

Section 1: Governance

Functional Area	Attributes	Traits	Level 1 Basic Capabilities Characteristics	Level 2 Evolving Maturity Characteristics	Level 3 Demonstrated Maturity Characteristics
GOVERNANCE EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE DRIVES BETTER IT OUTCOMES	<p>Functional Area Description: The objective of FITARA is to improve the management of IT within an agency and hence, improve the ability for that agency to deliver its mission and conduct its business. To effectively enable the agency's mission IT must meet the current functional needs as well as evolve to meet the future needs as laid out in the agency's strategic plan. Governance is the means by which IT programs and projects are selected and managed to ensure the agency's needs are met in an effective manner while minimizing unnecessary duplication. IT governance requires an approach that brings together IT, mission/business, procurement, finance, human resources, etc. to be the right authority, with the right information, at the right time, to make the best possible decisions to effectively deliver IT programs. This need for proper collaboration and decision making includes both horizontal (to include all appropriate stakeholder organizations) and vertical (from strategy all the way to a program) integration.</p> <p><i>Note: Agency means a department or establishment of the Government (compare to bureau). e.g., Treasury is an agency where Enterprise governance would reside. The bureaus under Treasury would include mission specific portfolios and sub-portfolios aligned to the functions of the bureau. Yellow highlights identify linkages to the M-15-14 Attachment A: Common Baseline for IT Management and CIO Assignment Plan elements.</i></p>				
	Horizontal Integration: Is there proper level of involvement from all appropriate agency stakeholders, including the mission/business leaders, Privacy Officer, General Counsel, and the CIO, CAO, CFO, CHCO (the CXOs) etc.? Are portfolio strategies governed by executives who are in the best position to identify existing capability gaps, set priorities for IT spending and investment, and adapt quickly to evolving strategic priorities and business challenges? Is the governance	Governance framework in the agency across the IT management lifecycle	Partially defined	Fully defined	Governance drives decision-making across all IT Management lifecycle activities
		Key stakeholder representation of Business, IT and related support areas like Finance, Acquisition, Legal, etc. in decision making	H.1 CIO role on program governance boards. Appropriate representation and participation from business and IT to meet agency needs. Participation from other areas is lagging, especially at portfolio and program level boards	H.2 CIO role on program governance boards. Appropriate representation and participation from business and IT to meet agency needs. There is active, but not full, participation from other stakeholders at the portfolio and program-level boards	Governance at each level (enterprise, portfolio, program) has all proper stakeholders involved with active participation to drive mission aligned, cost effective IT spending (both investments and operations & maintenance)
		Executive-level participation in enterprise decision making	Senior agency leadership participation is limited and participation is irregular. Critical enterprise decisions rely on ad hoc meetings	Senior agency leadership participation includes regular participation in governance boards to drive enterprise decisions	Highest level executives within the agency are actively engaged in enterprise level decision making
		Integrated decision making across functions (CXO lanes) used to drive consensus-based governance decisions	Fragmented decision making by function impacts ability to implement governance decisions. Incongruent decisions require multiple meetings to create alignment	Fully defined framework and appropriate representation creates better integration between functions. There are few decisions that require resolution	All decisions are made in an integrated manner providing cohesive governance decisions. Boards strive for consensus-based decisions

