SOCIAL SECURITY
The Commissioner

March 31, 2015

The Honorable Ron Johnson
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security
and Governmental Affairs
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We are pleased to provide you with our fiscal year 2014 Federal Information Security Management Act report as required by the Office of Management and Budget's Memorandum M-15-01, *Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Guidance on Improving Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Practices*. Our report includes the reports of our Chief Information Officer (CIO), our Senior Agency Official for Privacy, and our Office of the Inspector General (OIG). Our OIG's independent evaluation of our information security program found that we continue to be fully compliant in all areas.

I am sending a copy of the report to the following House Committees: Oversight and Government Reform; Science, Space, and Technology; Appropriations; and Ways and Means. I am also sending a copy of the report to the following Senate Committees: Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Finance; and Appropriations.

If you have any questions, please have your staff contact Bill Zielinski, our CIO, at (410) 965-4380, or by email at Bill.Zielinski@ssa.gov.

Sincerely,

Carolyn W. Colvin

Carolyn W. Colvin
Acting Commissioner

Enclosure

SOCIAL SECURITY
The Commissioner

March 31, 2015

The Honorable Jason Chaffetz
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and
Government Reform
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We are pleased to provide you with our fiscal year 2014 Federal Information Security Management Act report as required by the Office of Management and Budget's Memorandum M-15-01, *Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Guidance on Improving Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Practices*. Our report includes the reports of our Chief Information Officer (CIO), our Senior Agency Official for Privacy, and our Office of the Inspector General (OIG). Our OIG's independent evaluation of our information security program found that we continue to be fully compliant in all areas.

I am sending a copy of the report to the following House Committees: Oversight and Government Reform; Science, Space, and Technology; Appropriations; and Ways and Means. I am also sending a copy of the report to the following Senate Committees: Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Finance; and Appropriations.

If you have any questions, please have your staff contact Bill Zielinski, our CIO, at (410) 965-4380, or by email at Bill.Zielinski@ssa.gov.

Sincerely,

Carolyn W. Colvin

Carolyn W. Colvin
Acting Commissioner

Enclosure

SOCIAL SECURITY
The Commissioner

November 14, 2014

The Honorable Shaun Donovan
Director, Office of Management and Budget
725 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20503

Dear Mr. Donovan:

We are pleased to submit our fiscal year (FY) 2014 Information Technology Security Program Review Report, as required by the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA). Our submission includes the reports of our Chief Information Officer, our Senior Agency Official for Privacy, and our Office of the Inspector General (OIG). Our OIG's report includes an independent evaluation of our information security program and FISMA compliance.

In accordance with the Office of Management and Budget's Memorandum M-15-01, "Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Guidance on Improving Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Practices," we also offer the following information as an Executive Summary describing our:

- Progress towards meeting FY 2014 FISMA metrics;
- Progress towards meeting the Cybersecurity Cross-Agency Priority (CAP) goals; and
- Information on incidents reported to the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT).

Progress towards meeting FY 2014 FISMA metrics

Our financial statement auditors found that our progress toward meeting the FY 2014 FISMA metrics resulted in a high degree of compliance. We successfully met all metrics in the areas of continuous monitoring, incident response and reporting, tracking and monitoring weaknesses, remote access, contingency planning, contractor and cloud computing systems, and capital planning for investments in security.

In the areas of security configurations, identity and access, managing risk, and training, our auditors found that we met the majority of metrics but cited several findings. Consequently, we are undertaking new steps to correct these weaknesses, as well as strengthening our existing safeguards. While we look forward to collaborating with our federal partners to further strengthen our security, we believe our ongoing efforts and multi-layered security approach provide effective protection for our network, systems, and data against the evolving cyber threat landscape.

Our auditors also found that we have made significant progress in strengthening controls over our information systems to address the significant deficiency the auditors found last year. While we are aggressively pursuing several initiatives to strengthen our controls, some of the underlying causes require continued long-term commitment.

Consequently, our auditors have cited their findings as a significant deficiency under FISMA. FISMA requires that we report the significant deficiency as a material weakness under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) and as a lack of substantial compliance with the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act (FFMIA) if related to financial management systems.

We continue to believe that the significant deficiency does not rise to the level of a material weakness under FMFIA. Further, we believe that we are substantially compliant with FFMIA as this finding does not prevent us from providing reliable and timely financial information. As we do with all auditor findings, we will continue to aggressively pursue a risk-based corrective action plan to address the remaining deficiency and build on our progress to date.

Progress towards meeting the Cybersecurity CAP goals

Our Performance Improvement Officer reviewed our progress towards meeting the four Cybersecurity CAP goals for FY 2014:

- Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (HSPD-12);
- Continuous monitoring;
- Trusted Internet Connection (TIC) consolidation; and
- TIC version 2.0.

We met the following three Cybersecurity CAP goals for FY 2014:

- HSPD-12 (we are at 87 percent);
- Continuous monitoring (we are at 98 percent); and
- TIC consolidation (we met 100 percent).

For the fourth Cybersecurity CAP goal, TIC version 2.0, we are 94 percent compliant with DHS metrics. While this is slightly under the Cybersecurity CAP goal of 100 percent, we are taking aggressive action to meet the DHS metrics.

Information on incidents reported to DHS US-CERT

In addition, we continue to meet all requirements for timely reporting of computer security incidents to the DHS US-CERT. During FY 2014, we reported 256 cyber incidents and suspected incidents through the DHS US-CERT Incident Notification System.

If you have any questions about this information, please have your staff contact Bill Zielinski, our Chief Information Officer at (410) 965-4380 or by email at Bill.Zielinski@ssa.gov.

