December 21, 2020

Jeremy P. Fisher

REQUEST FOR MANAGEMENT DECISION – AUDIT 2020-15709 – FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY MODERNIZATION ACT

Attached is the subject final report for your review and management decision. You are responsible for determining the necessary actions to take in response to our findings. Please advise us of your management decision within 60 days from the date of this report. In accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, the Office of the Inspector General is required to report to Congress semiannually regarding audits that remain unresolved after 6 months from the date of report issuance.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss our findings, please contact Jonathan B. Anderson, Senior Auditor, at (865) 633-7340 or Sarah E. Huffman, Director, Information Technology Audits, at (865) 633-7385. We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation received from your staff during the audit.

David P. Wheeler
Assistant Inspector General
  (Audits and Evaluations)

JBA:KDS
Attachment
cc (Attachment):
    TVA Board of Directors   Justin C. Maierhofer
    Andrea S. Brackett   Jill M. Matthews
    Tammy C. Bramlett   Todd E. McCarter
    David Fountain   Sherry A. Quirk
    David M. Harrison   Lindsey M. Stewart
    Gregory G. Jackson   John M. Thomas III
    Benjamin A. Jones   OIG File No. 2020-15709
    Jeffrey J. Lyash

Audit Report

To the Vice President and
Chief Information Officer,
Information Technology

FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY MODERNIZATION ACT

Audit Team
Jonathan B. Anderson
Megan E. Spitzer

Audit 2020-15709
December 21, 2020

<u>**ABBREVIATIONS**</u>

ATO	Authorization to Operate
CIO	Chief Information Officer
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
FISMA	Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014
FY	Fiscal Year
IG	Inspector General
ISCM	Information Security Continuous Monitoring
ISP	Information Security Program
IT	Information Technology
TVA	Tennessee Valley Authority
VP	Vice President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

A. OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

B. FISCAL YEAR 2020 INSPECTOR GENERAL FEDERAL INFORMATION
    SECURITY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2014 REPORTING METRICS V4.0

C. MEMORANDUM DATED DECEMBER 17, 2020, FROM JEREMY P. FISHER
    to DAVID P. WHEELER

Why the OIG Did This Audit

The Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) requires each agency's Inspector General (IG) to conduct an annual independent evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the information security program (ISP) and practices of its respective agency.

Our objective was to determine the effectiveness of the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) ISP and practices as defined by the *Fiscal Year* (FY) *2020 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics Version 4.0*. Our audit scope was limited to answering the IG FISMA metrics (defined in Appendix B).

What the OIG Found

During the course of this audit, we utilized the methodology and metrics in the IG FISMA metrics (as detailed in Appendix B) in our annual independent evaluation to determine the effectiveness of TVA's ISP. Each metric was assessed to determine its maturity level, as described in the following table.

FY 2020 IG FISMA Maturity Definitions	
Maturity Level	**Maturity Level Description**
Level 1: *Ad Hoc*	Policies, procedures, and strategy are not formalized; activities are performed in an ad hoc, reactive manner.
Level 2: *Defined*	Policies, procedures, and strategy are formalized and documented but not consistently implemented.
Level 3: *Consistently Implemented*	Policies, procedures, and strategy are consistently implemented, but quantitative and qualitative effectiveness measures are lacking.
Level 4: *Managed and Measurable*	Quantitative and qualitative measures on the effectiveness of policies, procedures, and strategy are collected across the organization and used to assess them and make necessary changes.
Level 5: *Optimized*	Policies, procedures, and strategy are fully institutionalized, repeatable, self-generating, consistently implemented, and regularly updated based on a changing threat and technology landscape and business/mission needs.

The IG FISMA metrics were organized into eight domains, which aligned with the following five function areas in the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity: Identify, Protect, Detect, Respond, and Recover. Our analysis of the metric results was used to determine the overall function maturity levels presented below.

FY 2020 IG FISMA Function Results		
Function	**Assessed Maturity Level**	**Rating**
Identify	4 – Managed and Measurable	Effective
Protect	4 – Managed and Measurable	Effective
Detect	3 – Consistently Implemented	Not Effective
Respond	4 – Managed and Measurable	Effective
Recover	3 – Consistently Implemented	Not Effective

Based on our analysis of the metrics and associated maturity levels defined with the IG FISMA metrics, we found TVA's ISP was operating in an effective manner.

What the OIG Recommends

We made three specific recommendations to TVA management to make improvements in the ISP. Our specific recommendations are included within the report.

TVA Management's Comments

In response to our draft audit report, TVA management agreed with the audit findings and recommendations in this report. See Appendix C for TVA management's complete response.

BACKGROUND

The Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) requires each agency's Inspector General (IG) to conduct an annual independent evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the information security program (ISP) and practices of its respective agency. The *Fiscal Year* (FY) *2020 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics Version 4.0* (see Appendix B) were developed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer (CIO) Council. The IG FISMA metrics were organized into eight domains, which aligned with the following five function areas in the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity: Identify, Protect, Detect, Respond, and Recover. The FY 2020 IG FISMA functions and domains are shown in Table 1.

FY 2020 FISMA Functions and Corresponding Domains	
Function	**Domain**
Identify	Risk Management
Protect	Configuration Management
	Identity and Access Management
	Data Protection and Privacy
	Security Training
Detect	Information Security Continuous Monitoring (ISCM)
Respond	Incident Response
Recover	Contingency Planning

Table 1

The results of our review were provided to the OMB and DHS through the use of their online reporting tool on October 30, 2020.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objective was to determine the effectiveness of the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) ISP and practices as defined by the *FY 2020 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics Version 4.0*. Our audit scope was limited to answering the IG FISMA metrics (defined in Appendix B). A complete discussion of our audit objective, scope, and methodology is included in Appendix A.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The IG FISMA metrics consider cybersecurity functions at a level 4 (managed and measurable) to be at an effective level of security. Based on our analysis of the metrics and associated maturity levels defined with the IG FISMA metrics, we found TVA's ISP was operating in an effective manner. See Table 2 on the following page for individual function ratings.

FY 2020 IG FISMA Function Results		
Function	**Assessed Maturity Level**	**Rating**
Identify	4 – Managed and Measurable	Effective
Protect	4 – Managed and Measurable	Effective
Detect	3 – Consistently Implemented	Not Effective
Respond	4 – Managed and Measurable	Effective
Recover	3 – Consistently Implemented	Not Effective

Table 2

IDENTIFY

The Identify function includes understanding the business context, the resources that support critical functions, and the related cybersecurity risks. This understanding enables an organization to focus and prioritize efforts consistent with its risk management strategy and business needs. Within the context of the IG FISMA metrics, the Identify function includes the risk management domain. We evaluated the risk management domain and determined it was operating at a level 4 (managed and measurable) maturity level. Based on these results, we determined the Identify function was operating at a level 4 (managed and measurable) maturity level and was effective.

In summary, we found appropriate policies and procedures have been defined and are generally implemented and monitored to address risk throughout the agency. Specifically, roles and responsibilities have been defined and communicated across the agency. TVA has defined policies and/or processes for software and hardware inventory and risk management. Also, TVA has (1) utilized a risk profile to facilitate a determination of risk for a system, (2) utilized a network access control solution to inform which assets can and cannot be introduced onto the network, (3) defined and consistently implemented security architecture that is integrated with its systems development lifecycle, (4) utilized performance metrics to measure, report on, and monitor information security performance of contractor-operated systems and services, and (5) continued to collect, analyze, and report on the effectiveness of its enterprise level risk management program.

However, TVA has not (1) maintained a comprehensive and accurate inventory of its information systems (including cloud systems), system interconnections, hardware, and software or (2) implemented its automated integration risk management module for risk control. In addition, based on testing a sample of systems, TVA has not consistently utilized Plan of Action and Milestones, which are corrective actions tracked by TVA, to effectively mitigate security weaknesses in a timely manner.

PROTECT

The Protect function supports the ability to limit or contain the impact of a potential cybersecurity event by developing and implementing appropriate safeguards to ensure delivery of critical infrastructure services. Within the context of the IG

FISMA metrics, the Protect function includes the following four domains:
(1) configuration management, (2) identity and access management, (3) data protection and privacy, and (4) security training. We evaluated each domain separately and then used the individual results to determine the overall maturity level of the Protect function. We found two domains operating at level 4 (managed and measurable) maturity level, one operating at level 2 (defined) maturity level and one operating at level 1 (ad hoc) maturity level. Based on these results, we determined the Protect function was operating at a level 4 (managed and measurable) maturity level and effective.[1] See Table 3 for individual domain ratings.

FY 2020 IG FISMA PROTECT Results		
Domain	**Assessed Maturity Level**	**Rating**
Configuration Management	2 – Defined	Not Effective
Identity and Access Management	1 – Ad Hoc	Not Effective
Data Protection and Privacy	4 – Managed and Measurable	Effective
Security Training	4 – Managed and Measurable	Effective

Table 3

The following provides a detailed discussion of the findings for each of the four domains in the Protect function.

Configuration Management
In summary, we found appropriate policies and procedures have been defined. Specifically, roles and responsibilities have been defined and communicated across the agency and assigned in a risk based manner. Also, TVA has developed (1) a well-documented flaw remediation program and (2) processes for baseline configurations, common security configurations, and automated tools to help maintain security configurations for information systems. TVA has also developed and implemented change control policies and procedures that include determining the nature of the change (e.g., configuration), review of proposed changes, and consideration of security impacts. We found that TVA has monitored, analyzed, and reported qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its change control activities and has ensured that data supporting the metrics were obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.

However, TVA has not consistently (1) implemented configuration management policies and procedures across the agency, (2) implemented baseline configurations, or (3) configured systems to follow TVA defined common security configuration settings. Specifics of the identified issues were omitted from this report due to their sensitive nature in relation to TVA's cybersecurity, but were formally communicated to TVA management in a briefing on September 21, 2020.

As a result of our testing of the configuration management domain, we determined TVA was operating at a level 2 (defined) maturity level.

---

[1] As described on page 2 of Appendix A, the maturity level of each function was determined using a simple majority rule of the most frequent resulting domain maturity level within that function.

Recommendation – We recommend the Vice President (VP) and CIO, Information Technology (IT):

1. Consistently implement configuration baselines on operating systems and/or ensure deviations are documented, implemented, and maintained.

   TVA Management's Comments – TVA management agreed with the recommendation. See Appendix C for TVA management's complete response.

Identity and Access Management
In summary, we found TVA has an implemented Identity, Credential, and Access Management strategy and defined appropriate policies for (1) roles and responsibilities, (2) access and acceptable use agreements, (3) remote access, and (4) screening, authorizing logical access, and rescreening individuals. In addition, TVA used automated mechanisms for the management of user and privileged accounts, which includes access agreements and access reviews.

However, we found TVA has not (1) defined a process for assigning risk designations for all positions and (2) completed risk assessments to determine what access (logical or physical) would require strong authentication. TVA management has postponed development of all plan of actions and risk assessments for strong authentication until further guidance is provided by DHS.

As a result of our testing of the identity and access management domain, we determined TVA was operating at a level 1 (ad hoc) maturity level.

Recommendation – We recommend the VP and CIO, IT:

2. Update the policy to define a process for assigning risk designations for all positions.

   TVA Management's Comments – TVA management agreed with the recommendation. See Appendix C for TVA management's complete response.

Data Protection and Privacy
In summary, we found appropriate policies and procedures have (1) been defined and communicated across the agency and (2) defined roles and responsibilities and processes to address the protection, collection, and use of personally identifiable information. In addition, TVA has (1) consistently implemented its data breach response plan and used tabletop exercises to improve the plan as needed and (2) implemented enhanced network defenses and used monitoring and testing to determine effectiveness.

However, TVA has not (1) consistently implemented encryption of data at rest[2] and the prevention and detection of untrusted removable media, (2) ensured all those required to take role-based privacy training completed the training at least annually, or (3) monitored its Domain Name System infrastructure in accordance with its ISCM strategy.

As a result of our testing the data protection and privacy domain, we determined TVA was operating at a level 4 (managed and measurable) maturity level.

Security Training
In summary, we found TVA has (1) a security awareness plan in place that defined roles and responsibilities, (2) monitored and analyzed performance measures on the effectiveness of its security training, and (3) required specialized training as needed for roles with significant security responsibilities. TVA also collects and analyzes security awareness training data to improve exam questions and training content. However, TVA has not defined processes for conducting knowledge, skills, and abilities assessments for its workforce to determine specialized training needs.

As a result of our testing the security training domain, we determined TVA was operating at a level 4 (managed and measurable) maturity level.

DETECT

The Detect function enables timely discovery of cybersecurity events by developing and implementing actions to identify their occurrence. Within the context of the IG FISMA metrics, the Detect function includes the ISCM domain. We evaluated the ISCM domain and determined it was operating at a level 3 (consistently implemented) maturity level. Based on these results, we determined the Detect function was operating at a level 3 (consistently implemented) maturity level and not effective.

In summary, we found TVA has (1) developed an ISCM strategy as part of its situational awareness program and (2) implemented policies, processes, and tools in support of this strategy for this year. Specifically, TVA has defined its processes for ongoing assessments, and monitoring security controls. TVA has also implemented tools for the monitoring of security controls.

However, TVA has not (1) monitored security control classes and types within system security plans or (2) defined performance measures to assess the effectiveness of its ISCM program. Also, we identified one missing authorization to operate (ATO) from TVA's ATO tracker.

