpose. We recommended that agencies appropriately categorize IT investments and that OMB make Dashboard information available independent of the budget process. OMB neither agreed nor disagreed with these recommendations. Six agencies generally agreed with the report or had no comments and two others did not agree, believing their categorizations were appropriate. We continue to believe that our recommendations are valid.

TechStat reviews were initiated by OMB to enable the federal government to turnaround, halt, or terminate IT projects that are failing or are not producing results. In 2013, we reported that OMB and selected agencies had held multiple TechStats, but that additional OMB oversight was needed to ensure that these meetings were having the appropriate impact on underperforming projects and that resulting cost savings were valid. Specifically, we determined that as of April 2013, OMB reported conducting 79 TechStats, which focused on 55 investments at 23 federal agencies. Further, 4 selected agencies—the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Energy, Justice, Transportation, the Treasury, and Veterans Affairs; and the Social Security Administration.

18 The eight agencies selected for the review were the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Energy, Justice, Transportation, the Treasury, and Veterans Affairs; and the Social Security Administration.

19 At times, a project’s cost, schedule, and performance goals—known as its baseline—are modified to reflect changed development circumstances. These changes—called a rebaseline—can be done for valid reasons, but can also be used to mask cost overruns and schedule delays.

20 GAO-13-524.
Commerce, HHS, and DHS—conducted 37 TechStats covering 28 investments. About 70 percent of the OMB-led and 76 percent of agency-led TechStats on major investments were considered medium to high risk at the time of the TechStat.

However, the number of at-risk TechStats held was relatively small compared to the current number of medium- and high-risk major IT investments. Specifically, the OMB-led TechStats represented roughly 18.5 percent of the investments across the government that had a medium- or high-risk CIO rating. For the 4 selected agencies, the number of TechStats represented about 33 percent of the investments that have a medium- or high-risk CIO rating. We concluded that until OMB and agencies develop plans to address these weaknesses, the investments would likely remain at risk.

In addition, we reported that OMB and selected agencies had tracked and reported positive results from TechStats, with most resulting in improved governance. Agencies also reported projects with accelerated delivery, reduced scope, or termination. We also found that OMB reported in 2011 that federal agencies achieved almost $4 billion in life-cycle cost savings as a result of TechStat sessions. However, we were unable to validate OMB’s reported results because OMB did not provide artifacts showing that it ensured the results were valid. Among other things, we recommended that OMB require agencies to report on how they validated the outcomes. OMB generally agreed with this recommendation.

In an effort to consolidate the growing number of federal data centers, in 2010, OMB launched a consolidation initiative intended to close 40 percent of government data centers by 2015, and, in doing so, save $3 billion. Since 2011, we have issued a series of reports on the efforts of agencies to consolidate their data centers.21 For example, in July 2011 and July 2012, we found that agencies had developed plans to consolidate data centers; however, these plans were incomplete and did not include best practices.22 In addition, although we reported that agencies had made progress on their data center closures, OMB had not determined initiative-wide cost savings, and oversight of the initiative was

---

21GAO-13-378; GAO-12-742; and GAO-11-565.

22GAO-12-742 and GAO-11-565.
not being performed in all key areas. Among other things, we recommended that OMB track and report on key performance measures, such as cost savings to date, and improve the execution of important oversight responsibilities, and that agencies complete inventories and plans. OMB agreed with these two recommendations, and most agencies agreed with our recommendations to them.

Additionally, as part of ongoing follow-up work, we have determined that while agencies had closed data centers, the number of federal data centers was significantly higher than previously estimated by OMB. Specifically, as of May 2013, agencies had reported closing 484 data centers by the end of April 2013, and were planning to close an additional 571 data centers—for a total of 1,055—by September 2014. However, as of July 2013, 22 of the 24 agencies participating in the initiative had collectively reported 6,836 data centers in their inventories—approximately 3,700 data centers more than OMB’s previous estimate from December 2011. This dramatic increase in the count of data centers highlights the need for continued oversight of agencies’ consolidation efforts.

OMB launched the PortfolioStat initiative in March 2012, which required 26 executive agencies\(^{23}\) to, among other things, reduce commodity IT spending and demonstrate how their IT investments align with the agency’s mission and business functions.\(^{24}\) In November 2013, we reported on agencies efforts to complete key required PortfolioStat actions and make portfolio improvements.\(^{25}\) We noted that all 26 agencies that were required to implement the PortfolioStat initiative took actions to address OMB’s requirements. However, there were shortcomings in their implementation of selected requirements, such as addressing all required elements of an action plan to consolidate commodity IT, and migrating two commodity areas to a shared service by the end of 2012. In addition, several agencies had weaknesses in selected areas such as the CIO’s authority to review and approve the entire portfolio, and ensuring a

---

\(^{23}\) Of the 27 previously mentioned agencies, 1 agency—the Smithsonian Institute—is not required to participate in the PortfolioStat initiative.


\(^{25}\) GAO-14-65.
complete baseline of information relative to commodity IT. Further, we observed that OMB’s estimate of about 100 consolidation opportunities and a potential $2.5 billion in savings from the PortfolioStat initiative was understated because, among other things, it did not include estimates from Defense and the Department of Justice. Our analysis, which included these estimates, showed that, collectively, the 26 agencies reported about 200 opportunities and at least $5.8 billion in potential savings through fiscal year 2015, at least $3.3 billion more than the number initially reported by OMB.

In March 2013, OMB issued a memorandum commencing the second iteration of its PortfolioStat initiative. This memorandum identified a number of improvements that should help strengthen IT portfolio management and address key issues we have identified. However, we concluded that selected OMB efforts could be strengthened to improve the PortfolioStat initiative and ensure agencies achieve identified cost savings, including addressing issues related to existing CIO authority at federal agencies, and publicly reporting on agency-provided data. We recommended, among other things, that OMB require agencies to fully disclose limitations with respect to CIO authority. In addition, we made several recommendations to improve agencies’ implementation of PortfolioStat requirements. OMB partially agreed with these recommendations, and responses from 20 of the agencies commenting on the report varied.

In summary, OMB’s and agencies’ recent efforts have resulted in greater transparency and oversight of federal spending, but continued leadership and attention are necessary to build on the progress that has been made. The expanded use of the common factors critical to the successful management of large-scale IT acquisitions should result in more effective delivery of mission-critical systems. Additionally, federal agencies need to continue to improve the accuracy and availability of information on the Dashboard to provide greater transparency and even more attention to


27Of the 20 agencies commenting on the report, 12 agreed with our recommendations directed to them, 4 disagreed or partially disagreed with our recommendations directed to them, and 4 provided additional clarifying information.
the billions of dollars invested in troubled projects. Further, agencies should conduct additional TechStat reviews to focus management attention on troubled projects and establish clear action items to turn the projects around or terminate them.

The federal government can also build on the progress of agencies’ data center closures and reduction in commodity IT. With the possibility of over $5.8 billion in savings from the data center consolidation and PortfolioStat initiatives, agencies should continue to identify consolidation opportunities in both data centers and commodity IT. In addition, better support for the estimates of cost savings associated with the opportunities identified would increase the likelihood that these savings will be achieved.

Chairman Udall, Ranking Member Johanns, and Members of the Subcommittee, this completes my prepared statement. I would be pleased to respond to any questions that you may have at this time.

If you or your staffs have any questions about this testimony, please contact me at (202) 512-9286 or at pownerd@gao.gov. Individuals who made key contributions to this testimony are Dave Hinchman (Assistant Director), Rebecca Eyler, Kaelin Kuhn, Bradley Roach, Andrew Stavisky, and Kevin Walsh.
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