Sincerely,

Carolyn W. Colvin

Carolyn W. Colvin
Acting Commissioner

Enclosure

Chief Information Officer

Section Report

2014

Annual FISMA Report

Social Security Administration

Section 1: Systems Inventory

1.1 **For each of the FIPS 199 systems impact levels (H = High, M = Moderate, L = Low), what is the total number of information systems by organization (i.e., Bureau or Sub-Department Operating Element) categorized at that level? Answer in Table 1 below. (Organizations with fewer than 5000 users may report as one unit.)**

		1.1.1 Organization Operated Systems	1.1.2 Contractor Operated Systems	1.1.3 Systems (from 1.1.1 and 1.1.2) with Security ATO
SSA	High	0	0	0
	Moderate	16	0	16
	Low	5	0	5
	Not Categorized	0	0	0
	Sub-Total	***21***	***0***	***21***
Component Total	High	0	0	0
	Moderate	16	0	16
	Low	5	0	5
	Not Categorized	0	0	0
	Total	***21***	***0***	***21***

For Official Use Only

Section 2: Asset Management

2.1 What is the total number of the organization's hardware assets connected to the organization's unclassified network(s)?

285843

2.2 What percentage of assets in 2.1 are covered by an automated capability (scans/device discovery processes) to provide enterprise-level visibility into asset inventory information for all hardware assets?

100%

2.2.1 What is the minimum frequency for device discovery scanning conducted on all assets?

14.0

2.3 For how many assets in 2.1 does the organization have an automated capability to determine both whether the asset is authorized and to whom management has been assigned?

268268

2.4 Can the organization track the installed operating system's vendor, product, and version in use on the assets in 2.1?

Yes

2.5 For what percentage of applicable assets in 2.1 has the organization implemented an automated capability to detect and block unauthorized software from executing or for what percentage does no such software exist for the device type?

100%

Comments: SSA has the ability to detect unauthorized software and block the execution of malware.

Section 3: Configuration Management

3.1 For each operating system, vendor, product, and version referenced in 2.4, report the following:

Comments: "OTHER" applies to: 87,248 Voice Over IP Devices | 16,058 Printers and Multi-Functional Devices (MFD) | 865 Wireless Access Points | 642 Windows 2003 Server SP 1 and SP2 servers | 434 Windows Vista workstations

Vendor/Operating System/Version	3.1.1 Has a minimal acceptable security configuration baseline been defined?	3.1.2 How many hardware assets (which are covered by this baseline, if it exists) have this software?	3.1.3 What is the percentage of the applicable hardware assets (per question 2.1) of each kind of operating system software in 3.1 covered by an automated capability to identify deviations from the approved configuration baselines identified in 3.1.1 and to provide visibility at the organization's enterprise level?
Apple Mac OS X 10.9.5	Yes	11	100%
Blackberry OS 10.0	Yes	3874	100%
Brocade SilkWorm 200E Switch 5.2.0	Yes	4	100%

For Official Use Only

Section 3: Configuration Management

Vendor/Operating System/Version	3.1.1 Has a minimal acceptable security configuration baseline been defined?	3.1.2 How many hardware assets (which are covered by this baseline, if it exists) have this software?	3.1.3 What is the percentage of the applicable hardware assets (per question 2.1) of each kind of operating system software in 3.1 covered by an automated capability to identify deviations from the approved configuration baselines identified in 3.1.1 and to provide visibility at the organization's enterprise level?
Cisco IOS 12.2	Yes	5833	100 %
Cisco IOS 12.3	Yes	58	100 %
Cisco IOS 12.4	Yes	589	100 %
Cisco IOS 15.0	Yes	2747	100 %
Cisco IOS XE 3.2.4SG	Yes	54	100 %
HP HP-UX 11.4	Yes	50	100 %
IBM AIX 7.1.2	Yes	6	100 %
IBM i 7.1	Yes	280	100 %
IBm z/OS 1.13	Yes	62	100 %
Linux Kernel 1.2	Yes	120	100 %
Microsoft Windows 2003 Server R2 Service Pack 2	Yes	780	100 %
Microsoft Windows 7 64-bit Service Pack 1 (initial release)	Yes	149235	100 %
Windows 8 x64 (64-bit)	Yes	19	100 %
Windows 8 x86 (32-bit)	Yes	16	100 %
Microsoft Windows Server 2008 Service Pack 1 Enterprise Edition	Yes	99	100 %
Microsoft Windows Server 2008 Enterprise Service Pack 2 x64 (64-bit) (initial release)	Yes	311	100 %
Microsoft Windows Server 2008 R2	Yes	205	100 %
Microsoft Windows Server 2008 R2 Service Pack 1	Yes	7037	100 %
Microsoft Windows Server 2012	Yes	8448	100 %
Microsoft Windows XP Service Pack 3 Professional Edition	Yes	13	100 %
OTHER	No	16058	0 %
OTHER	Yes	87248	100 %
OTHER	Yes	865	100 %

For Official Use Only

Section 3: Configuration Management

Vendor/Operating System/Version	3.1.1 Has a minimal acceptable security configuration baseline been defined?	3.1.2 How many hardware assets (which are covered by this baseline, if it exists) have this software?	3.1.3 What is the percentage of the applicable hardware assets (per question 2.1) of each kind of operating system software in 3.1 covered by an automated capability to identify deviations from the approved configuration baselines identified in 3.1.1 and to provide visibility at the organization's enterprise level?
OTHER	Yes	434	100 %
OTHER	Yes	642	100 %
Red Hat Enterprise Linux 5.0	Yes	7	100 %
Red Hat Enterprise Linux 6	Yes	31	100 %
Sun SunOS (Solaris 10) 5.10	Yes	1	100 %
Sun OS 5.10 SPARC	Yes	801	100 %

Section 4: Vulnerability and Weakness Management

4.1 What percentage of hardware assets identified in section 2.1 are evaluated using an automated capability that identifies NIST National Vulnerability Database vulnerabilities (CVEs) present with visibility at the organization's enterprise level?