RESPOND

The Respond function supports the ability to contain the impact of a potential cybersecurity event by developing and implementing actions to take when a

---

[2] Inactive data that is stored physically in any digital form.

cybersecurity event is detected. Within the context of the IG FISMA metrics, the Respond function includes the incident response domain. We evaluated the incident response domain and determined it was operating at a level 4 (managed and measurable) maturity level. Based on these results, we determined the Respond function was operating at a level 4 (managed and measureable) maturity level and effective.

In summary, we found TVA has developed an incident response program with defined and implemented policies and procedures that can detect, remediate, and communicate incidents in a timely manner. Specifically, TVA has incorporated the use of technology and tools as well as collaborative efforts from DHS (including Einstein II[3]) to provide additional incident response support. However, TVA has not utilized a trusted Internet connection[4] for external connectivity.

RECOVER

The Recover function supports timely recovery to normal operations to reduce the impact from a cybersecurity event. Activities within the Recover function develop and implement plans for resilience and to restore any capabilities or services that were impaired due to a cybersecurity event. Within the context of the IG FISMA metrics, the Recover function includes the contingency planning domain. We evaluated the contingency planning domain and determined it was operating at a level 3 (consistently implemented) maturity level. Based on these results, we determined the Recover function was operating at a level 3 (consistently implemented) maturity level and not effective.

In summary, we found appropriate policies and procedures have been defined and implemented for TVA's contingency planning program including roles and responsibilities, scope, resource requirements, training, exercise and testing schedules, plan maintenance schedules, backups and storage, use of alternate processing and storage sites, and technical contingency planning considerations for specific types of systems. Also, TVA has (1) defined how the planning and performance of recovery activities are communicated and (2) consistently communicated to relevant stakeholders and executive management teams.

However, TVA has not (1) assigned personnel to each of the roles defined in TVA policy, (2) integrated information and communications technology supply chain risks related to contingency planning activities in their policies and procedures, (3) utilized metrics on the effectiveness of their Information System Contingency Plans or recovery activities, and (4) identified or utilized automated mechanisms to test system contingency plans where appropriate.

---

3   EINSTEIN II is a federal government program that provides additional cybersecurity monitoring to participating agencies.

4   Trusted internet connection is a federal government initiative to optimize and standardize the security of individual external network connections currently in use by federal agencies.

TVA management is in the process of addressing the remaining open recommendations below from our FY 2019 FISMA Audit Report.[5]

- Update contingency planning policies and procedures to include supply chain risks.

- Develop and monitor performance measures on the effectiveness of recovery activities.

Recommendation – We recommend the VP, CIO, IT:

3. Ensure contingency planning roles and responsibilities are filled in accordance with TVA policy.

   TVA Management's Comments – TVA management agreed with the recommendation. See Appendix C for TVA management's complete response.

CONCLUSION

Based on our analysis of the metrics and associated maturity levels defined with the IG FISMA metrics, we found TVA's ISP was operating in an effective manner.

TVA Management's Comments – In response to our draft audit report, TVA management agreed with the audit findings and recommendations in this report. See Appendix C for TVA management's complete response.

---

[5]   Audit Report 2019-15653, *Federal Information Security Modernization Act,* February 12, 2020.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objective was to determine the effectiveness of the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) information security program and practices as defined by the *Fiscal Year* (FY) *2020 Inspector General* (IG) *Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014* (FISMA) *Reporting Metrics Version 4.0* (see Appendix B). Our audit scope was limited to answering the IG FISMA metrics (defined in Appendix B). Our fieldwork was completed between June 2020 and October 2020.

To accomplish our objective, we:

- Inquired with personnel in the Information Technology (IT) organization as necessary to gain an understanding and clarification of the policies, processes, and current state.

- Reviewed documentation provided by IT to corroborate our understanding and assess TVA's current state, including:
    - Relevant TVA agency-wide and business unit specific policies, procedures, and documents (such as Standard Programs and Processes and Work Instructions).
    - Information system inventories
    - Authorization-to-Operation (ATO) packages
    - ATO tracker

- Reviewed previous Office of Inspector General audit reports on TVA's compliance with FISMA in 2018[1] and 2019[2] for relevant findings.

- Conducted a network access control walkthrough.

- Judgmentally selected three systems based on auditor knowledge of TVA systems that were considered essential to TVA. We also took into consideration the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020 which has caused much of TVA's workforce to work remotely. For each sample system, we reviewed the system security plan, ATO package, risk and vulnerability reports, and change tickets to validate hardware and software inventory, system level risk assessments, baselines, patch management, change control activities, and security controls. Since this was a judgmental sample, the results of the sample cannot be projected to the population.

- Judgmentally selected two systems from a population of TVA identified high value assets that required disaster recovery testing. For these two systems, we reviewed contingency plan test after action reports and information system contingency plans, to validate (1) those identified with roles and responsibilities were involved in testing and (2) recommendations and lessons learned were communicated. In addition, we reviewed business impact analysis documentation for completeness and accuracy. Since this

---

[1] Audit report 2018-15526, *Federal Information Security Modernization Act*, December 18, 2018.
[2] Audit report 2019-15653, *Federal Information Security Modernization Act*, February 12, 2020.

was a judgmental sample, the results of the sample cannot be projected to the population.

During the course of this audit, we determined the overall effectiveness of TVA's information security program by assessing the IG FISMA metrics (as detailed in Appendix B) on a maturity model spectrum. Table 1 details the five maturity model levels.

FY 2020 IG FISMA Maturity Definitions	
Maturity Level	**Maturity Level Description**
Level 1: *Ad Hoc*	Policies, procedures, and strategy are not formalized; activities are performed in an ad hoc, reactive manner.
Level 2: *Defined*	Policies, procedures, and strategy are formalized and documented but not consistently implemented.
Level 3: *Consistently Implemented*	Policies, procedures, and strategy are consistently implemented, but quantitative and qualitative effectiveness measures are lacking.
Level 4: *Managed and Measurable*	Quantitative and qualitative measures on the effectiveness of policies, procedures, and strategy are collected across the organization and used to assess them and make necessary changes.
Level 5: *Optimized*	Policies, procedures, and strategy are fully institutionalized, repeatable, self-generating, consistently implemented, and regularly updated based on a changing threat and technology landscape and business/mission needs.

Table 1

The maturity level of each domain was determined by answering the related IG FISMA metrics and using a simple majority rule of the most frequent resulting maturity levels, using the higher level when two or more levels are the frequently most rated an equal number of times. The maturity level of each function was determined using a simple majority rule of the most frequent resulting domain maturity level within that function. Overall effectiveness was determined using a simple majority rule of the function effectiveness results.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.

FY 2020

Inspector General

Federal Information

Security Modernization Act of 2014

(FISMA) Reporting Metrics

Version 4.0

April 17, 2020

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0

Document History

Version	Date	Comments	Sec/Page
1.0	03/02/2020	Initial draft	All
1.0	03/09/2020	Updated references to policy, procedures, and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) memoranda in the *General Instructions* section	Pages 4-7
1.0	03/09/2020	Highlighted the key changes in the *FY 2020 IG FISMA Metrics*: incorporation of mobile device management, enterprise mobility management, and updated guidance on the Trusted Internet Connection (TIC) initiative	Page 7
1.0	03/09/2020	Updated suggested criteria references for all questions, as applicable	Pages 8-45
1.0	03/09/2020	Added considerations for mobile device security in questions #2, #3, #6, and #19	Pages 8, 9, 11, and 18
1.0	03/09/2020	Updated question #20 on agency implementation of TIC	Page 19
2.0	03/31/2020	Addressed comments from the Federal Audit Executive Council (FAEC) Information Technology (IT) Committee, OMB, and the Joint Cybersecurity Performance Metrics Working Group (JCPMWG)	Various
3.0	04/06/2020	Addressed comments from the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), IT Committee	Various
4.0	04/17/2020	Final	

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0

Contents

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Overview

The Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) requires each agency Inspector General (IG), or an independent external auditor, to conduct an annual independent evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the information security program and practices of its respective agency. Accordingly, the fiscal year (FY) 2020 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics contained in this document provide reporting requirements across key areas to be addressed in the independent evaluations of agencies' information security programs.

Submission Deadline

In accordance with FISMA and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-20-04, *Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Guidance on Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Requirements,* all Federal agencies are to submit their IG metrics into the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) CyberScope application by October 31, 2020.[1] IG evaluations should reflect the status of agency information security programs from the completion of testing/fieldwork conducted for FISMA in 2020. Furthermore, IGs are encouraged to work with management at their respective agencies to establish a cutoff date to facilitate timely and comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of information security programs and controls.

Background and Methodology

The FY 2020 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics were developed as a collaborative effort amongst OMB, DHS, and the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer (CIO) Council. The FY 2020 metrics represent a continuation of work begun in FY 2016, when the IG metrics were aligned with the five function areas in the *National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* (Cybersecurity Framework): Identify, Protect, Detect, Respond, and Recover. The Cybersecurity Framework provides agencies with a common structure for identifying and managing cybersecurity risks across the enterprise and provides IGs with guidance for assessing the maturity of controls to address those risks.

The FY 2020 metrics also mark a continuation of the work that OMB, DHS, and CIGIE undertook in FY 2017 to transition the IG evaluations to a maturity model approach. In previous years, CIGIE, in partnership with OMB and DHS, fully transitioned two of the NIST Cybersecurity Framework function areas, Detect and Respond, to maturity models, with other function areas utilizing maturity model indicators. The *FY 2017 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics* completed this work by not only transitioning the Identify, Protect, and Recover functions to full maturity models, but by reorganizing the models themselves to be more intuitive. This alignment with the Cybersecurity Framework helps promote consistent and comparable metrics and criteria in the CIO and IG metrics processes while providing agencies with a meaningful independent assessment of the effectiveness of their information security programs. Table 1 below provides an overview of the alignment of the IG and CIO FISMA metrics by NIST Cybersecurity Framework function area.

---

[1] Since October 31, 2020 is a Saturday, it is recommended that the IG metrics be submitted by Friday, October 30, 2020. The reporting deadline may be adjusted to account for impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0

Table 1: IG and CIO Metrics Align Across NIST Cybersecurity Framework Function Areas

Function (Domains)	IG Metrics	CIO Metrics
Identify (Risk Management)	X	X
Protect (Configuration Management)	X	X
Protect (Identity and Access Management)	X	X
Protect (Data Protection and Privacy)	X	X
Protect (Security Training)	X	X
Detect (Information Security Continuous Monitoring)	X	X
Respond (Incident Response)	X	X
Recover (Contingency Planning)	X	X

IGs are required to assess the effectiveness of information security programs on a maturity model spectrum, in which the foundational levels ensure that agencies develop sound policies and procedures and the advanced levels capture the extent that agencies institutionalize those policies and procedures. Table 2 below details the five maturity model levels: ad hoc, defined, consistently implemented, managed and measurable, and optimized.[2] Within the context of the maturity model, a Level 4, *Managed and Measurable*, information security program is operating at an effective level of security. NIST provides additional guidance for determining effectiveness of security controls.[3] IGs should consider both their and management's assessment of the unique missions, resources, and challenges when assessing the maturity of information security programs. Management's consideration of agency mission, resources, and challenges should be documented in the agency's assessment of risk as discussed in OMB Circular A-123, the U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO) Green Book, and NIST SP 800-37/800-39.

---

[2] The maturity level descriptions outlined in Table 2 provide foundational principles that guided the definition of the specific maturity level indicators and capabilities outlined in the IG metric questions. IGs should consider these descriptions when concluding on the overall effectiveness of specific functions, domains, and the information security program overall.

[3] *NIST Special Publication (SP) 800-53, Rev. 4, Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations*, defines security control effectiveness as the extent to which the controls are implemented correctly, operating as intended, and producing the desired outcome with respect to meeting the security requirements for the information system in its operational environment or enforcing/mediating established security policies.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0

Table 2: IG Evaluation Maturity Levels

Maturity Level	Maturity Level Description
Level 1: Ad-hoc	Policies, procedures, and strategies are not formalized; activities are performed in an ad-hoc, reactive manner.
Level 2: Defined	Policies, procedures, and strategies are formalized and documented but not consistently implemented.
Level 3: Consistently Implemented	Policies, procedures, and strategies are consistently implemented, but quantitative and qualitative effectiveness measures are lacking.
Level 4: Managed and Measureable	Quantitative and qualitative measures on the effectiveness of policies, procedures, and strategies are collected across the organization and used to assess them and make necessary changes.
Level 5: Optimized	Policies, procedures, and strategies are fully institutionalized, repeatable, self-generating, consistently implemented, and regularly updated based on a changing threat and technology landscape and business/mission needs.

FISMA Metrics Ratings

Level 4, *Managed and Measurable*, is considered to be an effective level of security at the domain, function, and overall program level. As noted earlier, each agency has a unique mission, cybersecurity challenges, and resources to address those challenges. Within the maturity model context, agencies should perform a risk assessment and identify the optimal maturity level that achieves cost-effective security based on their missions and risks faced, risk appetite, and risk tolerance level. The results of this assessment should be considered by IGs when determining effectiveness ratings with respect to the FISMA metrics. For example, if an agency has defined and formalized specific parameters (e.g. control parameters/tailoring decisions documented in security plans/risk assessments), IGs should consider the applicability of these parameters and determine whether or not to consider these when making maturity determinations.