Section 1: Governance

Functional Area	Attributes	Traits	Level 1 Basic Capabilities Characteristics	Level 2 Evolving Maturity Characteristics	Level 3 Demonstrated Maturity Characteristics
	model properly integrated with enterprise-wide processes for strategic planning, requirements development, programming, budgeting, acquisition, and execution (the IT management lifecycle)?			outside the governance framework	
		Roles and responsibilities of governance boards are clearly articulated and recognized	Policy is defined, but routine attempts made to bypass governance or overrule/ignore governance decisions	Policy is defined, but there are still attempts made to bypass governance or overrule/ignore governance decisions	Policy clearly defined, and the agency requires adherence to the governance framework and its decisions
		Mission/Business Leadership focus to drive mission capabilities	More emphasis on IT processes rather than what capabilities are needed	Focus on shifting to desired services and capabilities and less emphasis on how the capabilities will be delivered	Focus on desired capabilities, allowing IT to propose best solutions
	Vertical Integration: Is there completeness and linkage from Enterprise Governance (overarching strategy of an agency) to Portfolio Governance (the appropriate grouping of mission/business activities of an agency) to Program Governance (oversight for program planning and execution activities)? Is the governance decision making process recognized and adhered to throughout? Are there clear escalation rules and paths for	Governance structure is linked across enterprise, portfolio, and program level governance	Partially accounts for enterprise, portfolio, and program level governance; governance set up at all levels but the decision making alignment across the levels is nascent	Enterprise, portfolio, and program level governance; in place; but the decision making alignment across the levels is still under development	Enterprise, portfolio, and program governance are operational with enterprise, portfolio, and program governance boards in place and alignment decisions made and implemented at each level
		Strategic alignment and objective success measures are linked to portfolios	Initial stages of developing a strategic plan for the agency, with objectives and success measures to drive portfolio decision making	Established strategic vision and strategic alignment is underway and performance measurement and monitoring are in the early stages of initiation	Overarching strategic plan in place, with objectives and success measures used to drive portfolio decision making
		Decision making is made and enforced at the proper level of governance	Decision making routinely bypassed; escalation frequent	Appropriate level decision making; occasional escalation during normal management of IT portfolio	Appropriate level decision making; escalation used rarely during normal management of IT portfolio
		Escalation rules and paths for contested decisions are clearly defined and enforced	Ad-hoc; few rules or paths	Rules exist, but not consistently enforced	Rules exist, and are consistently followed and enforced

Section 1: Governance

Functional Area	Attributes	Traits	Level 1 Basic Capabilities Characteristics	Level 2 Evolving Maturity Characteristics	Level 3 Demonstrated Maturity Characteristics
	decisions that can have broader impacts? (Caveat: for small agencies, it may be possible to combine enterprise and portfolio governance)	Portfolio governance is operational and allocates requirements to programs	Emerging with constant reorganization; does not properly allocate requirements to programs	Becoming operational through the “Select” phase; does not in all cases allocate requirements to programs	Good visibility into portfolio strategies and the performance of related programs; allocates requirements and success metrics to programs
		Program governance is operational and provides set guidance for programs to achieve success	Operational, but not in place for all programs and inconsistent sharing with portfolio governance; Inadequate guidance and oversight	Program governance in place for all development programs with improving alignment to portfolio governance. Processes and metrics are not yet standardized	Program governance sets guidance for programs, and helps the PM and program staff achieve success. Program governance covers all programs, including those in operations and maintenance
	(Vertical Integration)	Governance structure oversees IT Portfolio and has process to evaluate all elements of the portfolio	Somewhat defined or followed governance structure that only oversees the IT Portfolio at a high level	Defined governance structure that oversees the IT Portfolio at a high level but does not evaluate every aspect of the Portfolio	Clearly defined governance structure oversees IT Portfolio and ensure all aspects of the Portfolio are reviewed
		Strategic direction for IT is developed with a multi-year approach aligned with IT needs and IT WCF process	Strategic direction is developed for IT; however, it is often hard to execute a multi-year approach making funding IT needs a challenge	Strategic direction is developed for IT with a multi-year approach but does not always align or tie to IT WCF process making funding a challenge	Strategic direction is developed for IT with a multi-year approach that aligns with the budget and IT WCF processes
	Right Authority: Does each level of governance (and associated governance bodies) have the ability to make authoritative decisions that are binding for that organization (e.g., does a program-level governance body have	Governance model contains delegation authorities at each level of governance, and enables authoritative decision making	Gaps present in delegation authorities for some levels of governance; delegations have not been made to enable authoritative decision making on a consistent basis	Appropriate delegation authorities for each level of governance, however, inconsistencies in delegation hinder consistent authoritative decision making	Appropriate delegation authorities at each level of governance to enable authoritative decision making
		Well-structured and non-overlapping roles for each level of governance exist	Structure under development. Overlap of roles is common and may result in duplicative or contradicting decisions	Exists, but hand-offs between boards may be unclear	Clearly defined; clean hand-offs occur between boards ensuring transparency and accountability of all decision making