100%

Section 5: Identity and Access Management

5.1 How many people have unprivileged network accounts? (Exclude privileged network accounts and non-user accounts.)

77086

5.2 What percentage of people with an unprivileged network account can log onto the network in each of the following ways?

5.2.1 Allowed to log on with user ID and password.

16%

Comments: This number consists of non-Federal, State employeees awaiting SSA issued HSPD-12 credentials.

5.2.2 Allowed, but not required, to log on with a non-PIV form of two-factor authentication.

0%

Comments: SSA does not employ non-PIV, two-factor authentications for Windows.

5.2.3 Allowed, but not required, to log on with a two-factor PIV card.

84%

Comments: SSA policy requires all users with PIV cards to use them for network log on.

For Official Use Only

Section 5: Identity and Access Management

5.2.4 Required to log on with a non-PIV form of two-factor authentication.

0%

Comments: SSA does not employ non-PIV, two-factor authentication for Windows.

5.2.5 Required to log on with a two-factor PIV card.

84%

Comments: SSA policy requires all users with PIV cards to use them for network logon.

5.2.6 Required to conduct PIV authentication at the user-account level.

84%

Comments: All PIV user-account level authentications occur at network login.

5.3 How many people have privileged network accounts? (Exclude unprivileged network accounts and non-user accounts.)

8400

5.4 What percentage of people with a privileged network account can log onto the network in each of the following ways?

5.4.1 Allowed to log on with user ID and password.

1%

Comments: This is the number of accounts for SSA's Active Domain Adminstrators.

5.4.2 Allowed, but not required, to log on with a non-PIV form of two-factor authentication.

0%

Comments: SSA does not employ non-PIV, two-factor authentications.

5.4.3 Allowed, but not required, to log on with a two-factor PIV card.

1%

Comments: This number of accounts for SSA's Active Directory Domain Administrators.

5.4.4 Required to log on with a non-PIV form of two-factor authentication.

0%

Comments: SSA does not employ non-PIV, two-factor authentications.

5.4.5 Required to log on with a two-factor PIV card.

99%

5.4.6 Required to conduct PIV authentication at the user-account level.

For Official Use Only

Section 5: Identity and Access Management

99%

Comments: All PIV user-account level authentications occur at network login.

5.5 What is the estimated number of organization internal systems?

21

5.6 What percentage of the organizations internal systems are configured for authentication in each of the following ways?

5.6.1 Allows user ID and password.

100%

Comments: Users are required by policy to access systems running on our network with PIV.

5.6.2 Allows, but does not enforce, non-PIV, two-factor authentication for users.

0%

5.6.3 Allows, but does not enforce, two-factor PIV card authentication for users.

100%

Comments: Authentication is enforced at the domain/user level, not at the Windows machine.

5.6.4 Enforces non-PIV, two-factor authentication for all users.

0%

Comments: A limit set of SSA security infrastructure does require the use of access tokens for two-factor authentication.

5.6.5 Enforces two-factor PIV card for all users.

1%

Comments: SSA is currently conducting a pilot for a technical control that enforces PIV authentication.

5.7 Does the organization have a policy in place that requires the review of privileged network users' privileges? (If the answer is no, then answer 'N/A' for questions 5.7.1 through 5.7.2.)

Yes

5.7.1 What percentage of privileged network users had their privileges reviewed this year for the following?

5.7.1.1 Privileges on that account reconciled with work requirements.

3%

5.7.1.2 Adequate separation of duties considering aggregated privileges on all accounts for the same person (user).

100%

For Official Use Only

Section 5: Identity and Access Management

5.7.2 What percentage of privileged network users had their privileges adjusted or terminated after being reviewed this year?

0%

Comments: 2 out of the 272 privileged accounts reviewed this year had their privileges accounts adjusted.

5.8 What is the percentage of an agency's operational PACS that comply with procurement requirements for purchasing products and services from the FIPS 201 Approval Products List maintained by GSA (per OMB M-06-18)?

100%

5.9 What is the percentage of an agency's operational PACS that electronically accept and authenticate internal users' PIV credentials for routine access in accordance with NIST standards and guidelines (e.g. FIPS 201 and SP 800-116)?

100

5.10 How many people log onto the organization's remote access solution(s) to obtain access to the organization's desktop LAN/WAN resources or services?

12534

Comments: This is total is up by 7,699 users from last year because of SSA's Agency-wide deployment of telework in 2014.

5.11 Of the people reported in 5.10, how many can remotely log onto the organization's desktop LAN/WAN resources or services in each of the following ways?

5.11.1 Allowed to log on with user ID and password.

0%

5.11.2 Allowed, but not required, to log on with a non-PIV form of two-factor authentication.

0%

5.11.3 Allowed, but not required, to log on with a two-factor PIV card.

0%

5.11.4 Required to log on with a non-PIV form of two-factor authentication.

0%

5.11.5 Required to log on with a two-factor PIV card.

100%

Comments: SSA requires that all remote users use a two factor PIV card for authentication.

5.11.6 Required to conduct PIV authentication at the user-account level.

100%

For Official Use Only

Section 5: Identity and Access Management

Comments: All PIV user-account level authentications occur at network login.

5.12 What is the estimated percentage of remote access connections that have each of the following properties?

5.12.1 Utilizes FIPS 140-2-validated cryptographic modules.

100%

5.12.2 Prohibits split tunneling and/or dual-connected remote hosts where the laptop has two active connections.

100%

5.12.3 Is configured in accordance with OMB M-07-16 to time-out after 30 minutes of inactivity (or less) and require re-authentication to reestablish session.