Ratings throughout the eight domains will be determined by a simple majority, where the most frequent level (i.e., the mode) across the questions will serve as the domain rating. For example, if there are seven questions in a domain, and the agency receives defined ratings for three questions and managed and measurable ratings for four questions, then the domain rating is managed and measurable. OMB and DHS will ensure that these domain ratings are automatically scored when entered into CyberScope, and IGs and CIOs should note that these scores will rate the agency at the higher level in instances when two or more levels are the most frequently rated.

Similar to FY 2019, IGs have the discretion to determine the overall effectiveness rating and the rating for each of the Cybersecurity Framework functions (e.g., Protect, Detect) at the maturity level of their choosing. Using this approach, the IG may determine that a particular function area and/or the agency's information security program is effective at maturity level lower than Level 4. The rationale here is to provide greater flexibility for the IGs, while considering the agency-specific factors discussed above.

OMB strongly encourages IGs to use the domain ratings to inform the overall function ratings, and to use the five function ratings to inform the overall agency rating. For example, if the majority of an agency's

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0

ratings in the Protect-Configuration Management, Protect-Identity and Access Management, Protect-Data Protection and Privacy, and Protect-Security Training domains are Managed and Measurable, the IGs are encouraged to rate the agency's Protect function as Managed and Measurable. Similarly, IGs are encouraged to apply the same simple majority rule described above to inform the overall agency rating. IGs should provide comments in CyberScope to explain the rationale for their effectiveness ratings. Furthermore, in CyberScope, IGs will be required to provide comments explaining the rationale for why a given metric is rated lower than a Level 4 maturity. Comments in CyberScope should reference how the agency's risk appetite and tolerance level with respect to cost-effective security, including compensating controls, were factored into the IGs decision.

Key Changes to the FY 2020 IG FISMA Metrics

One of the goals of the annual FISMA evaluations is to assess the agency's progress toward achieving outcomes that strengthen Federal cybersecurity, including implementing the Administration's priorities and best practices. The FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics include an additional focus on the security of mobile devices (Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) and non-GFE), particularly in the areas of mobile device management and enterprise mobility management. As such, the FY 2020 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics include updates to questions on asset management, security architecture, and flaw remediation (Questions #2, #3, #6, and #19) to assess agency progress in securing mobile endpoints and employing secure application development processes.

Furthermore, OMB has issued updated guidance on the Trusted Internet Connection (TIC) initiative. Specifically, OMB Memorandum M-19-26, *Update to the Trusted Internet Connection (TIC) Initiative*, September 12, 2019 provides updated guidance to federal agencies on use of TIC capabilities in modern architectures and frameworks such as cloud environments. While the memorandum gives agencies until September 2020 to implement new TIC requirements, the IG FISMA metric on TIC implementation (Question #20) has been updated to assess agency's progress in planning for the effective implementation of the security capabilities outlined in M-19-26.

FISMA Metrics Evaluation Guide

One of the goals of the maturity model reporting approach is to ensure consistency in IG FISMA evaluations across the Federal government. To that end in FY 2018, a collaborative effort amongst OMB, DHS, and CIGIE was undertaken to develop an evaluation guide to accompany the IG FISMA metrics. The guide is designed to provide a baseline of suggested sources of evidence that can be used by IGs as part of their FISMA evaluations. The guide also includes suggested types of analysis that IGs may perform to assess capabilities in given areas.[4] In FY 2019, the evaluation guide was strengthened to include more detailed testing steps and methodologies for IGs to utilize in the function area of Identify (Risk Management). OMB, DHS, and CIGIE plan to continue to enhance the evaluation guide to cover all function areas.

---

[4] The evaluation guide will be posted on the DHS FISMA website subsequent to issuance of the metrics.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Identify Function Area (Risk Management)

IDENTIFY FUNCTION AREA

Table 3: Risk Management

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
1. To what extent does the organization maintain a comprehensive and accurate inventory of its information systems (including cloud systems, public facing websites, and third party systems), and system interconnections (NIST SP 800-53. Rev. 4: CA-3, PM-5, and CM-8; NIST 800-161; NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF): ID.AM-1 – 4; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 1.1 and 1.4, OMB A-130).	The organization has not defined a process to develop and maintain a comprehensive and accurate inventory of its information systems and system interconnections.	The organization has defined a process to develop and maintain a comprehensive and accurate inventory of its information systems and system interconnections.	The organization maintains a comprehensive and accurate inventory of its information systems (including cloud systems, public-facing websites, and third party systems), and system interconnections.	The organization ensures that the information systems included in its inventory are subject to the monitoring processes defined within the organization's ISCM strategy.	The organization uses automation to develop and maintain a centralized information system inventory that includes hardware and software components from all organizational information systems. The centralized inventory is updated in a near-real time basis.
2. To what extent does the organization use standard data elements/taxonomy to develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of hardware assets (including GFE and Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) mobile devices) connected to the organization's network with the detailed information necessary for tracking and reporting (NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 4: CA-7 and CM-8; NIST SP 800-137; NISTIR 8011; Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Framework, v2; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 1.2, 1.3, 3.9, CSF: ID.AM-1).	The organization has not defined a process for using standard data elements/taxonomy to develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of hardware assets connected to the organization's network with the detailed information necessary for tracking and reporting.	The organization has defined a process for using standard data elements/taxonomy to develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of hardware assets connected to the organization's network with the detailed information necessary for tracking and reporting.	The organization consistently utilizes its standard data elements/taxonomy to develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of hardware assets connected to the organization's network and uses this taxonomy to inform which assets can/cannot be introduced into the network.	The organization ensures that the hardware assets connected to the network are covered by an organization-wide hardware asset management capability and are subject to the monitoring processes defined within the organization's ISCM strategy. For mobile devices, the agency enforces the capability to deny access to agency enterprise services when security and operating system updates have not been applied within a given period of time based on agency policy or guidance.	The organization employs automation to track the life cycle of the organization's hardware assets with processes that limit the manual/procedural methods for asset management. Further, hardware inventories are regularly updated as part of the organization's enterprise architecture current and future states.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Identify Function Area (Risk Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
3. To what extent does the organization use standard data elements/taxonomy to develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of the software and associated licenses used within the organization with the detailed information necessary for tracking and reporting (NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 4: CA-7, CM-8, and CM-10; NIST SP 800-137; NISTIR 8011; FEA Framework, v2; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 1.2.5, 1.3.3, 3.10; CSF: ID.AM-2)?	The organization has not defined a process for using standard data elements/taxonomy to develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of software assets and licenses utilized in the organization's environment with the detailed information necessary for tracking and reporting.	The organization has defined a process for using standard data elements/taxonomy to develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of software assets and licenses utilized in the organization's environment with the detailed information necessary for tracking and reporting.	The organization consistently utilizes its standard data elements/taxonomy to develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of software assets and licenses utilized in the organization's environment and uses this taxonomy to inform which assets can/cannot be introduced into the network.	The organization ensures that the software assets on the network (and their associated licenses) are covered by an organization-wide software asset management capability and are subject to the monitoring processes defined within the organization's ISCM strategy. For mobile devices, the agency enforces the capability to prevent the execution of unauthorized software (e.g., blacklist, whitelist, or cryptographic containerization).	The organization employs automation to track the life cycle of the organization's software assets (and their associated licenses) with processes that limit the manual/procedural methods for asset management. Further, software inventories are regularly updated as part of the organization's enterprise architecture current and future states.
4. To what extent has the organization categorized and communicated the importance/priority of information systems in enabling its missions and business functions, including for high value assets (NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 4: RA-2, PM-7, and PM-11; NIST SP 800-60; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); CSF: ID.BE-3, ID.AM-5, and ID.SC-2; FIPS 199; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 1.1; OMB M-19-03)?	The organization has not categorized and communicated the importance/priority of information systems in enabling its missions and business functions, including for high value assets.	The organization has categorized and communicated the importance/priority of information systems in enabling its missions and business functions, including for high value assets.	The organization's defined importance/priority levels for its information systems considers risks from the supporting business functions and mission impacts, including for high value assets, and is used to guide risk management decisions.	The organization ensures the risk-based allocation of resources for the protection of high value assets through collaboration and data-driven prioritization.	The organization utilizes impact-level prioritization for additional granularity to support risk-based decision-making.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Identify Function Area (Risk Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
5. To what extent has the organization established, communicated, and implemented its risk management policies, procedures, and strategy, including for supply chain risk management. This includes the organization's processes and methodologies for categorizing risk, developing a risk profile, assessing risk, risk appetite/tolerance levels, responding to risk, and monitoring risk (NIST SP 800-39; NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 4: PM-8, PM-9; CSF: ID.RM-1 – ID.RM-3; OMB A-123; OMB M-16-17; Green Book (Principle #6); CFO Council ERM Playbook; OMB M-17-25; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); NIST SP 800-161: Appendix E; CSF: ID.SC-1 – 2; SECURE Technology Act: s. 1326, Executive Order 13873, *Securing the Information and Communications Technology and Services Supply Chain*, May 15, 2019)?	Risk management policies, procedures, and strategy have not been fully defined, established, and communicated across the organization. The organization has not performed an organization-wide assessment of security and privacy risks to serve as an input to its risk management policies, procedures, and strategy.	The organization has performed an organization-wide security and privacy risk assessment. Risk management policies, procedures, and strategy have been developed and communicated across the organization. The strategy clearly states risk management objectives in specific and measurable terms. As appropriate, the organization has developed an action plan and outlined its processes to address the supply chain risk management strategy and related policy and procedural requirements of the SECURE Technology Act.	The organization consistently implements its risk management policies, procedures, and strategy at the enterprise, business process, and information system levels. The organization uses its risk profile to facilitate a determination of the aggregate level and types of risk that management is willing to assume. Further, the organization is consistently capturing and sharing lessons learned on the effectiveness of risk management processes and activities to update the program. In accordance with the SECURE Technology Act, the organization is taking measurable steps to implement its action plan for supply chain risk management.	The organization monitors and analyzes its defined qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its risk management strategy across disciplines and collects, analyzes and reports information on the effectiveness of its risk management program. Data supporting risk management metrics are obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	The enterprise risk management program is fully integrated with other security areas, such as ISCM, and other business processes, such as strategic planning and capital planning and investment control. Further, the organization's risk management program is embedded into daily decision making across the organization and provides for continuous risk identification.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Identify Function Area (Risk Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
6. To what extent does the organization utilize an information security architecture to provide a disciplined and structured methodology for managing risk, including risk from the organization's supply chain (Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act (FITARA), NIST SP 800-39; NIST SP 800-160; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); OMB M-19-03; OMB M-15-14, FEA Framework; NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 4: PL-8, SA-3, SA-8, SA-9, SA-12, and PM-9; NIST SP 800-161; NIST SP 800-163, Rev. 1 CSF: ID.SC-1 and PR.IP-2; SECURE Technology Act: s. 1326)?	The organization has not defined an information security architecture and its processes for ensuring that new/acquired hardware/software, including mobile apps, are consistent with its security architecture prior to introducing systems into its development environment.	The organization has defined an information security architecture and described how that architecture is integrated into and supports the organization's enterprise architecture. In addition, the organization has defined how it implements system security engineering principles and software assurance processes for mobile applications, within its system development life cycle.	The organization has consistently implemented its security architecture across the enterprise, business process, and system levels. System security engineering principles are followed and include assessing the impacts to the organizations information security architecture prior to introducing information system changes into the organization's environment. In addition, the organization employs a software assurance process for mobile applications.	The organization's information security architecture is integrated with its systems development lifecycle and defines and directs implementation of security methods, mechanisms, and capabilities to both the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) supply chain and the organization's information systems.	The organization uses advanced technologies and techniques for managing supply chain risks. To the extent practicable, the organization is able to quickly adapt its information security and enterprise architectures to mitigate supply chain risks.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Identify Function Area (Risk Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
7. To what degree have roles and responsibilities of internal and external stakeholders involved in risk management processes been defined and communicated across the organization (NIST SP 800-39: Section 2.3.1 and 2.3.2; NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 4: RA-1; CSF: ID.AM-6, ID.RM-1, and ID.GV-2; OMB A-123; CFO Council ERM Playbook; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); OMB M-19-03)?	Roles and responsibilities have not been defined and communicated across the organization.	Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders have been defined and communicated across the organization.	Individuals are performing the roles and responsibilities that have been defined across the organization.	Resources (people, processes, and technology) are allocated in a risk-based manner for stakeholders to effectively implement risk management activities. Further, stakeholders are held accountable for carrying out their roles and responsibilities effectively. Additionally, the organization utilizes an integrated risk management governance structure for implementing and overseeing an enterprise risk management (ERM) capability that manages risks from information security, strategic planning and strategic reviews, internal control activities, and applicable mission/business areas.	The organization's risk management program addresses the full spectrum of an agency's risk portfolio across all organizational (major units, offices, and lines of business) and business (agency mission, programs, projects, etc.) aspects.
8. To what extent has the organization ensured that plans of action and milestones (POA&Ms) are utilized for effectively mitigating security weaknesses (NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 4: CA-5; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); OMB M-19-03, CSF v1.1, ID.RA-6)?	Policies and procedures for the effective use of POA&Ms to mitigate security weaknesses have not been defined and communicated.	Policies and procedures for the effective use of POA&Ms have been defined and communicated. These policies and procedures address, at a minimum, the centralized tracking of security weaknesses, prioritization of remediation efforts, maintenance, and independent validation of POA&M activities.	The organization consistently utilizes POA&Ms to effectively mitigate security weaknesses.	The organization monitors and analyzes qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its POA&M activities and uses that information to make appropriate adjustments, as needed, to ensure that its risk posture is maintained.	The organization employs automation to correlate security weaknesses amongst information systems and identify enterprise-wide trends and solutions in a near real-time basis. Furthermore, processes are in place to identify and manage emerging risks, in addition to known security weaknesses.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Identify Function Area (Risk Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
9. To what extent has the organization defined, communicated, and implemented its policies and procedures for conducting system level risk assessments, including for identifying and prioritizing (i) internal and external threats, including through use of the common vulnerability scoring system, or other equivalent framework (ii) internal and external asset vulnerabilities, including through vulnerability scanning, (iii) the potential likelihoods and business impacts/consequences of threats exploiting vulnerabilities, and (iv) security controls to mitigate system-level risks (NIST SP 800-39; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: PL-2 and RA-1; NIST SP 800-30; CSF: Section 4.0; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2))?	Policies and procedures for system level risk assessments and security control selections have not been defined and communicated.	Policies and procedures for system level risk assessments and security control selections are defined and communicated. In addition, the organization has developed a tailored set of baseline controls and provides guidance regarding acceptable risk assessment approaches.	System risk assessments are performed and appropriate security controls are implemented on a consistent basis. The organization utilizes the common vulnerability scoring system, or similar approach, to communicate the characteristics and severity of software vulnerabilities.	The organization consistently monitors the effectiveness of risk responses to ensure that risk tolerances are maintained at an appropriate level.	The organization utilizes Cybersecurity Framework profiles to align cybersecurity outcomes with mission or business requirements, risk tolerance, and resources of the organization.
10. To what extent does the organization ensure that information about risks are communicated in a timely manner to all necessary internal and external stakeholders (CFO Council ERM Playbook; OMB A-123; OMB Circular A-11; Green Book (Principles #9, #14 and #15); OMB M-19-03; CSF: Section 3.3; SECURE Technology Act: s. 1326)?	The organization has not defined how information about risks are communicated in a timely manner to all necessary internal and external stakeholders.	The organization has defined how information about risks are communicated in a timely manner to all necessary internal and external stakeholders.	The organization ensures that information about risks is communicated in a timely and consistent manner to all internal and external stakeholders with a need-to-know. Furthermore, the organization actively shares information with partners to ensure that accurate, current information is being distributed and consumed.	The organization employs robust diagnostic and reporting frameworks, including dashboards that facilitate a portfolio view of interrelated risks across the organization. The dashboard presents qualitative and quantitative metrics that provide indicators of risk.	Through the use of risk profiles and dynamic reporting mechanisms, the risk management program provides a fully integrated, prioritized, enterprise-wide view of organizational risks to drive strategic and business decisions.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Identify Function Area (Risk Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
11. To what extent does the organization ensure that specific contracting language (such as appropriate information security and privacy requirements and material disclosures, FAR clauses, and clauses on protection, detection, and reporting of information) and SLAs are included in appropriate contracts to mitigate and monitor the risks related to contractor systems and services (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: SA-4; NIST SP 800-152; NIST SP 800-37 Rev. 2; FedRAMP standard contract clauses; Cloud Computing Contract Best Practices; OMB M-19-03; OMB A-130; CSF: ID.SC-2 through 4).	The organization has not defined a process that includes information security and other business areas as appropriate for ensuring that contracts and other agreements for contractor systems and services include appropriate clauses to monitor the risks related to such systems and services. Further, the organization has not defined its processes for ensuring appropriate information security oversight of contractor provided systems and services.	The organization has defined a process that includes information security and other business areas as appropriate for ensuring that contracts and other agreements for third party systems and services include appropriate clauses to monitor the risks related to such systems and services. In addition, the organization has defined its processes to ensure that security controls of systems or services provided by contractors or other entities on behalf of the organization meet FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidance.	The organization ensures that specific contracting language and SLAs are consistently included in appropriate contracts to mitigate and monitor the risks related to contractor systems and services. Further, the organization obtains sufficient assurance, through audits, test results, or other forms of evaluation, that the security controls of systems or services provided by contractors or other entities on behalf of the organization meet FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidance.	The organization uses qualitative and quantitative performance metrics (e.g., those defined within SLAs) to measure, report on, and monitor information security performance of contractor-operated systems and services.	The organization analyzes the impact of material changes to security assurance requirements on its vendor relationships and ensures that contract vehicles are updated as soon as possible.
12. To what extent does the organization utilize technology (such as a governance, risk management, and compliance tool) to provide a centralized, enterprise wide (portfolio) view of risks across the organization, including risk control and remediation activities, dependencies, risk scores/levels, and management dashboards (NIST SP 800-39; OMB A-123; CFO Council ERM Playbook)?	The organization has not identified and defined its requirements for an automated solution to provide a centralized, enterprise wide (portfolio) view of risks across the organization, including risk control and remediation activities, dependencies, risk scores/levels, and management dashboards.	The organization has identified and defined its requirements for an automated solution that provides a centralized, enterprise wide view of risks across the organization, including risk control and remediation activities, dependencies, risk scores/levels, and management dashboards.	The organization consistently implements an automated solution across the enterprise that provides a centralized, enterprise wide view of risks, including risk control and remediation activities, dependencies, risk scores/levels, and management dashboards. All necessary sources of risk information are integrated into the solution.	The organization uses automation to perform scenario analysis and model potential responses, including modeling the potential impact of a threat exploiting a vulnerability and the resulting impact to organizational systems and data.	The organization has institutionalized the use of advanced technologies for analysis of trends and performance against benchmarks to continuously improve its risk management program.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Identify Function Area (Risk Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
13. Provide any additional information on the effectiveness (positive or negative) of the organization's risk management program that was not noted in the questions above. Taking into consideration the overall maturity level generated from the questions above and based on all testing performed, is the risk management program effective?					