Section 1: Governance

Functional Area	Attributes	Traits	Level 1 Basic Capabilities Characteristics	Level 2 Evolving Maturity Characteristics	Level 3 Demonstrated Maturity Characteristics
	authority over the program being governed)? Are there distinctly defined relationships between each governance tier with clear, non-redundant roles, responsibilities, and authorities? Is the span of governance optimal for the boards to be effective considering scope of governance, expertise and number of boards?	Decisions by the governance boards are implemented and enforced	Frequently reversed by agency executives; undermines the effectiveness of the governance process – resulting in increased cost and delays	Occasionally reversed by higher level boards; lower frequency of reversals creates more stability	Decisions are not changed by a higher level board unless there is a compelling business reason
		Governance decision making is consistent, and backed by evidence-based information and analysis, on a timely basis	Inconsistent decision making; may be swayed by agency leadership. Not always made in a timely manner	Demonstrated decision making that is typically within the authority of the board, is timely, and is based on appropriate presentation of data and analysis to help support the decision process	Evidenced-based decision making is demonstrated at all levels of governance
		Clearly defined approach to ensure that governance boards are operating consistently with an objective decision-making framework, allowing the measurement of governance effectiveness	Not fully defined or operating, thus the effectiveness of the governance boards cannot be measured	Defined and operating consistently, but measures of governance effectiveness are still lagging	Defined and operating consistently; allowing the effectiveness of all governance boards to be measured to ensure all boards are getting the information they need, holding regular meetings, having the right engagement, and demonstrating the ability to make decisions based on proper analysis and discussion of the stakeholders
		Span of control in governance boards are appropriately sized to enable effective decision making across the breadth of the portfolio	Either too broad to be knowledgeable, or too narrow to effectively see the big picture. The narrow span of governance results too many boards and delayed decision making	Boards have a better span of governance ensuring decisions are made with insight into programs, however some lower-level governance boards (particularly at a program level) are not authorized to make decisions	Optimal for effective decision making
		Number of governance boards are right-sized and appropriately staffed to avoid governance fatigue, and to	Proliferation of boards often staffed by the same members, resulting in governance fatigue	Better defined roles and responsibilities result in less duplication of boards and membership is reduced	Appropriate balance is struck among number boards, membership, and the items to be governed facilitating

Section 1: Governance

Functional Area	Attributes	Traits	Level 1 Basic Capabilities Characteristics	Level 2 Evolving Maturity Characteristics	Level 3 Demonstrated Maturity Characteristics
		facilitate timely and effective decisions			timely and effective decisions
	Right Information: Does each level of governance (and associated governance bodies) have the means to obtain the right information to be able to make properly informed decisions? Does Enterprise Architecture inform the governance process? Is there evidence-based decision making? Is there transparency and information accountability? Are metrics actively used to measure effectiveness of governance? (metrics on governance process – meeting regularly, outputs) (caveat: for small agencies, it may be possible to combine enterprise and portfolio governance)	Governance boards have the means to obtain the right information to inform and support decision making	Operates with the right types of information, but there are significant gaps in the quality of data and analysis	Operates with the right types of information, but have gaps in the quality of data and analysis	Operates with reliable information and analysis to support informed decision making
		Enterprise governance is supplied with objective information and analysis to support strategic decision making	Some objective analysis but much information tends to be anecdotal	Analysis and information is generally provided to support strategic decision making; improvements can be made in obtaining information, particularly from the portfolios and external entities	Information is supplied from both internal (portfolios) and external entities regarding expectations of performance for the agency, perceived or real shortfalls, political imperatives, etc. that fully supports decision making on strategic direction and objectives
		Enterprise architecture (EA) model enables portfolio-level governance to assess the state of the portfolio, assisting with decisions that are in alignment with mission or business outcomes	EA exists, but does not fully represent current state of the portfolio; there is uneven analysis of the ‘to-be’ state to support improved mission or business outcomes	EA is incomplete in at least one dimension; the current portfolio is mostly understood but has gaps in the ‘to-be’ state to support improved mission or business outcomes	Mature EA enables full transparency of the current state of the portfolio, and enabling complete analysis of the ‘to-be’ state to support improved mission or business outcomes
		Program staff is able to provide reporting on program status, risks, issues, and recommendations via dashboards; standards and tools for reporting are defined and implemented	Program staff is in the initial stages of establishing standards and tools for consistent and accurate reporting on program status	Program staff has defined standards for tracking and program metrics, and is in the process of implementing tools for consistent collection of data; data quality improvement is in progress through analysis and training	Program staff is able to provide consistent and complete reporting on program status, risks, issues, and recommendations due to fully defined and implemented standards and tools
		Governance outcomes and effectiveness tracking is in place, supported with	Outcomes, effectiveness tracking, and process metrics are yet to be measured	Decisions are tracked, but implementation tracking is lagging. Governance outcome	Outcomes, effectiveness tracking are standard process, with data accurately reflecting the true