100%

5.12.4 Scans for malware upon connection.

100%

Comments: SSA does not scan remote hosts for malware upon connection; however, hosts are scanned for compliance with the approved security configuration prior to being granted access. In the event that a host is not configured appropriately, the host is quarantined until it has been updated.

5.13 How many of the organizations systems are internet-accessible and are accessed by the organizations users? This excludes systems accessed through the remote access solutions covered in 5.10 and 5.11.

2

5.14 What percentage of the organization's systems that is internet-accessible and is accessed by the organization's users is configured for authentication in each of the following ways?

5.14.1 Allows user ID and password.

100%

5.14.2 Allows, but does not enforce, non-PIV, two-factor authentication for users.

0%

5.14.3 Allows, but does not enforce, two-factor PIV card authentication for users.

0%

5.14.4 Enforces non-PIV, two-factor authentication for all users.

0%

5.14.5 Enforces two-factor PIV card for all users.

For Official Use Only

Section 5: Identity and Access Management

0%

Section 6: Data Protection

6.1 What is the estimated number of hardware assets from 2.1 in each of the following mobile asset types, and how many are encrypted?

Mobile Assets Types (each asset should be recorded no more than once in each column)	Estimated number of mobile hardware assets of the types indicated in each row.	Estimated number assets from column a with encryption of data on the device.
Laptop computers and netbooks	13489	13489
Tablet-type computers	0	0
BlackBerries and other smartphones	3898	3898
USB-connected devices (e.g., flash drives and removable hard drives)	1970	1970
Other mobile hardware assets (describe types in comments field)	0	0

6.2 What percentage of email systems implements the following capabilities?

6.2.1 Anti-spoofing Technologies (when sending messages)

100%

6.2.2 Anti-spoofing Technologies (when receiving messages)

100%

6.2.3 Ability to analyze links or attachments to identify and quarantine suspected malicious payload (when receiving messages)

100%

6.2.4 Digitally Signed Email (when sending messages)

100%

6.2.5 FIPS 140-2 Encryption of Email (when sending messages)

100%

Section 7: Boundary Protection

7.1 What percentage of the required TIC 2.0 Capabilities are implemented?

94%

7.2 What percentage of external network traffic to/from the organization's networks passes through a TIC/MTIPS?

100%

7.3 What percentage of external network/application interconnections to/from the organization's networks passes through a TIC/MTIPS?

100%

For Official Use Only

Section 7: Boundary Protection

7.4 What frequency does the organization scan for unauthorized wireless access points (WAP)?

0.25

Comments: All walkthroughs are scheduled. SSA runs scans automatically 4 times daily (.25).

7.4.1 What percentage of the network is covered by the scans?

100%

7.4.2 How many unauthorized wireless access points were detected in the prior year?

302

7.5 What percentage of traffic is scanned for Digital Loss Protection/Digital Rights Management (DLP/DRM) to capture outbound data leakage?

100%

7.6 How many public-facing domain names (second-level, e.g., www.dhs.gov) does the organization own? (Exclude domain names which host only FIPS-199 low-impact information on ISPs.)

3

7.6.1 How many DNS names from 7.6 are signed using DNSSEC?

3

7.6.2 What percentage of the second-level DNS names from 7.6 and their sub-domains are signed?

100%

7.7 What percentage of public-facing servers use IPv6 (e.g., web servers, email servers, DNS servers, etc.)? (Exclude low-impact networks, cloud servers, and ISP resources unless they require IPv6 to perform their business function.)

100%

Section 8: Incident Management

8.1 How many of the organization's hardware assets from 2.1 are on networks on which controlled network penetration testing was performed in the reporting period?

285843

8.1.1 What percentage of applicable events was detected by NOC/SOC during the penetration test?

0%

Comments: SSA incident response process does not currently track the start and duration of network penetration tests.

8.1.2 What was the mean time to detection of applicable events?

For Official Use Only

Section 8: Incident Management

0.0

Comments: SSA incident response process does not currently track the start and duration of network penetration tests.

Section 9: Training and Education

9.1 What percentage of the organization's network users were given and successfully completed cybersecurity awareness training in the past year (at least annually)?

97%

9.1.1 What is the estimated percentage of new users who satisfactorily completed security awareness training before being granted network access, or completed security awareness training within an organizationally defined time limit that provides minimal acceptable security after being granted access?

50%

Comments: SSA provides security awareness training to all new employees and contractors joining SSA, but SSA does not currently retain artifacts for new hirees that come onboard outside of SSA's headquarter location.

9.2 What percentage of training content addresses emerging threats (i.e.; social engineering attacks like phishing, spear phishing, whaling, etc.)?

100%

9.3 How many of the organizations network users and other staff have significant security responsibilities?

598

9.3.1 What is the organization's standard for the longest acceptable amount of time between security training events for the personnel counted in question 9.3?

365

9.3.2 How many of the personnel counted in question 9.3 have taken security training within the organizational standard defined in 9.3.1?

580

For Official Use Only

SOCIAL SECURITY
Office of the General Counsel

MEMORANDUM

Date: OCT 16 2014

Refer To: S9

To: Bill Zielinski
Chief Information Officer

From: David F. Black
General Counsel

David F. Black

Subject: Senior Agency Official for Privacy (SAOP) Section Report for SSA's FY 2014 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) Report to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) – INFORMATION

OMB's FISMA FY 2014 privacy reporting instructions require that the Social Security Administration (SSA or agency) provide an SAOP privacy report. I have attached the FY 2014 SAOP privacy report for inclusion with the agency's FY 2014 FISMA report.