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Configuration Management)

PROTECT FUNCTION AREA

Table 4: Configuration Management

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
14. To what degree have the roles and responsibilities of configuration management stakeholders been defined, communicated across the agency, and appropriately resourced (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CM-1; NIST SP 800-128: Section 2.4)?	Roles and responsibilities at the organizational and information system levels for stakeholders involved in information system configuration management have not been fully defined and communicated across the organization.	Roles and responsibilities at the organizational and information system levels for stakeholders involved in information system configuration management have been fully defined and communicated across the organization.	Individuals are performing the roles and responsibilities that have been defined across the organization.	Resources (people, processes, and technology) are allocated in a risk-based manner for stakeholders to effectively perform information system configuration management activities. Further, stakeholders are held accountable for carrying out their roles and responsibilities effectively.	
15. To what extent does the organization utilize an enterprise wide configuration management plan that includes, at a minimum, the following components: roles and responsibilities, including establishment of a Change Control Board (CCB) or related body; configuration management processes, including processes for: identifying and managing configuration items during the appropriate phase within an organization's SDLC; configuration monitoring; and applying configuration management requirements to contractor operated systems (NIST SP 800-128: Section 2.3.2; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CM-9)?	The organization has not developed an organization wide configuration management plan with the necessary components.	The organization has developed an organization wide configuration management plan that includes the necessary components.	The organization has consistently implemented an organization wide configuration management plan and has integrated its plan with its risk management and continuous monitoring programs. Further, the organization utilizes lessons learned in implementation to make improvements to its plan.	The organization monitors, analyzes, and reports to stakeholders qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its configuration management plan, uses this information to take corrective actions when necessary, and ensures that data supporting the metrics is obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	The organization utilizes automation to adapt its configuration management plan and related processes and activities to a changing cybersecurity landscape on a near real-time basis (as defined by the organization).

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Configuration Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
16. To what degree have information system configuration management policies and procedures been defined and implemented across the organization? (Note: the maturity level should take into consideration the maturity of questions 17, 18, 19, and 21) (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CM-1; NIST SP 800-128: 2.2.1)	The organization has not developed, documented, and disseminated comprehensive policies and procedures for information system configuration management.	The organization has developed, documented, and disseminated comprehensive policies and procedures for managing the configurations of its information systems. Policies and procedures have been tailored to the organization's environment and include specific requirements.	The organization consistently implements its policies and procedures for managing the configurations of its information systems. Further, the organization utilizes lessons learned in implementation to make improvements to its policies and procedures.	The organization monitors, analyzes, and reports on the qualitative and quantitative performance measures used to gauge the effectiveness of its configuration management policies and procedures and ensures that data supporting the metrics is obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	On a near real-time basis, the organization actively adapts its configuration management plan and related processes and activities to a changing cybersecurity landscape to respond to evolving and sophisticated threats.
17. To what extent does the organization utilize baseline configurations for its information systems and maintain inventories of related components at a level of granularity necessary for tracking and reporting (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CM-2 and CM-8; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.2, 3.9.2, and 3.10.1; CSF: DE.CM-7 and PR.IP-1)?	The organization has not established policies and procedures to ensure that baseline configurations for its information systems are developed, documented, and maintained under configuration control and that system components are inventoried at a level of granularity deemed necessary for tracking and reporting.	The organization has developed, documented, and disseminated its baseline configuration and component inventory policies and procedures.	The organization consistently records, implements, and maintains under configuration control, baseline configurations of its information systems and an inventory of related components in accordance with the organization's policies and procedures.	The organization employs automated mechanisms (such as application whitelisting and network management tools) to detect unauthorized hardware, software, and firmware on its network and take immediate actions to limit any security impact.	The organization utilizes technology to implement a centralized baseline configuration and information system component inventory process that includes information from all organization systems (hardware and software) and is updated in a near real-time basis.
18. To what extent does the organization utilize configuration settings/common secure configurations for its information systems? (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CM-6, CM-7, RA-5, and SI-2; NIST SP 800-70, Rev. 4, FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.1, 2.2, 2.14, 4.3; SANS/CIS Top 20 Security Controls 3.7; CSF: ID.RA-1 and DE.CM-8)?	The organization has not established policies and procedures for ensuring that configuration settings/common secure configurations are defined, implemented, and monitored.	The organization has developed, documented, and disseminated its policies and procedures for configuration settings/common secure configurations. In addition, the organization has developed, documented, and disseminated common secure configurations (hardening guides) that are tailored to its environment. Further, the organization has established a deviation process.	The organization consistently implements, assesses, and maintains secure configuration settings for its information systems based on least functionality. Further, the organization consistently utilizes SCAP-validated software assessing (scanning) capabilities against all systems on the network (see inventory from questions #1 - #3) to assess and manage both code-based and configuration-based vulnerabilities.	The organization employs automation to help maintain an up-to-date, complete, accurate, and readily available view of the security configurations for all information system components connected to the organization's network.	The organization deploys system configuration management tools that automatically enforce and redeploy configuration settings to systems at frequent intervals as defined by the organization, or on an event driven basis.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Configuration Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
19. To what extent does the organization utilize flaw remediation processes, including patch management, to manage software vulnerabilities (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CM-3, RA-5, SI-2, and SI-3; NIST SP 800-40, Rev. 3; SANS/CIS Top 20, Control 4.5; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 2.13, 2.14; CSF: ID.RA-1; DHS Binding Operational Directive (BOD) 15-01; DHS BOD 18-02)?	The organization has not developed, documented, and disseminated its policies and procedures for flaw remediation, including for mobile devices (GFE and non-GFE).	The organization has developed, documented, and disseminated its policies and procedures for flaw remediation, including for mobile devices. Policies and procedures include processes for: identifying, reporting, and correcting information system flaws, testing software and firmware updates prior to implementation, installing security relevant updates and patches within organizational-defined timeframes, and incorporating flaw remediation into the organization's configuration management processes.	The organization consistently implements its flaw remediation policies, procedures, and processes and ensures that patches, hotfixes, service packs, and anti-virus/malware software updates are identified, prioritized, tested, and installed in a timely manner. In addition, the organization patches critical vulnerabilities within 30 days.	The organization centrally manages its flaw remediation process and utilizes automated patch management and software update tools for operating systems, where such tools are available and safe.	The organization utilizes automated patch management and software update tools for all applications and network devices (including mobile devices), as appropriate, where such tools are available and safe.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Configuration Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
20. To what extent has the organization adopted the Trusted Internet Connection (TIC) program to assist in protecting its network (OMB M-19-26)	The organization has not prepared and planned to meet the goals of the TIC initiative (TIC 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0). This includes plans for reducing and consolidating its external connections, routing agency traffic through defined access points, and meeting the critical TIC security controls. The agency has not defined processes to develop and maintain an accurate inventory of its network connections, including details on the service provider, cost, capacity, traffic volume, logical/physical configurations, and topological data for each connection.	The organization has defined its plans for meeting the goals of the TIC initiative (TIC 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0) and its processes for inventorying its external connections, meeting the defined TIC security controls, and routing all agency traffic through defined access points. The agency has defined its processes to develop and maintain an accurate inventory of agency network connections, including details on the service provider, cost, capacity, traffic volume, logical/physical configurations, and topological data for each connection.	The organization has consistently implemented its TIC approved connections and critical capabilities that it manages internally. The organization has consistently implemented defined TIC security controls, as appropriate, and implemented actions to ensure that all agency traffic, including mobile and cloud, are routed through defined access points, as appropriate. The agency develops and maintains an accurate inventory of agency network connections, including details on the service provider, cost, capacity, traffic volume, logical/physical configurations, and topological data for each connection.	The organization, in accordance with OMB M-19-26, DHS guidance, and its cloud strategy is ensuring that its TIC implementation remains flexible and that its policies, procedures, and information security program are adapting to meet the security capabilities outlined in TIC 3.0, including the use of TIC Use Case requirements, as appropriate, for scenarios in which traffic may not be required to flow through a physical TIC access point. Further, the agency has developed a plan to update its internal network and system boundary policies to reflect OMB M-19-26, including guidance regarding TIC Use Case pilots, as appropriate.	