Section 1: Governance

Functional Area	Attributes	Traits	Level 1 Basic Capabilities Characteristics	Level 2 Evolving Maturity Characteristics	Level 3 Demonstrated Maturity Characteristics
		data reflecting the status of IT spending		and effectiveness tracking is nascent	status of IT spending. Governance process metrics are tracked and used to make improvements
		Agency leverages iterative software development processes to deliver in increments (e.g. 6 months, etc..) versus broadly scoped and delivering functionality over several years after initiation	Process for incremental development process established to review and leverage iterative practices for software development (e.g., Agile) to be used to ensure delivery completed in 6 month or less increments	Mature iterative process for incremental development process metrics are established, tracked and measured leading to iterative practices to reduce the risk and drive quality while incrementally delivering software components	Agency has well established iterative development process metrics that are tracked and measured leading to iterative practices to reduce the risk and drive quality. A large percentage of the software projects which planned to deliver functionality incrementally
	Right Timing: Does enterprise governance work well within the timing required for strategic planning, requirements development, programming, budgeting, acquisition, and execution? Are there timely decisions for a program in execution at the program governance level, especially as enterprises leverage modular and agile methodologies to drive smaller and more frequent incremental releases?	Governance structure is operational to make decisions in support of all phases of the IT management lifecycle	Operating; but governance at all levels struggles to make timely decisions	Operating at all levels, but there are occasionally failures to make timely decisions	Fully operational at all levels and making timely decisions
		Governance board meetings are aligned with the IT management lifecycle	Governance meetings are not aligned; decisions are often made outside of governance framework	Governance meetings are mostly aligned; most decisions are prioritized and staged for decision making	Governance meetings are fully aligned, ensuring decisions are prioritized and staged for timely decision making
		Board meetings are held consistently and attended by principal attendees	Inconsistent meetings, or principal attendees do not consistently attend	Consistent meetings, however, principals do not always attend; delegates are sent without appropriate background or empowerment resulting in delayed decision making	Consistent meetings and attended by principal attendees
		Enterprise governance board meets continuously throughout the year	Only meets during the budget preparation cycle	Meets throughout the year, and may meet more frequently during budget preparation	Meets throughout the year, and will meet more frequently during budget preparation

