

## Memorandum

June 6, 2013

TO:

Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Senate Committee on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs

## **SUBJECT:** FISMA Spending, Historical Trends

You requested information on annual federal spending on cybersecurity under the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA). As we discussed by telephone, the first year for which CRS has such data is FY2006, and the most recent is FY2012.<sup>1</sup>

Fiscal Year	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
FISMA Spending (\$ billions)	14.6	13.3	12.0	6.8	6.2	5.9	5.5

Source: Annual reports on implementation of FISMA from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Note: Data for FY2006-FY2009 are not comparable to later data, because of changes in how OMB collected the information. See text.

As the table indicates, there was a large increase in reported spending on FISMA beginning in FY2010. However, OMB changed the way it collected the data beginning with FY2010, when it introduced a separate form (Exhibit 53B) on which agencies were required to report detailed spending.<sup>2</sup> Before that, agencies reported the data as a simple percentage of their overall information technology (IT) investment.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, data from FY2006 to FY2009 are not

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The data come from annual FISMA reports. Most of these are available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/docs.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Office of Management and Budget, Fiscal Year 2010 Report to Congress on Implementation of the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002, March 2011, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/egov\_docs/FY10\_FISMA.pdf.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Office of Management and Budget, Fiscal Year 2009 Report to Congress on Implementation of the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002, March 2010, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/egov\_docs/FY09\_FISMA.pdf.

comparable to those from FY2010 to FY2012. The large increase in reported funding between FY2009 and FY2010 is almost certainly an artifact of the change in reporting method.