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Configuration Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
21. To what extent has the organization defined and implemented configuration change control activities including: determination of the types of changes that are configuration controlled; review and approval/disapproval of proposed changes with explicit consideration of security impacts and security classification of the system; documentation of configuration change decisions; implementation of approved configuration changes; retaining records of implemented changes; auditing and review of configuration changes; and coordination and oversight of changes by the CCB, as appropriate (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CM-2, CM-3 and CM-4; CSF: PR.IP-3).	The organization has not developed, documented, and disseminated its policies and procedures for managing configuration change control. Policies and procedures do not address, at a minimum, one or more of the necessary configuration change control related activities.	The organization has developed, documented, and disseminated its policies and procedures for managing configuration change control. The policies and procedures address, at a minimum, the necessary configuration change control related activities.	The organization consistently implements its change control policies, procedures, and processes, including explicit consideration of security impacts prior to change implementation.	The organization monitors, analyzes, and reports qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its change control activities and ensures that data supporting the metrics is obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	
22. Provide any additional information on the effectiveness (positive or negative) of the organization's configuration management program that was not noted in the questions above. Taking into consideration the maturity level generated from the questions above and based on all testing performed, is the configuration management program effective?					

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Identity and Access Management)

Table 5: Identity and Access Management

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
23. To what degree have the roles and responsibilities of identity, credential, and access management (ICAM) stakeholders been defined, communicated across the agency, and appropriately resourced (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AC-1, IA-1, and PS-1; NIST SP 800-63-3 and 800-63A, B, and C; Federal Identity, Credential, and Access Management Roadmap and Implementation Guidance (FICAM), OMB M-19-17)?	Roles and responsibilities at the organizational and information system levels for stakeholders involved in ICAM have not been fully defined and communicated across the organization.	Roles and responsibilities at the organizational and information system levels for stakeholders involved in ICAM have been fully defined and communicated across the organization. This includes, as appropriate, developing an ICAM governance structure to align and consolidate the agency's ICAM investments, monitor programs, and ensuring awareness and understanding.	Individuals are performing the roles and responsibilities that have been defined across the organization.	Resources (people, processes, and technology) are allocated in a risk-based manner for stakeholders to effectively implement identity, credential, and access management activities. Further, stakeholders are held accountable for carrying out their roles and responsibilities effectively.	In accordance with OMB M-19-17, the agency has implemented an integrated agency-wide ICAM office, team, or other governance structure in support of its ERM capability to effectively govern and enforce ICAM efforts.
24. To what degree does the organization utilize an ICAM strategy to guide its ICAM processes and activities (FICAM, OMB M-19-17)?	The organization has not developed an ICAM strategy that includes a review of current practices ("us-is" assessment), identification of gaps (from a desired or "to-be" state"), and a transition plan.	The organization has defined its ICAM strategy and developed milestones for how it plans to align with Federal initiatives, including strong authentication, the FICAM, OMB M-19-17, segment architecture, and phase 2 of DHS's Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM) program, as appropriate.	The organization is consistently implementing its ICAM strategy and is on track to meet milestones. The strategy encompasses the entire organization, aligns with the FICAM and CDM requirements, and incorporates applicable Federal policies, standards, playbooks, and guidelines.	The organization has transitioned to its desired or "to-be" ICAM architecture and integrates its ICAM strategy and activities with its enterprise architecture and the FICAM segment architecture.	On a near real-time basis, the organization actively adapts its ICAM strategy and related processes and activities to a changing cybersecurity landscape to respond to evolving and sophisticated threats.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Identity and Access Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
25. To what degree have ICAM policies and procedures been defined and implemented? (Note: the maturity level should take into consideration the maturity of questions 26 through 31) (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AC-1 and IA-1; OMB M-19-17, Cybersecurity Strategy and Implementation Plan (CSIP); SANS/CIS Top 20: 14.1; DHS ED 19-01; CSF: PR.AC-4 and 5).	The organization has not developed, documented, and disseminated its policies and procedures for ICAM.	The organization has developed, documented, and disseminated its policies and procedures for ICAM. Policies and procedures have been tailored to the organization's environment and include specific requirements.	The organization consistently implements its policies and procedures for ICAM, including for account management, separation of duties, least privilege, remote access management, identifier and authenticator management, and identification and authentication of non-organizational users. Further, the organization is consistently capturing and sharing lessons learned on the effectiveness of its ICAM policies, procedures, and processes to update the program. The organization ensures that there is consistent coordination amongst organization leaders and mission owners to implement, manage, and maintain the organization's ICAM policies, processes, and technologies.	The organization uses automated mechanisms (e.g. machine-based, or user based enforcement), where appropriate, to manage the effective implementation of its policies and procedures. Examples of automated mechanisms include network segmentation based on the label/classification of information stored on the servers; automatic removal/disabling of temporary/emergency/inactive accounts, use of automated tools to inventory and manage accounts and perform segregation of duties/least privilege reviews.	The organization employs adaptive identification and authentication techniques to assess suspicious behavior and potential violations of its ICAM policies and procedures on a near-real time basis.
26. To what extent has the organization developed and implemented processes for assigning position risk designations and performing appropriate personnel screening prior to granting access to its systems (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: PS-2 and PS-3; National Insider Threat Policy, CSF: PR.IP-11, OMB M-19-17)?	The organization has not defined its processes for assigning personnel risk designations and performing appropriate screening prior to granting access to its systems.	The organization has defined its processes for ensuring that all personnel are assigned risk designations and appropriately screened prior to being granted access to its systems. Processes have been defined for assigning risk designations for all positions, establishing screening criteria for individuals filling those positions, authorizing access following screening completion, and rescreening individuals on a periodic basis.	The organization ensures that all personnel are assigned risk designations, appropriately screened prior to being granted system access, and rescreened periodically.	The organization employs automation to centrally document, track, and share risk designations and screening information with necessary parties.	On a near-real time basis, the organization evaluates personnel security information from various sources, integrates this information with anomalous user behavior data (audit logging) and/or its insider threat activities, and adjusts permissions accordingly.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Identity and Access Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
27. To what extent does the organization ensure that access agreements, including nondisclosure agreements, acceptable use agreements, and rules of behavior, as appropriate, for individuals (both privileged and non-privileged users) that access its systems are completed and maintained (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AC-8, PL-4, and PS-6)?	The organization has not defined its processes for developing, documenting, and maintaining access agreements for individuals that access its systems.	The organization has defined its processes for developing, documenting, and maintaining access agreements for individuals that access its systems.	The organization ensures that access agreements for individuals are completed prior to access being granted to systems and are consistently maintained thereafter. The organization utilizes more specific/detailed agreements for privileged users or those with access to sensitive information, as appropriate.	The organization uses automation to manage and review user access agreements for privileged and non-privileged users. To the extent practical, this process is centralized.	On a near real-time basis, the organization ensures that access agreements for privileged and non-privileged users are maintained, as necessary.
28. To what extent has the organization implemented strong authentication mechanisms (PIV or an Identity Assurance Level (IAL)3/Authenticator Assurance Level (AAL) 3 credential) for non-privileged users to access the organization's facilities, networks, and systems, including for remote access (CSIP; HSPD-12; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AC-17, IA-2, IA-5, and IA-8; NIST SP 800-128; FIPS 201-2; NIST SP 800-63, 800-157; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.4, 2.7, CSF: PR.AC-1 and 6; OMB M-19-17, NIST SP 800-157, and Cybersecurity Sprint)?	The organization has not planned for the use of strong authentication mechanisms for non-privileged users of the organization's facilities, systems, and networks, including for remote access. In addition, the organization has not performed e-authentication risk assessments to determine which systems require strong authentication.	The organization has planned for the use of strong authentication mechanisms for non-privileged users of the organization's facilities, systems, and networks, including the completion of e-authentication risk assessments.	The organization has consistently implemented strong authentication mechanisms for non-privileged users of the organization's facilities and networks, including for remote access, in accordance with Federal targets. For instances where it would be impracticable to use the PIV card, the organization uses an alternative token (derived PIV credential) which can be implemented and deployed with mobile devices.	All non-privileged users utilize strong authentication mechanisms to authenticate to applicable organizational systems.	The organization has implemented an enterprise-wide single sign on solution and all of the organization's systems interface with the solution, resulting in an ability to manage user (non-privileged) accounts and privileges centrally and report on effectiveness on a near real-time basis.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Identity and Access Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
29. To what extent has the organization implemented strong authentication mechanisms (PIV or a Level of Assurance 4 credential) for privileged users to access the organization's facilities, networks, and systems, including for remote access (CSIP; HSPD-12; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AC-17; NIST SP 800-128; FIPS 201-2; NIST SP 800-63, 800-157; OMB M-19-17, FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.3, 2.5, and 2.7; CSF: PR.AC-1 and 6; DHS ED 19-01; and Cybersecurity Sprint)?	The organization has not planned for the use of strong authentication mechanisms for privileged users of the organization's facilities, systems, and networks, including for remote access. In addition, the organization has not performed e-authentication risk assessments to determine which systems require strong authentication.	The organization has planned for the use of strong authentication mechanisms for privileged users of the organization's facilities, systems, and networks, including the completion of E-authentication risk assessments.	The organization has consistently implemented strong authentication mechanisms for privileged users of the organization's facilities and networks, including for remote access, in accordance with Federal targets.

For instances where it would be impracticable to use the PIV card, the organization uses an alternative token (derived PIV credential) which can be implemented and deployed with mobile devices. | All privileged users, including those who can make changes to DNS records, utilize strong authentication mechanisms to authenticate to applicable organizational systems. | The organization has implemented an enterprise-wide single sign on solution and all of the organization's systems interface with the solution, resulting in an ability to manage user (privileged) accounts and privileges centrally and report on effectiveness on a near real-time basis. |
| 30. To what extent does the organization ensure that privileged accounts are provisioned, managed, and reviewed in accordance with the principles of least privilege and separation of duties? Specifically, this includes processes for periodic review and adjustment of privileged user accounts and permissions, inventorying and validating the scope and number of privileged accounts, and ensuring that privileged user account activities are logged and periodically reviewed (FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.3, 2.5, and 2.6, OMB M-19-17, NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AC-1, AC-2, AC-5, AC-6, AC-17; AU-2, AU-3, AU-6, and IA-4; CSIP; DHS ED 19-01; CSF: PR.AC-4). | The organization has not defined its processes for provisioning, managing, and reviewing privileged accounts. | The organization has defined its processes for provisioning, managing, and reviewing privileged accounts. Defined processes cover approval and tracking, inventorying and validating, and logging and reviewing privileged users' accounts. | The organization ensures that its processes for provisioning, managing, and reviewing privileged accounts are consistently implemented across the organization. The organization limits the functions that can be performed when using privileged accounts; limits the duration that privileged accounts can be logged in; limits the privileged functions that can be performed using remote access; and ensures that privileged user activities are logged and periodically reviewed. | The organization employs automated mechanisms (e.g. machine-based, or user based enforcement) to support the management of privileged accounts, including for the automatic removal/disabling of temporary, emergency, and inactive accounts, as appropriate. | |

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Identity and Access Management)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
31. To what extent does the organization ensure that appropriate configuration/connection requirements are maintained for remote access connections? This includes the use of appropriate cryptographic modules, system time-outs, and the monitoring and control of remote access sessions (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AC-11, AC-12, AC-17, AC-19, AU-2, IA-7, SC-10, SC-13, and SI-4; CSF: PR.AC-3; and FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.10 and 2.11).	The organization has not defined the configuration/connection requirements for remote access connections, including use of FIPS 140-2 validated cryptographic modules, system time-outs, and monitoring and control of remote access sessions.	The organization has defined its configuration/connection requirements for remote access connections, including use of cryptographic modules, system time-outs, and how it monitors and controls remote access sessions.	The organization ensures that FIPS 140-2 validated cryptographic modules are implemented for its remote access connection method(s), remote access sessions time out after 30 minutes (or less), and that remote users' activities are logged and reviewed based on risk.	The organization ensures that end user devices have been appropriately configured prior to allowing remote access and restricts the ability of individuals to transfer data accessed remotely to non-authorized devices.	The organization has deployed a capability to rapidly disconnect remote access user sessions based on active monitoring. The speed of disablement varies based on the criticality of missions/business functions.
32. Provide any additional information on the effectiveness (positive or negative) of the organization's identity and access management program that was not noted in the questions above. Taking into consideration the maturity level generated from the questions above and based on all testing performed, is the identity and access management program effective?					