Additionally, OMB Memorandum M-15-01, entitled "FY 2014 - 2015 Guidance on Improving Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Practices," requires the SAOP to submit the following documents:

- Description of the agency's privacy training for employees and contractors,
- Breach notification policy,
- Progress update on eliminating unnecessary use of Social Security Numbers, and
- Progress update on the review and reduction of holdings of personally identifiable information.

With regard to SSA's review and reduction of holdings of personally identifiable information, the attached SAOP privacy report states in response to Question 9a that OGC participated in agency activities to implement the requirements of OMB Memorandum M-07-16, entitled "Safeguarding Against and Responding to Breach of Personally Identifiable Information." Specifically, during FY 2014, OGC participated in an agency-wide annual review and reduction of all PII holdings. I have attached a September 8, 2014 memorandum documenting the completion of this review.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Your staff may address questions to Jasson Seiden, on extension 7-4307.

Senior Agency Official For Privacy

Section Report

2014
Annual
FISMA

Social Security Administration

Q1: Information Security Systems

		1a Number of Federal systems that contain personal information in an identifiable form			1b Number of systems in 1a for which a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) is required under the E-Government Act			1c Number of systems in 1b covered by a current PIA				1d Number of systems in 1a for which a System of Records Notice (SORN) is required under the Privacy Act			1e Number of systems in 1d for which a current SORN has been published in the Federal Register			
Agency/ Component	Submission Status	Agency Systems	Contractor Systems	Total Systems	Agency Systems	Contractor Systems	Total Systems	Agency Systems	Contractor Systems	Total Systems	% Complete	Agency Systems	Contractor Systems	Total Systems	Agency Systems	Contractor Systems	Total Systems	% Complete
SSA	Submitted to Agency	21	0	21	18	0	18	18	0	18	100%	21	0	21	21	0	21	100%
Agency Totals		21	0	21	18	0	18	18	0	18	100%	21	0	21	21	0	21	100%

Q2: PIAs and SORNs

2a Provide the URL of the centrally located page on the organization web site that provides working links to organization PIAs (N/A if not applicable)

http://www.socialsecurity.gov/foia/html/pia.htm

2b Provide the URL of the centrally located page on the organization web site that provides working links to the published SORNs (N/A if not applicable)

http://www.socialsecurity.gov/foia/bluebook/toc.htm

Q3: Senior Agency Official for Privacy (SAOP) Responsibilities

3a Can your organization demonstrate with documentation that the SAOP participates in all organization information privacy compliance activities?

Yes

Comments:

As documented in our regulations (20 C.F.R. § 401.30(e)), the SAOP assumes responsibility and accountability for ensuring the agency's implementation of information privacy protections, as well as agency compliance with Federal laws, regulations, and policies relating to the privacy of information. Our Administrative Instructions Manual System (AIMS) (Chapter 15.01.04) further defines these responsibilities. The Office of Privacy and Disclosure (OPD), which the SAOP oversees, implements agency privacy policies and procedures. We participated in the agency's PII Breach Response Group and the E-Government Steering Committee to ensure privacy compliance. We reviewed, wrote, and amended Privacy Act Statements, SORNs, Privacy Threshold Analyses (PTA), PIAs, and the PII clauses found in our contracts. We maintain and annually review the disclosure program instructions section of the agency's internal Program Operations Manual System (POMS) to ensure privacy compliance.

For Official Use Only

Q3: Senior Agency Official for Privacy (SAOP) Responsibilities

3b **Can your organization demonstrate with documentation that the SAOP participates in evaluating the privacy implications of legislative, regulatory, and other policy proposals, as well as testimony and comments under OMB Circular A-19?**

Yes

Comments: The SAOP is involved in the agency's formal review and approval process for legislative initiatives involving new privacy policy, as well as requests for testimony and comments arising under OMB Circular A-19. As indicated in our regulations (20 C.F.R. § 401.30(e)), the SAOP has a central role in the agency's development and evaluation of legislative, regulatory, and other policy proposals which might implicate information privacy issues.

3c **Can your organization demonstrate with documentation that the SAOP participates in assessing the impact of the organization's use of technology on privacy and the protection of personal information?**

Yes

Comments: The SAOP, under 20 C.F.R. § 401.30, approves PIAs assessing the impact of technology on protecting the privacy of personal information and ensures privacy principles are integrated into all aspects of technology systems. Our integral review occurs early in the System Development Lifecycle (SDLC) via the Control, Audit, Security, and Privacy Certification checklist. We use our PTA process to assess privacy risks in systems or applications and to determine if a PIA or SORN is required. We also approve Project Scope Agreements and Business Process Descriptions associated with the system or application. The agency uses data loss prevention technology to mitigate the risk of PII disclosure via our communications systems. We also continue to participate in workgroups to assess the technological impact of social media and other emerging technologies.

Q4: Privacy Training

4a **Does your organization have a policy in place to ensure that all personnel (employees, contractors, etc.) with access to Federal data are generally familiar with information privacy laws, regulations, and policies, and understand the ramifications of inappropriate access and disclosure?**

Yes

Comments: Our regulations (20 C.F.R. § 401.30(e)) provide that the SAOP ensure that employees and contractors receive training and education regarding privacy laws, regulations, policies, and procedures governing the agency's handling of personal information. We provide employees privacy education resources, and employees annually sign a sanctions document acknowledging their understanding of the penalties for misusing protected information. We also issue documentation to staff on safeguarding PII and adherence to the Privacy Act and other provisions. Our POMS, Chapter GN 033, contains instructions that apply to the disclosure of personal information in our records. In 2014, we continued to devote time and resources to hosting privacy education and awareness activities, including several Videos on Demand (VOD) via our Office of Learning.