Section 1: Governance

Functional Area	Attributes	Traits	Level 1 Basic Capabilities Characteristics	Level 2 Evolving Maturity Characteristics	Level 3 Demonstrated Maturity Characteristics
		Portfolio governance boards meet continuously throughout the year	Meets less than quarterly during a year; or board sessions are cancelled or delayed significantly	Meets quarterly after the portfolio EA has been developed. There may be unevenness in the maturity and meeting frequency of the portfolio governance boards	Meet quarterly after a mature portfolio EA has been developed
		Program governance boards meet as appropriate to support timely decision making	Do not meet often enough to support the program(s), providing limited proactive help	Vary in meeting frequency; occasionally fail to provide timely decision making for a program(s), but making improvements through incremental implementation and agile development	Vary in meeting frequency; but boards will meet with proper frequency to provide timely decision making for a program(s)
	Risk Management (while a specific management discipline, risk management is so critical to an agency's success that it is recognized as an attribute for assessing governance maturity): Does the agency have a comprehensive risk management approach, to include risk identification and impact assessment, risk prioritization analysis, risk mitigation, and risk reporting? Are risks considered in all levels of governance?	Agency has a robust risk management program in place	Agency has a comprehensive risk management process but it is not used consistently at all levels of governance	Agency has a comprehensive risk management process but that is used at all levels of governance but does not cover all programs	Agency has a comprehensive and well documented risk management process in place supporting all levels of governance and all programs
		Risks are integrated into agency decision-making	Risks are clearly understood by senior agency leadership. Decision making focuses on risks proactively. Prioritization is based on a balanced set of factors, including probability, degree of impact, past history, and interdependencies	Risks are clearly understood at enterprise and portfolio levels of governance. Decision making focuses on proactive management of risks. Prioritization is based on a balanced set of factors, including probability, degree of impact, past history, and interdependencies	Risks are clearly understood at all levels of governance. Decision-making focuses on proactive management of risks. Prioritization is based on a balanced set of factors, including probability, degree of impact, past history, and interdependencies
		The agency uses risk analysis to evaluate approach and execution of IT program delivery	Agency has a risk analysis toolkit (process/policy/people) but not all elements are standardly applied to IT program delivery	Agency has a risk analysis toolkit (process/policy/people) but only some elements are standardly applied to IT program delivery	Agency has a risk analysis toolkit (process/policy/people) and all elements are standardly applied to IT program delivery

Section 1: Governance

Functional Area	Attributes	Traits	Level 1 Basic Capabilities Characteristics	Level 2 Evolving Maturity Characteristics	Level 3 Demonstrated Maturity Characteristics
	Information Security (IS) (while a specific technology area and set of requirements for an IT environment, information security is so critical that is recognized as an attribute for assessing governance maturity): Does the agency properly recognize and incorporate information security requirements? Does the agency have proactive means in place to keep information security policies and approaches current? Does the agency measure effectiveness of information security outcomes by actively collecting metrics? Does the agency use metrics to improve programs and acquisition processes?	The agency has mechanisms in place to monitor and response to cyber threats	The agency has begun implementing automated Security Assessment Tools for continuous monitoring and a Security Operations Center (SOC) provides continuous monitoring and diagnostics of IS posture	The agency has implemented automated Security Assessment Tools for continuous monitoring, reports via CyberScope, and works closely with US-CERT	The agency has implemented a fully automated Security Assessment Tools for continuous monitoring, reports via CyberScope, and works closely with US-CERT
		The agency leverages leading IS practices to improvement their IT security posture	There is a process to review and leverage leading IS practices to be used to make improvements to the agency's IS posture	Some IS process metrics are tracked and there is a process to review and leverage leading IT security practices to be used to make improvements to the agency's IT security posture	IS process metrics are tracked and there is a process to review and leverage leading IS practices to be used to make improvements to the agency's IT security posture
		The agency has aligned IS policies with organizational levels, performs assessments, provides training, and uses metrics actively to measure effectiveness of IS outcomes and improve programs	The agency has stand-alone IS policies and procedures, addresses assessments and training to meet minimal requirements. The agency collects metrics only as required for FISMA reporting	The agency has established a linkage between IS policies at each level in the agency, actively assesses risks, and collects metrics for FISMA reporting. Assessments and risk management are key IT responsibilities	The IS program fully supported throughout the agency, has integrated IS into agency's mission and performance measures, has a robust IS training, collects metrics for FISMA reporting and uses them used for continuous IS process improvement
		There are modernization efforts to replace antiquated and insecure networks and infrastructure, and to improve resilience of legacy applications	The agency is working to secure funding to implement incremental modernization efforts to replace insecure networks, infrastructure, and legacy applications	The agency is working to secure funding and schedules incremental modernization efforts to replace insecure networks, infrastructure, and legacy applications	The agency has secured funding and is incrementally implementing modern infrastructure to replace insecure networks, infrastructure, and legacy applications