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Data Protection and Privacy)

Table 6: Data Protection and Privacy

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
33. To what extent has the organization developed a privacy program for the protection of personally identifiable information (PII) that is collected, used, maintained, shared, and disposed of by information systems (NIST SP 800-122; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); OMB M-20-04; OMB M-19-03; OMB A-130, Appendix I; CSF: ID.GV-3; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AR-4 and Appendix J, FY 2019 SAOP FISMA metrics, Sections 1 and 2)?	The organization has not established a privacy program and related plans, policies, and procedures as appropriate for the protection of PII collected, used, maintained, shared, and disposed of by information systems. Additionally, roles and responsibilities for the effective implementation of the organization's privacy program have not been defined.	The organization has defined and communicated its privacy program plan and related policies and procedures for the protection of PII that is collected, used, maintained, shared, and/or disposed of by its information systems. In addition, roles and responsibilities for the effective implementation of the organization's privacy program have been defined and the organization has determined the resources and optimal governance structure needed to effectively implement its privacy program.	The organization consistently implements its privacy program by: Dedicating appropriate resources to the program Maintaining an inventory of the collection and use of PII Conducting and maintaining privacy impact assessments and system of records notices for all applicable systems. Reviewing and removing unnecessary PII collections on a regular basis (i.e., SSNs)	The organization monitors and analyses quantitative and qualitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its privacy activities and uses that information to make needed adjustments. The organization conducts an independent review of its privacy program and makes necessary improvements.	The privacy program is fully integrated with other security areas, such as ISCM, and other business processes, such as strategic planning and risk management. Further, the organization's privacy program is embedded into daily decision making across the organization and provides for continuous identification of privacy risks.
34. To what extent has the organization implemented the following security controls to protect its PII and other agency sensitive data, as appropriate, throughout the data lifecycle. (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4; Appendix J, SC-8, SC-28, MP-3, and MP-6; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.8, 2.12; DHS BOD 18-02; CSF: PR.DS-1, PR.DS-2, PR.PT-2, and PR.IP-6)? • Encryption of data at rest • Encryption of data in transit • Limitation of transfer to removable media • Sanitization of digital media prior to disposal or reuse	The organization has not defined its policies and procedures in one or more of the specified areas.	The organization's policies and procedures have been defined and communicated for the specified areas. Further, the policies and procedures have been tailored to the organization's environment and include specific considerations based on data classification and sensitivity.	The organization's policies and procedures have been consistently implemented for the specified areas, including (i) use of FIPS-validated encryption of PII and other agency sensitive data, as appropriate, both at rest and in transit, (ii) prevention and detection of untrusted removable media, and (iii) destruction or reuse of media containing PII or other sensitive agency data.	The organization ensures that the security controls for protecting PII and other agency sensitive data, as appropriate, throughout the data lifecycle are subject to the monitoring processes defined within the organization's ISCM strategy.	The organization employs advanced capabilities to enhance protective controls, including (i) remote wiping, (ii) dual authorization for sanitization of media devices, (iii) exemption of media marking as long as the media remains within organizationally-defined control areas, and (iv) configuring systems to record the date the PII was collected, created, or updated and when the data is to be deleted or destroyed according to an approved data retention schedule.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Data Protection and Privacy)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
35. To what extent has the organization implemented security controls to prevent data exfiltration and enhance network defenses? (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: SI-3, SI-7(8), SI-4(4) and (18), SC-7(10), and SC-18; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 3.8; DHS BOD 18-01; DHS ED 19-01; CSF: PR.DS-5)?	The organization has not defined its policies and procedures related to data exfiltration, enhanced network defenses, email authentication processes, and mitigation against DNS infrastructure tampering.	The organization has defined and communicated it policies and procedures for data exfiltration, enhanced network defenses, email authentication processes, and mitigation against DNS infrastructure tampering.	The organization consistently monitors inbound and outbound network traffic, ensuring that all traffic passes through a web content filter that protects against phishing, malware, and blocks against known malicious sites. Additionally, the organization checks outbound communications traffic to detect encrypted exfiltration of information, anomalous traffic patterns, and elements of PII. Also, suspected malicious traffic is quarantined or blocked. In addition, the organization utilizes email authentication technology, audits its DNS records, and ensures the use of valid encryption certificates for its domains.	The organization analyzes qualitative and quantitative measures on the performance of its data exfiltration and enhanced network defenses. The organization also conducts exfiltration exercises to measure the effectiveness of its data exfiltration and enhanced network defenses. Further, the organization monitors its DNS infrastructure for potential tampering, in accordance with its ISCM strategy.	The organizations data exfiltration and enhanced network defenses are fully integrated into the ISCM and incident response programs to provide near real-time monitoring of the data that is entering and exiting the network, and other suspicious inbound and outbound communications.
36. To what extent has the organization developed and implemented a Data Breach Response Plan, as appropriate, to respond to privacy events? (NIST SP 800-122; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: Appendix J, SE-2; FY 2019 SAOP FISMA metrics, Section 12; OMB M-17-12; and OMB M-17-25)?	The organization has not developed a Data Breach Response Plan that includes the agency's policies and procedures for reporting, investigating, and managing a privacy-related breach. Further, the organization has not established a breach response team that includes the appropriate agency officials.	The organization has defined and communicated its Data Breach Response Plan, including its processes and procedures for data breach notification. Further, a breach response team has been established that includes the appropriate agency officials.	The organization consistently implements its Data Breach Response plan. Additionally, the breach response team participates in table-top exercises and uses lessons learned to make improvements to the plan as appropriate. Further, the organization is able to identify the specific individuals affected by a breach, send notice to the affected individuals, and provide those individuals with credit monitoring and repair services, as necessary.	The organization monitors and analyzes qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its Data Breach Response Plan, as appropriate. The organization ensures that data supporting metrics are obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	The organization's Data Breach Response plan is fully integrated with incident response, risk management, continuous monitoring, continuity of operations, and other mission/business areas, as appropriate. Further the organization employs automation to monitor for potential privacy incidents and takes immediate action to mitigate the incident and provide protection to the affected individuals.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Data Protection and Privacy)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
37. To what degree does the organization ensure that privacy awareness training is provided to all individuals, including role-based privacy training (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AR-5, FY 2019 SAOP FISMA Metrics, Sections 9, 10, and 11)? (Note: Privacy awareness training topics should include, as appropriate: responsibilities under the Privacy Act of 1974 and E-Government Act of 2002, consequences for failing to carry out responsibilities, identifying privacy risks, mitigating privacy risks, and reporting privacy incidents, data collections and use requirements)	The organization has not defined its privacy awareness training program based on organizational requirements, culture, and the types of PII that its users have access to. In addition, the organization has not developed role-based privacy training for individuals having responsibility for PII or activities involving PII.	The organization has defined and communicated its privacy awareness training program, including requirements for role-based privacy awareness training. Further, training has been tailored to the organization's culture and risk environment.	The organization ensures that all individuals receive basic privacy awareness training and individuals having responsibilities for PII or activities involving PII receive role-based privacy training at least annually. Additionally, the organization ensures that individuals certify acceptance of responsibilities for privacy requirements at least annually.	The organization measures the effectiveness of its privacy awareness training program by obtaining feedback on the content of the training and conducting targeted phishing exercises for those with responsibility for PII. Additionally, the organization make updates to its program based on statutory, regulatory, mission, program, business process, information system requirements, and/or results from monitoring and auditing.	The organization has institutionalized a process of continuous improvement incorporating advanced privacy training practices and technologies.
38. Provide any additional information on the effectiveness (positive or negative) of the organization's data protection and privacy program that was not noted in the questions above. Taking into consideration the maturity level generated from the questions above and based on all testing performed, is the data protection and privacy program effective?					

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Security Training)

Table 7: Security Training

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
39. To what degree have the roles and responsibilities of security awareness and training program stakeholders been defined, communicated across the agency, and appropriately resourced? (Note: this includes the roles and responsibilities for the effective establishment and maintenance of an organization wide security awareness and training program as well as the awareness and training related roles and responsibilities of system users and those with significant security responsibilities (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AT-1; and NIST SP 800-50).	Roles and responsibilities have not been defined, communicated across the organization, and appropriately resourced.	Roles and responsibilities have been defined and communicated across the organization and resource requirements have been established.	Individuals are performing the roles and responsibilities that have been defined across the organization.	Resources (people, processes, and technology) are allocated in a risk-based manner for stakeholders to consistently implement security awareness and training responsibilities. Further, stakeholders are held accountable for carrying out their roles and responsibilities effectively.	
40. To what extent does the organization utilize an assessment of the skills, knowledge, and abilities of its workforce to provide tailored awareness and specialized security training within the functional areas of: identify, protect, detect, respond, and recover (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AT-2 and AT-3; NIST SP 800-50: Section 3.2; Federal Cybersecurity Workforce Assessment Act of 2015; National Cybersecurity Workforce Framework v1.0; NIST SP 800-181; and CIS/SANS Top 20: 17.1)?	The organization has not defined its processes for conducting an assessment of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of its workforce.	The organization has defined its processes for conducting an assessment of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of its workforce to determine its awareness and specialized training needs and periodically updating its assessment to account for a changing risk environment.	The organization has conducted an assessment of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of its workforce to tailor its awareness and specialized training and has identified its skill gaps. Further, the organization periodically updates its assessment to account for a changing risk environment. In addition, the assessment serves as a key input to updating the organization's awareness and training strategy/plans.	The organization has addressed its identified knowledge, skills, and abilities gaps through training or hiring of additional staff/contractors.	The organization's personnel collectively possess a training level such that the organization can demonstrate that security incidents resulting from personnel actions or inactions are being reduced over time.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Security Training)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
41. To what extent does the organization utilize a security awareness and training strategy/plan that leverages its organizational skills assessment and is adapted to its culture? (Note: the strategy/plan should include the following components: the structure of the awareness and training program, priorities, funding, the goals of the program, target audiences, types of courses/material for each audience, use of technologies (such as email advisories, intranet updates/wiki pages/social media, web based training, phishing simulation tools), frequency of training, and deployment methods (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AT-1; NIST SP 800-50: Section 3; CSF: PR.AT-1).	The organization has not defined its security awareness and training strategy/plan for developing, implementing, and maintaining a security awareness and training program that is tailored to its mission and risk environment.	The organization has defined its security awareness and training strategy/plan for developing, implementing, and maintaining a security awareness and training program that is tailored to its mission and risk environment.	The organization has consistently implemented its organization-wide security awareness and training strategy and plan.	The organization monitors and analyzes qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its security awareness and training strategies and plans. The organization ensures that data supporting metrics are obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	The organization's security awareness and training activities are integrated across other security-related domains. For instance, common risks and control weaknesses, and other outputs of the agency's risk management and continuous monitoring activities inform any updates that need to be made to the security awareness and training program.
42. To what degree have security awareness and specialized security training policies and procedures been defined and implemented? (Note: the maturity level should take into consideration the maturity of questions 43 and 44 below) (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AT-1 through AT-4; and NIST SP 800-50).	The organization has not developed, documented, and disseminated its policies and procedures for security awareness and specialized security training.	The organization has developed, documented, and disseminated comprehensive policies and procedures for security awareness and specialized security training that are consistent with FISMA requirements.	The organization consistently implements its policies and procedures for security awareness and specialized security training.	The organization monitors and analyzes qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its security awareness and training policies and procedures. The organization ensures that data supporting metrics are obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	On a near real-time basis, the organization actively adapts its security awareness and training policies, procedures, and program to a changing cybersecurity landscape and provides awareness and training, as appropriate, on evolving and sophisticated threats.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Security Training)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
43. To what degree does the organization ensure that security awareness training is provided to all system users and is tailored based on its organizational requirements, culture, and types of information systems? (Note: awareness training topics should include, as appropriate: consideration of organizational policies, roles and responsibilities, secure e-mail, browsing, and remote access practices, mobile device security, secure use of social media, phishing, malware, physical security, and security incident reporting (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AT-2; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.15; NIST SP 800-50: 6.2; CSF: PR.AT-2; SANS Top 20: 17.4).	The organization has not defined its security awareness material based on its organizational requirements, culture, and the types of information systems that its users have access to. In addition, the organization has not defined its processes for ensuring that all information system users are provided security awareness training prior to system access and periodically thereafter. Furthermore, the organization has not defined its processes for evaluating and obtaining feedback on its security awareness and training program and using that information to make continuous improvements.	The organization has defined and tailored its security awareness material and delivery methods based on its organizational requirements, culture, and the types of information systems that its users have access to. In addition, the organization has defined its processes for ensuring that all information system users including contractors are provided security awareness training prior to system access and periodically thereafter. In addition, the organization has defined its processes for evaluating and obtaining feedback on its security awareness and training program and using that information to make continuous improvements.	The organization ensures that all systems users complete the organization's security awareness training (or a comparable awareness training for contractors) prior to system access and periodically thereafter and maintains completion records. The organization obtains feedback on its security awareness and training program and uses that information to make improvements.	The organization measures the effectiveness of its awareness training program by, for example, conducting phishing exercises and following up with additional awareness or training, and/or disciplinary action, as appropriate.	The organization has institutionalized a process of continuous improvement incorporating advanced security awareness practices and technologies.
44. To what degree does the organization ensure that specialized security training is provided to all individuals with significant security responsibilities (as defined in the organization's security policies and procedures) (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: AT-3 and AT-4; FY 2019 CIO FISMA Metrics: 2.15)?	The organization has not defined its security training material based on its organizational requirements, culture, and the types of roles with significant security responsibilities. In addition, the organization has not defined its processes for ensuring that all personnel with significant security roles and responsibilities are provided specialized security training prior to information system access or performing assigned duties and periodically thereafter.	The organization has defined its security training material based on its organizational requirements, culture, and the types of roles with significant security responsibilities. In addition, the organization has defined its processes for ensuring that all personnel with assigned security roles and responsibilities are provided specialized security training prior to information system access or performing assigned duties and periodically thereafter.	The organization ensures that individuals with significant security responsibilities are provided specialized security training prior to information system access or performing assigned duties and periodically thereafter and maintains appropriate records.	The organization obtains feedback on its security training content and makes updates to its program, as appropriate. In addition, the organization measures the effectiveness of its specialized security training program by, for example, conducting targeted phishing exercises and following up with additional awareness or training, and/or disciplinary action, as appropriate.	The organization has institutionalized a process of continuous improvement incorporating advanced security training practices and technologies.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Protect Function Area (Security Training)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
45. Provide any additional information on the effectiveness (positive or negative) of the organization's security training program that was not noted in the questions above. Taking into consideration the maturity level generated from the questions above and based on all testing performed, is the security training program effective?					