For Official Use Only

Q4: Privacy Training

4b **Does your organization have a program for job-specific and comprehensive information privacy training for all personnel (employees, contractors, etc.) that handle personal information, that are directly involved in the administration of personal information or information technology systems, or that have significant information security responsibilities?**

Yes

Comments:

We provide specialized training on the Privacy Act, and related privacy regulations, policies, and procedures. Employees have access to four specific VODs on protecting and safeguarding PII. In FY 2014, we continued our practice of training systems development staff on the importance of privacy and privacy risk assessment via the SDLC Configuration Control Board (CCB). By participating in the SDLC CCB, we review any proposed changes to lifecycle roles, activities, or work products that affect the administration of personal information and educate members on the importance of these activities. Additionally, both management and staff experts attend training conferences hosted by Privacy Interest Groups, OMB, and the CIO Council to ensure that their expertise remains current.

Q5: PIA and Web Privacy Policies and Processes

5a **PIA Practices**

5a(1) **Determining whether a PIA is needed**

Yes

5a(2) **Conducting a PIA**

Yes

5a(3) **Evaluating changes in technology or business practices that are identified during the PIA process**

Yes

5a(4) **Ensuring systems owners, privacy officials, and IT experts participate in conducting the PIA**

Yes

5a(5) **Making PIAs available to the public as required by law and OMB policy**

Yes

5a(6) **Monitoring the organization's systems and practices to determine when and how PIAs should be updated**

Yes

For Official Use Only

Q5: PIA and Web Privacy Policies and Processes

5a(7) Assessing the quality and thoroughness of each PIA and performing reviews to ensure that appropriate standards for PIAs are maintained

Yes

Comments:

Under our PTA process, we document our privacy analysis of new or modified technology and business processes. The agency's Project Resource Guide establishes our PTA process. We work with stakeholders on their systems, and via the PTA, analyze the need for a PIA or the modification of an existing PIA because of new systems or changes to existing systems. Our PIA process is established in our regulations (C.F.R. § 401.30(f)); it includes review and approval by multiple levels of management and involves the system owner and IT staff. Our PTA and PIA processes ensure that the appropriate standards for PIAs are met in accordance with OMB M-03-22 and § 208 of the E-Government Act.

5b Web Privacy Practices

5b(1) Determining circumstances where the organization's web-based activities warrant additional consideration of privacy implications.

Yes

5b(2) Making appropriate updates and ensuring continued compliance with stated web privacy policies.

Yes

5b(3) Requiring machine-readability of public-facing organization web sites (i.e., use of P3P).

Yes

Comments:

In accordance with federal mandates and policy, we continue to make many of our web pages machine-readable. Following requirements from the Open Data Policy and Digital Strategy, we make public data files, our public data listing, and our Digital Strategy road map available in machine-readable formats allowing the public and other government agencies the ability to harvest our information in an automated process. Even when making information available in a machine-readable format we continue to follow our Administrative Instructions Manual System (AIMS) (Chapter 15.01.05) requiring that we ensure compliance with rules and requirements concerning the protection of PII when making information available through our websites. We use content-aware compliance software to examine our webpages.

Q6: Conduct of Mandated Reviews

Component / Bureau	a. Section (m) Contracts	b. Records Practices	c. Routine Uses	d. Exemp-tions	e. Matching Programs	f. Training	g. Violations: Civil Action	h. Violations: Remedial Action	i. System of Records Notices	j. (e)(3) Statement	k. Privacy Impact Assessments and Updates	l. Data Mining Impact Assessment
SSA	Y	Y	Y	3	112	Y	X	X	103	127	49	X

For Official Use Only

Q6: Conduct of Mandated Reviews

Component / Bureau	a. Section (m) Contracts	b. Records Practices	c. Routine Uses	d. Exemp-tions	e. Matching Programs	f. Training	g. Violations: Civil Action	h. Violations: Remedial Action	i. System of Records Notices	j. (e)(3) Statement	k. Privacy Impact Assessments and Updates	l. Data Mining Impact Assessment
TOTAL				***3***	***112***				***103***	***127***	49	

Q7: Written Privacy Complaints

7a **Process and Procedural — consent, collection and appropriate notice**

0

7b **Redress — non-Privacy Act inquiries seeking resolution of difficulties or concerns about privacy matters**

0

7c **Operational — inquiries regarding Privacy Act matters not including Privacy Act requests for access and/or correction**

1

7d **Referrals — complaints referred to another organization with jurisdiction**

0

Q8: Policy Compliance Review

8a **Does the organization have current documentation demonstrating review of the organization's compliance with information privacy laws, regulations, and policies?**

Yes

Comments:

As noted in our response to Question 3a, the SAOP is responsible for ensuring the agency's compliance with Federal laws, regulations, and policies relating to the privacy of information. We have a mature Systems Process Improvement program that describes best practices for software development and implements standard processes and procedures for ensuring compliance. We integrate our Enterprise Architecture activities and our governance practices throughout our SDLC. A typical new software release takes six months from conclusion of the planning and analysis to production. We are involved during the planning and analysis stage, and thus are able to conduct and document our initial privacy assessment early in the SDLC.

For Official Use Only

Q8: Policy Compliance Review

8b **Can the organization provide documentation of planned, in progress, or completed corrective actions necessary to remedy deficiencies identified in compliance reviews?**

Yes

Comments:

Our SDLC includes independent validation testing; independent integration and environmental testing; independent usability testing; user acceptance testing; and project scope agreements with all stakeholders. We use appropriate corrective actions during each phase of testing.

8c **Does the organization use technologies that enable continuous auditing of compliance with stated privacy policies and practices?**

Yes

Comments:

We use content-aware compliance software and a data loss prevention tool to better identify any risks associated with our protection of personal information.