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Detect Function Area (ISCM)

DETECT FUNCTION AREA

Table 8: ISCM

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
46. To what extent does the organization utilize an information security continuous monitoring (ISCM) strategy that addresses ISCM requirements and activities at each organizational tier and helps ensure an organization-wide approach to ISCM (NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); NIST SP 800-137: Sections 3.1 and 3.6)?	The organization has not developed and communicated its ISCM strategy.	The organization has developed and communicated its ISCM strategy that includes: i) considerations at the organization/business process level, ii) considerations at the information system level, and iii) processes to review and update the ISCM program and strategy. At the organization/business process level, the ISCM strategy defines how ISCM activities support risk management in accordance with organizational risk tolerance. At the information system level, the ISCM strategy addresses monitoring security controls for effectiveness, monitoring for security status, and reporting findings.	The organization's ISCM strategy is consistently implemented at the organization, business process, and information system levels. In addition, the strategy supports clear visibility into assets, awareness into vulnerabilities, up-to-date threat information, and mission/business impacts. The organization also consistently captures lessons learned to make improvements to the ISCM strategy.	The organization monitors and analyzes qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its ISCM strategy and makes updates, as appropriate. The organization ensures that data supporting metrics are obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	The organization's ISCM strategy is fully integrated with its risk management, configuration management, incident response, and business continuity functions.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Detect Function Area (ISCM)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
47. To what extent does the organization utilize ISCM policies and procedures to facilitate organization-wide, standardized processes in support of the ISCM strategy? ISCM policies and procedures address, at a minimum, the following areas: ongoing assessments and monitoring of security controls; collection of security related information required for metrics, assessments, and reporting; analyzing ISCM data, reporting findings, and reviewing and updating the ISCM strategy (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CA-7, NISTIR 8011) (Note: The overall maturity level should take into consideration the maturity of question 49)?	The organization has not defined its ISCM policies and procedures, at a minimum, in one or more of the specified areas.	The organization's ISCM policies and procedures have been defined and communicated for the specified areas. Further, the policies and procedures have been tailored to the organization's environment and include specific requirements.	The organization's ISCM policies and procedures have been consistently implemented for the specified areas. The organization also consistently captures lessons learned to make improvements to the ISCM policies and procedures.	The organization monitors and analyzes qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its ISCM policies and procedures and makes updates, as appropriate. The organization ensures that data supporting metrics are obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	The organization's ISCM policies and procedures are fully integrated with its risk management, configuration management, incident response, and business continuity functions.
48. To what extent have ISCM stakeholders and their roles, responsibilities, levels of authority, and dependencies been defined and communicated across the organization (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CA-1; NIST SP 800-137; CSF: DE.DP-1)	Roles and responsibilities have not been fully defined and communicated across the organization, including appropriate levels of authority and dependencies.	The organization has defined and communicated the structures of its ISCM team, roles and responsibilities of ISCM stakeholders, and levels of authority and dependencies.	Individuals are performing the roles and responsibilities that have been defined across the organization.	Resources (people, processes, and technology) are allocated in a risk-based manner for stakeholders to effectively implement ISCM activities. Further, stakeholders are held accountable for carrying out their roles and responsibilities effectively.	

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Detect Function Area (ISCM)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
49. How mature are the organization's processes for performing ongoing assessments, granting system authorizations, including developing and maintaining system security plans, and monitoring security controls (OMB A-130, NIST SP 800-137: Section 2.2; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CA-2, CA-6, and CA-7; NIST Supplemental Guidance on Ongoing Authorization; NIST SP 800-37 (Rev. 2); NIST SP 800-18, Rev. 1, NISTIR 8011; OMB M-14-03; OMB M-19-03)	The organization has not defined its processes for performing ongoing security control assessments, granting system authorizations, including developing and maintaining system security plans, and monitoring security controls for individual systems.	The organization has defined its processes for performing ongoing security control assessments, granting system authorizations, including developing and maintaining system security plans, and monitoring security controls for individual systems.	The organization has consistently implemented its processes for performing ongoing security control assessments, granting system authorizations, including developing and maintaining system security plans, and monitoring security controls to provide a view of the organizational security posture, as well as each system's contribution to said security posture. All security control classes (management, operational, and technical) and types (common, hybrid, and system-specific) are assessed and monitored, and their status updated regularly (as defined in the agency's information security policy) in security plans.	The organization utilizes the results of security control assessments and monitoring to maintain ongoing authorizations of information systems, including the maintenance of system security plans	The ISCM program achieves cost-effective IT security objectives and goals and influences decision making that is based on cost, risk, and mission impact.
50. How mature is the organization's process for collecting and analyzing ISCM performance measures and reporting findings (NIST SP 800-137)?	The organization has not identified and defined the qualitative and quantitative performance measures that will be used to assess the effectiveness of its ISCM program, achieve situational awareness, and control ongoing risk. Further, the organization has not defined how ISCM information will be shared with individuals with significant security responsibilities and used to make risk based decisions.	The organization has identified and defined the performance measures and requirements that will be used to assess the effectiveness of its ISCM program, achieve situational awareness, and control ongoing risk. In addition, the organization has defined the format of reports, frequency of reports, and the tools used to provide information to individuals with significant security responsibilities.	The organization is consistently capturing qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the performance of its ISCM program in accordance with established requirements for data collection, storage, analysis, retrieval, and reporting.	The organization is able to integrate metrics on the effectiveness of its ISCM program to deliver persistent situational awareness across the organization, explain the environment from both a threat/vulnerability and risk/impact perspective, and cover mission areas of operations and security domains.	On a near real-time basis, the organization actively adapts its ISCM program to a changing cybersecurity landscape and responds to evolving and sophisticated threats in a timely manner.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Detect Function Area (ISCM)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
51. Provide any additional information on the effectiveness (positive or negative) of the organization's ISCM program that was not noted in the questions above. Taking into consideration the maturity level generated from the questions above and based on all testing performed, is the ISCM program effective?					

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Respond Function Area (Incident Response)

RESPOND FUNCTION AREA

Table 9: Incident Response

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
52. To what extent has the organization defined and implemented its incident response policies, procedures, plans, and strategies, as appropriate, to respond to cybersecurity events (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: IR-1; NIST SP 800-61 Rev. 2; NIST SP 800-184; OMB M-17-25; OMB M-19-03; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics, Section 4; CSF: RS.RP-1; Presidential Policy Direction (PPD) 41)? (Note: The overall maturity level should take into consideration the maturity of questions 53 - 58).	The organization has not defined its incident response policies, procedures, plans, and strategies in one or more of the following areas: incident response planning, to include organizational specific considerations for major incidents, incident response training and testing, incident detection and analysis, incident containment, eradication, and recovery; incident coordination, information sharing, and reporting.	The organization's incident response policies, procedures, plans, and strategies have been defined and communicated. In addition, the organization has established and communicated an enterprise level incident response plan.	The organization consistently implements its incident response policies, procedures, plans, and strategies. Further, the organization is consistently capturing and sharing lessons learned on the effectiveness of its incident response policies, procedures, strategy and processes to update the program.	The organization monitors and analyzes qualitative and quantitative performance measures on the effectiveness of its incident response policies, procedures, plans, and strategies, as appropriate. The organization ensures that data supporting metrics are obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	The organization's incident response program, policies, procedures, strategies, plans are related activities are fully integrated with risk management, continuous monitoring, continuity of operations, and other mission/business areas, as appropriate.
53. To what extent have incident response team structures/models, stakeholders, and their roles, responsibilities, levels of authority, and dependencies been defined and communicated across the organization (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: IR-7; NIST SP 800-83; NIST SP 800-61 Rev. 2; OMB M-20-04; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: Section 4; CSF: RS.CO-1; and US-CERT Federal Incident Notification Guidelines)?	Roles and responsibilities have not been fully defined and communicated across the organization, including appropriate levels of authority and dependencies.	The organization has defined and communicated the structures of its incident response teams, roles and responsibilities of incident response stakeholders, and associated levels of authority and dependencies. In addition, the organization has designated a principal security operations center or equivalent organization that is accountable to agency leadership, DHS, and OMB for all incident response activities.	Individuals are performing the roles and responsibilities that have been defined across the organization.	Resources (people, processes, and technology) are allocated in a risk-based manner for stakeholders to effectively implement incident response activities. Further, stakeholders are held accountable for carrying out their roles and responsibilities effectively.	

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Respond Function Area (Incident Response)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	**Defined**	**Consistently Implemented**	**Managed and Measureable**	**Optimized**
54. How mature are the organization's processes for incident detection and analysis? (NIST 800-53: IR-4 and IR-6; NIST SP 800-61 Rev. 2; OMB M-20-04; CSF: DE.AE-1, PR.DS-6, RS.AN-4, and PR.DS-8; and US-CERT Incident Response Guidelines)	The organization has not defined a common threat vector taxonomy for classifying incidents and its processes for detecting, analyzing, and prioritizing incidents.	The organization has defined a common threat vector taxonomy and developed handling procedures for specific types of incidents, as appropriate. In addition, the organization has defined its processes and supporting technologies for detecting and analyzing incidents, including the types of precursors and indicators and how they are generated and reviewed, and for prioritizing incidents.	The organization consistently utilizes its threat vector taxonomy to classify incidents and consistently implements its processes for incident detection, analysis, and prioritization. In addition, the organization consistently implements, and analyzes precursors and indicators generated by, for example, the following technologies: intrusion detection/prevention, security information and event management (SIEM), antivirus and antispam software, and file integrity checking software.	The organization utilizes profiling techniques to measure the characteristics of expected activities on its networks and systems so that it can more effectively detect security incidents. Examples of profiling include running file integrity checking software on hosts to derive checksums for critical files and monitoring network bandwidth usage to determine what the average and peak usage levels are on various days and times. Through profiling techniques, the organization maintains a comprehensive baseline of network operations and expected data flows for users and systems.	
55. How mature are the organization's processes for incident handling (NIST 800-53: IR-4; NIST SP 800-61, Rev. 2; CSF: RS.MI-1 and 2)	The organization has not defined its processes for incident handling to include: containment strategies for various types of major incidents, eradication activities to eliminate components of an incident and mitigate any vulnerabilities that were exploited, and recovery of systems.	The organization has developed containment strategies for each major incident type. In developing its strategies, the organization takes into consideration: the potential damage to and theft of resources, the need for evidence preservation, service availability, time and resources needed to implement the strategy, effectiveness of the strategy, and duration of the solution. In addition, the organization has defined its processes to eradicate components of an incident, mitigate any vulnerabilities that were exploited, and recover system operations.	The organization consistently implements its containment strategies, incident eradication processes, processes to remediate vulnerabilities that may have been exploited on the target system(s), and recovers system operations.	The organization manages and measures the impact of successful incidents and is able to quickly mitigate related vulnerabilities on other systems so that they are not subject to exploitation of the same vulnerability.	The organization utilizes dynamic reconfiguration (e.g., changes to router rules, access control lists, and filter rules for firewalls and gateways) to stop attacks, misdirect attackers, and to isolate components of systems.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Respond Function Area (Incident Response)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
56. To what extent does the organization ensure that incident response information is shared with individuals with significant security responsibilities and reported to external stakeholders in a timely manner (FISMA; OMB M-20-04; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: IR-6; US-CERT Incident Notification Guidelines; PPD-41; CSF: RS.CO-2 through 4; DHS Cyber Incident Reporting Unified Message)	The organization has not defined how incident response information will be shared with individuals with significant security responsibilities or its processes for reporting security incidents to US-CERT and other stakeholders (e.g., Congress and the Inspector General, as applicable) in a timely manner.	The organization has defined its requirements for personnel to report suspected security incidents to the organization's incident response capability within organization defined timeframes. In addition, the organization has defined its processes for reporting security incident information to US-CERT, law enforcement, the Congress (for major incidents) and the Office of Inspector General, as appropriate.	The organization consistently shares information on incident activities with internal stakeholders. The organization ensures that security incidents are reported to US-CERT, law enforcement, the Office of Inspector General, and the Congress (for major incidents) in a timely manner.	Incident response metrics are used to measure and manage the timely reporting of incident information to organizational officials and external stakeholders.	
57. To what extent does the organization collaborate with stakeholders to ensure on-site, technical assistance/surge capabilities can be leveraged for quickly responding to incidents, including through contracts/agreements, as appropriate, for incident response support (NIST SP 800-86; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: IR-4; OMB M-20-04; PPD-41).	The organization has not defined how it will collaborate with DHS and other parties, as appropriate, to provide on-site, technical assistance/surge resources/special capabilities for quickly responding to incidents. In addition, the organization has not defined how it plans to utilize DHS' Einstein program for intrusion detection/prevention capabilities for traffic entering and leaving the organization's networks.	The organization has defined how it will collaborate with DHS and other parties, as appropriate, to provide on-site, technical assistance/surge resources/special capabilities for quickly responding to incidents. This includes identification of incident response services that may need to be procured to support organizational processes. In addition, the organization has defined how it plans to utilize DHS' Einstein program for intrusion detection/prevention capabilities for traffic entering and leaving the organization's networks.	The organization consistently utilizes on-site, technical assistance/surge capabilities offered by DHS or ensures that such capabilities are in place and can be leveraged when needed. In addition, the organization has entered into contractual relationships in support of incident response processes (e.g., for forensic support), as needed. The organization has fully deployed DHS' Einstein 1 and 2 to screen all traffic entering and leaving its network through a TIC.	The organization utilizes Einstein 3 Accelerated to detect and proactively block cyber-attacks or prevent potential compromises.	