8d **Does the organization coordinate with the organization's Inspector General on privacy program oversight?**

Yes

Q9: SAOP Advice and Guidance

9a **Organization policies, orders, directives, or guidance governing the organization's handling of personally identifiable information**

Yes

Comments:

The SAOP, through OPD, develops and interprets SSA policy governing the collection, use, maintenance, and disclosure of PII contained in SSA records in accordance with the privacy statutes and regulations. We developed policies to cover the growing use of social media and mobile technologies. The SAOP, in conjunction with other agency components, coordinated our FY 2014 review of all PII holdings to ensure such holdings are accurate, relevant, timely, and complete, and to reduce the holdings to the minimum necessary for us to perform our functions.

9b **Written agreements (either interagency or with non-Federal entities) pertaining to information sharing, computer matching, and similar issues**

Yes

Comments:

OPD and the Office of General Law, under the leadership of the SAOP, review all written data exchange agreements.

For Official Use Only

Q9: SAOP Advice and Guidance

9c **The organization's practices for conducting, preparing, and releasing SORNs and PIAs**

Yes

Comments:

The SAOP reviews all practices for PIAs as described in the questions under 5a. The SAOP also reviews all similar practices regarding SORNs, including our PTA process that helps us determine whether a new or amended SORN or PIA is required for a system or application.

9d **Reviews or feedback outside of the SORN and PIA process (e.g., formal written advice in the context of budgetary or programmatic activities or planning)**

Yes

Comments:

The SAOP is involved in developing and evaluating rulemaking and agency initiatives with privacy implications, and ongoing application of privacy policy and compliance activities. Working with the SAOP, OPD provides comments on program initiatives or legislative and regulatory proposals that have privacy implications or that impact other statutes and regulations. We provide privacy and disclosure advice during the systems development process, including targeted training on our policies and procedures. Our participation ensures that we adhere to fair information principles and privacy practices during the planning and development of our IT systems. We help assess the privacy risks of new electronic applications that collect PII from the public to determine the level of user authentication, and to identify any risk that requires mitigation. We also participate on interagency committees and workgroups dedicated to privacy best practices and policies.

9e **Privacy training (either stand-alone or included with training on related issues)**

Yes

Comments:

Under the leadership of the SAOP, we provide comprehensive privacy training to our employees. Our POMS, Chapter GN 033, contains specific policy instructions that apply to the disclosure of personal information in our records. Also refer to our responses to questions 4a and 4b, above.

Q10: Agency Use of Web Management and Customization Technologies (e.g., "cookies," "tracking technologies")

10a **Does the organization use web management and customization technologies on any web site or application?**

Yes

Comments:

We use both Tier 1 (single session) and Tier 2 (multi-session without PII) web measurement and customization technologies, as defined in OMB Memorandum M-10-22, Guidance for Online Use of Web Measurement and Customization Technologies.

For Official Use Only

Q10: Agency Use of Web Management and Customization Technologies (e.g., "cookies," "tracking technologies")

10b **Does the organization annually review the use of web management and customization technologies to ensure compliance with all laws, regulations, and OMB guidance?**

Yes

Comments:

Under the guidelines established by OMB M-10-22, stake-holding components review new uses of the technology as they are proposed. The review includes legal, privacy, and security compliance. We also review compliance with OMB's guidelines on an annual basis and did not identify any issues during FY 2014.

10c **Can the organization demonstrate, with documentation, the continued justification for, and approval to use, web management and customization technologies?**

Yes

Comments:

We performed the activities described in response to question 10b to ensure that we comply with OMB Memorandum M-10-22. We also continue to develop agency-wide guidance on emerging technologies and participate on interagency workgroups to share policies and strategies.

10d **Can the organization provide the notice language or citation for the web privacy policy that informs visitors about the use of web management and customization technologies?**

Yes

Comments:

Our web privacy policy concerning the use of web management and customization technologies is available at http://www.ssa.gov/privacy.html.

For Official Use Only

FY 2014 FISMA

Senior Agency Official for Privacy Report

Update on Agency Efforts to Eliminate

Unnecessary Use of Social Security Numbers (SSN)

The Social Security Administration (SSA) recognizes the importance of eliminating the unnecessary use of SSNs. First introduced as a means of tracking contributions to the Social Security retirement system, the SSN is critical to the implementation of SSA's programs, and consequently is a necessary element in many of our information systems. Nevertheless, we continue to reduce our use of SSNs for non-program related purposes. Even where we need the SSN for program administration, we have reduced its use. We have continued to:

- Limit the use of the SSN in systems applications that do not require its use for every transaction. For example, applications that link to financial institutions may require the SSN for initial logon, but thereafter we use an account number or some other form of identification or authentication to reduce the use and transmission of SSNs.

- Review systems and applications that are being developed or revised. The Privacy Threshold Analysis portion of the systems development lifecycle ensures that we review any proposed new or revised collection of personally identifiable information and determine whether collection of an SSN is necessary to the operation of that system or application.

- Play a key role in limiting the further disclosure of SSNs once they are issued for enumeration purposes. We have removed the SSN from certain notices sent to the public. In addition, we review all requests for disclosure of an SSN to ensure that the disclosure is compatible with the original program purpose for which the SSN was collected and is otherwise in accordance with laws and policies limiting its disclosure.

- Review the need for collecting SSNs and eliminate the use of SSNs when their use is unnecessary for non-program purposes such as human resources. For example, we previously used SSNs to track our employees' training. We no longer collect SSNs for this purpose and instead use the employee's personal identification number.