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Respond Function Area (Incident Response)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
58. To what degree does the organization utilize the following technology to support its incident response program? -Web application protections, such as web application firewalls -Event and incident management, such as intrusion detection and prevention tools, and incident tracking and reporting tools -Aggregation and analysis, such as security information and event management (SIEM) products -Malware detection, such as antivirus and antispam software technologies - Information management, such as data loss prevention - File integrity and endpoint and server security tools (NIST SP 800-137; NIST SP 800-61, Rev. 2; NIST SP 800-44)	The organization has not identified and defined its requirements for incident response technologies needed in one or more of the specified areas and relies on manual/procedural methods in instances where automation would be more effective.	The organization has identified and fully defined its requirements for the incident response technologies it plans to utilize in the specified areas. While tools are implemented to support some incident response activities, the tools are not interoperable to the extent practicable, do not cover all components of the organization's network, and/or have not been configured to collect and retain relevant and meaningful data consistent with the organization's incident response policy, plans, and procedures.	The organization has consistently implemented its defined incident response technologies in the specified areas. In addition, the technologies utilized are interoperable to the extent practicable, cover all components of the organization's network, and have been configured to collect and retain relevant and meaningful data consistent with the organization's incident response policy, procedures, and plans.	The organization uses technologies for monitoring and analyzing qualitative and quantitative performance across the organization and is collecting, analyzing, and reporting data on the effectiveness of its technologies for performing incident response activities.	The organization has institutionalized the implementation of advanced incident response technologies for analysis of trends and performance against benchmarks (e.g., simulation based technologies to continuously determine the impact of potential security incidents to its IT assets) and adjusts incident response processes and security measures accordingly.
59. Provide any additional information on the effectiveness (positive or negative) of the organization's incident response program that was not noted in the questions above. Taking into consideration the maturity level generated from the questions above and based on all testing performed, is the incident response program effective?					

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Recover Function Area (Contingency Planning)

RECOVER FUNCTION AREA

Table 10: Contingency Planning

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
60. To what extent have roles and responsibilities of stakeholders involved in information systems contingency planning been defined and communicated across the organization, including appropriate delegations of authority (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CP-1 and CP-2; NIST SP 800-34; NIST SP 800-84; FCD-1: Annex B)?	Roles and responsibilities have not been fully defined and communicated across the organization, including appropriate delegations of authority.	Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders have been fully defined and communicated across the organization, including appropriate delegations of authority. In addition, the organization has designated appropriate teams to implement its contingency planning strategies.	Individuals are performing the roles and responsibilities that have been defined across the organization.	Resources (people, processes, and technology) are allocated in a risk-based manner for stakeholders to effectively implement system contingency planning activities. Further, stakeholders are held accountable for carrying out their roles and responsibilities effectively.	
61. To what extent has the organization defined and implemented its information system contingency planning program through policies, procedures, and strategies, as appropriate (Note: Assignment of an overall maturity level should take into consideration the maturity of questions 62-66) (NIST SP 800-34; NIST SP 800-161; CSF: ID.BE-5, PR.IP-9, and ID.SC-5, FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics, Section 5).	The organization has not defined its policies, procedures, and strategies, as appropriate, for information system contingency planning. Policies/procedures/strategies do not sufficiently address, at a minimum, the following areas: roles and responsibilities, scope, resource requirements, training, exercise and testing schedules, plan maintenance, technical contingency planning considerations for specific types of systems, schedules, backups and storage, and use of alternate processing and storage sites.	The organization has defined its policies, procedures, and strategies, as appropriate, for information system contingency planning, including technical contingency planning considerations for specific types of systems, such as cloud-based systems, client/server, telecommunications, and mainframe based systems. Areas covered include, at a minimum, roles and responsibilities, scope, resource requirements, training, exercise and testing schedules, plan maintenance schedules, backups and storage, and use of alternate processing and storage sites.	The organization consistently implements its defined information system contingency planning policies, procedures, and strategies. In addition, the organization consistently implements technical contingency planning considerations for specific types of systems, including but not limited to methods such as server clustering and disk mirroring. Further, the organization is consistently capturing and sharing lessons learned on the effectiveness of information system contingency planning policies, procedures, strategy, and processes to update the program.	The organization understands and manages its information and communications technology (ICT) supply chain risks related to contingency planning activities. As appropriate, the organization: integrates ICT supply chain concerns into its contingency planning policies and procedures, defines and implements a contingency plan for its ICT supply chain infrastructure, applies appropriate ICT supply chain controls to alternate storage and processing sites, considers alternate telecommunication service providers for its ICT supply chain infrastructure and to support critical information systems.	The information system contingency planning program is fully integrated with the enterprise risk management program, strategic planning processes, capital allocation/budgeting, and other mission/business areas and embedded into daily decision making across the organization.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Recover Function Area (Contingency Planning)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
62. To what degree does the organization ensure that the results of business impact analyses are used to guide contingency planning efforts (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CP-2; NIST SP 800-34, Rev. 1, 3.2; FIPS 199; FCD-1; OMB M-19-03; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics, Section 5; CSF:ID.RA-4)?	Processes for conducting organizational and system-level BIAs and for incorporating the results into strategy and plan development efforts have not been defined in policies and procedures and are performed in an ad-hoc, reactive manner.	Processes for conducting organizational and system-level BIAs and for incorporating the results into strategy and plan development efforts have been defined.	The organization incorporates the results of organizational and system level BIAs into strategy and plan development efforts consistently. System level BIAs are integrated with the organizational level BIA and include: characterization of all system components, determination of missions/business processes and recovery criticality, identification of resource requirements, and identification of recovery priorities for system resources. The results of the BIA are consistently used to determine contingency planning requirements and priorities, including mission essential functions/high value assets.		

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Recover Function Area (Contingency Planning)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
63. To what extent does the organization ensure that information system contingency plans are developed, maintained, and integrated with other continuity plans (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CP-2; NIST SP 800-34; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics: 5.1; OMB M-19-03; CSF: PR.IP-9)?	Processes for information system contingency plan development and maintenance have not been defined in policies and procedures; the organization has not developed templates to guide plan development; and system contingency plans are developed in an ad-hoc manner with limited integration with other continuity plans.	Processes for information system contingency plan development, maintenance, and integration with other continuity areas have been defined and include the following phases: activation and notification, recovery, and reconstitution.	Information system contingency plans are consistently developed and implemented for systems, as appropriate, and include organizational and system level considerations for the following phases: activation and notification, recovery, and reconstitution. In addition, system level contingency planning development/maintenance activities are integrated with other continuity areas including organization and business process continuity, disaster recovery planning, incident management, insider threat implementation plan (as appropriate), and occupant emergency plans.	The organization is able to integrate metrics on the effectiveness of its information system contingency plans with information on the effectiveness of related plans, such as organization and business process continuity, disaster recovery, incident management, insider threat implementation, and occupant emergency, as appropriate to deliver persistent situational awareness across the organization.	Information system contingency planning activities are fully integrated with the enterprise risk management program, strategic planning processes, capital allocation/budgeting, and other mission/business areas and embedded into daily decision making across the organization.
64. To what extent does the organization perform tests/exercises of its information system contingency planning processes (NIST SP 800-34; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CP-3 and CP-4; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics, Section 5; CSF: ID.SC-5 and CSF: PR.IP-10)?	Processes for information system contingency plan testing/exercises have not been defined and contingency plan tests for systems are performed in an ad-hoc, reactive manner.	Processes for information system contingency plan testing and exercises have been defined and include, as applicable, notification procedures, system recovery on an alternate platform from backup media, internal and external connectivity, system performance using alternate equipment, restoration of normal procedures, and coordination with other business areas/continuity plans, and tabletop and functional exercises.	Processes for information system contingency plan testing and exercises are consistently implemented. ISCP testing and exercises are integrated, to the extent practicable, with testing of related plans, such as incident response plan/COOP/BCP.	The organization employs automated mechanisms to more thoroughly and effectively test system contingency plans. In addition, the organization coordinates plan testing with external stakeholders (e.g., ICT supply chain partners/providers), as appropriate.	The organization coordinates information system contingency plan testing with organizational elements responsible for related plans.

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Recover Function Area (Contingency Planning)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
65. To what extent does the organization perform information system backup and storage, including use of alternate storage and processing sites, as appropriate (NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CP-6, CP-7, CP-8, and CP-9; NIST SP 800-34: 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3; FCD-1; NIST CSF: PR.IP-4; FY 2020 CIO FISMA Metrics, Section 5; and NARA guidance on information systems security records)?	Processes, strategies, and technologies for information system backup and storage, including the use of alternate storage and processing sites and redundant array of independent disks (RAID), as appropriate, have not been defined. Information system backup and storage is performed in an ad-hoc, reactive manner.	Processes, strategies, and technologies for information system backup and storage, including use of alternate storage and processing sites and RAID, as appropriate, have been defined. The organization has considered alternative approaches when developing its backup and storage strategies, including cost, maximum downtimes, recovery priorities, and integration with other contingency plans.	The organization consistently implements its processes, strategies, and technologies for information system backup and storage, including the use of alternate storage and processing sites and RAID, as appropriate. Alternate processing and storage sites are chosen based upon risk assessments which ensure the potential disruption of the organization's ability to initiate and sustain operations is minimized, and are not subject to the same physical and/or cybersecurity risks as the primary sites. In addition, the organization ensures that alternate processing and storage facilities are configured with information security safeguards equivalent to those of the primary site. Furthermore, backups of information at the user- and system-levels are consistently performed and the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of this information is maintained.		
66. To what level does the organization ensure that information on the planning and performance of recovery activities is communicated to internal stakeholders and executive management teams and used to make risk based decisions (CSF: RC.CO-3; NIST SP 800-53 REV. 4: CP-2 and IR-4)?	The organization has not defined how the planning and performance of recovery activities are communicated to internal stakeholders and executive management teams and used to make risk based decisions.	The organization has defined how the planning and performance of recovery activities are communicated to internal stakeholders and executive management teams.	Information on the planning and performance of recovery activities is consistently communicated to relevant stakeholders and executive management teams, who utilize the information to make risk based decisions.	Metrics on the effectiveness of recovery activities are communicated to relevant stakeholders and the organization has ensured that the data supporting the metrics are obtained accurately, consistently, and in a reproducible format.	

FY 2020 Inspector General FISMA Metrics v4.0
Recover Function Area (Contingency Planning)

Question	Maturity Level				
	Ad Hoc	Defined	Consistently Implemented	Managed and Measureable	Optimized
67. Provide any additional information on the effectiveness (positive or negative) of the organization's contingency planning program that was not noted in the questions above. Taking into consideration the maturity level generated from the questions above and based on all testing performed, is the contingency program effective?					

December 12, 2020

David P. Wheeler, WT 2C-K

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR COMMENTS – DRAFT AUDIT 2020-15709 –
FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY MODERNIZATION ACT

Our response to your request for comments regarding the subject draft report is
attached. Please let us know if your staff has any concerns with TVA's comments.

We would like to thank Sarah Huffman, Jonathan Anderson, and the audit team for their
professionalism and cooperation in conducting this audit. If you have any questions,
please contact Lindsey Stewart or Brandy Brown.

Jeremy Fisher
Vice President and Chief Information Officer
Information Technology
SP 3A-C

ASB:BAB
cc (Attachment): Response to Request
    Andrea Brackett, WT 5D-K   Jill Matthews, WT 2C-K
    Tammy Bramlett, SP 2A-C   Todd McCarter, MP 2C-C
    Brandy Brown, MP 2B-C   Sherry Quirk, WT 7C-K
    David Fountain, WT 6A-K   Lindsey Stewart, SP 3K-C
    David Harrison, MP 5C-C   John Thomas, MR 6D-C
    Benjamin Jones, SP 3L-C   OIG File No. 2020-15709

Audit 2020-15709
Federal Information Security Modernization Act
Response to Request for Comments

Page	Draft Report Section	Comments

	Recommendation	Comments
1	We recommend to the Vice President (VP) and CIO, Information Technology (IT): Consistently implement configuration baselines on operating systems and/or ensure deviations are documented, implemented, and maintained.	Management agrees.
2	Update the policy to define a process for assigning risk designations for all positions.	Management agees.
3	Ensure contingency planning roles and responsbilities are filled in accordance with TVA policy.	Management agrees.