SOCIAL SECURITY

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 8, 2014

Refer To:

To: Peter D. Spencer
Deputy Commissioner
for Budget, Finance, Quality, and Management

David F. Black
General Counsel
Senior Agency Official for Privacy

From: Kirsten J. Moncada
Executive Director
Office of Privacy and Disclosure

Subject: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-07-16 Requirement to Review and Reduce Agency Holdings of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) -- 2014 Annual Review--Notice of Completion--INFORMATION

As you know, the Office of Management and Budget requires us to review our current holdings of all PII. This requirement ensures that our PII holdings are accurate, relevant, timely, and complete, and reduces them to the minimum necessary for the proper performance of a documented agency function. We have successfully completed our FY 2014 review. Thus, no further action is required at this time.

Please contact me with any questions. Should your staff have any questions about this process, please have them contact Anthony Tookes (6-0096) of the Office of Privacy and Disclosure.

cc: Deputy Commissioner for Systems/Chief Information Officer (ODCS)

FY 2014 FISMA

Senior Agency Official for Privacy Report

Description of the Agency's Privacy Training for Employees and Contractors

The Social Security Administration (SSA) recognizes the importance of providing privacy training to all of our employees and contractors. Our regulations (20 C.F.R. § 401.30(e)) provide that the Senior Agency Official for Privacy (SAOP) ensure that employees and contractors receive training and education regarding privacy laws, regulations, policies, and procedures governing the agency's handling of personal information. We provide employees privacy education resources, and employees annually sign a sanctions document acknowledging their understanding of the penalties for misusing protected information. We also issue documentation to staff on safeguarding Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and adherence to the Privacy Act and other provisions. The agency's Program Operations Manual System (POMS) is a primary source of information used by our employees and contractors. Specifically, Chapter GN 033 of our POMS contains instructions that apply to the disclosure of personal information in our records.

In 2014, we continued to devote time and resources to hosting privacy education and awareness activities, including several Videos on Demand (VOD) via our Office of Learning. We provide specialized training on the Privacy Act, and related privacy regulations, policies, and procedures. For example, employees have access to four specific VODs on protecting and safeguarding PII. In FY 2014, we also continued our practice of training systems development staff on the importance of privacy and privacy risk assessment via the System Development Life Cycle (SDLC) Configuration Control Board (CCB). By participating in the SDLC CCB, we review any proposed changes to lifecycle roles, activities, or work products that affect the administration of personal information and educate members on the importance of these activities.

Additionally, both management and staff experts attend training conferences hosted by Privacy Interest Groups, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the CIO Council to ensure that their expertise remains current.

ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS MANUAL SYSTEM

MANUAL: General Administration

CHAPTER: 15 Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Loss and Remediation

INSTRUCTION NO.: 06

SUBJECT: Breach Notification Plan (BNP)

Audience: General (g)

Level: SSA

Date: 10/01/2013

INQUIRIES: Questions regarding the content of this issuance should be directed to ^OIS Controls@ssa.gov in the Office of Systems (OS), Office of Information Security (OIS), 410-965-4859.

15.06.00 Table of Contents

15.06.01 Purpose of Instruction
15.06.02 Authorities and References
15.06.03 Background
15.06.04 Scope
15.06.05 Policy
15.06.06 Is There Likely Risk of Harm? Factors to Consider
15.06.07 Factors to Determine the Risk of Harm
15.06.08 Whether Breach Notification Is Required
15.06.09 Content of Notification
15.06.10 SSA Official Responsible for Notification
15.06.11 How SSA Provides Notice
15.06.12 Attachment

Attachment A. Sample PII Breach Notification Letter

15.06.01 Purpose of Instruction

A. OMB M-07-16 requirement applicable to all agencies: "Each agency should develop a breach notification policy and plan comprising the elements discussed in this Attachment. In implementing the policy and plan, the Agency Head will make final decisions regarding breach notification."

B. The purpose of the Breach Notification Plan (BNP) is to establish a framework for when and how agencies will notify the subject of a harmful breach. The BNP and related procedures will ensure that SSA takes a consistent, reasonable approach to remediation and notification when there is a loss or suspected loss of PII. Publication of this AIMS guide codifies and supersedes all prior agency guidance.

15.06.02 Authorities and References

A. The Privacy Act of 1974 and related OMB Memorandums

B. OMB Memo M-07-16, Safeguarding Against and Responding to the Breach of Personally Identifiable Information, May 22, 2007

C. The E-Government Act of 2002 and Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) of 2002, 44 U.S.C. § 3541

D. Information Systems Security Handbook (ISSH)

E. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication 800-122 - Guide to Protecting the Confidentiality of Personally Identifiable Information (PII)

F. SSA Memo Dated 07/09/2013 - Designation of Deputy Commissioners (DC) to Issue Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Breach Notices

G. Related OMB Memorandums and NIST Guidelines

15.06.03 Background

The Privacy Act, the E-Government Act of 2002 (including FISMA), and OMB guidelines, including M-07-16, are the foundation of our BNP. Our BNP describes how we assess whether individuals are at risk of harm due to the breach, and whether we should provide notice of the breach to individuals and/or the public. The SSA BNP is distinct from OMB Guidance and our policy pertaining to reporting the loss of PII to management or to organizations such as the US Computer Emergency Response Team (US-CERT), which are covered by existing directives (see AIMS, GAM 15.02). The SSA BNP does not replace existing policy and procedure regarding security protocols and requirements for handling a security incident (see the Information Systems Security Handbook (ISSH).

15.06.04 Scope

This policy is applicable agency-wide. It is one component of our comprehensive policies and procedures applicable to safeguarding information, implementing Privacy Act provisions, and responding to the loss of PII. The concept of the BNP is to use a best judgment standard, e.g., the sensitivity of a PII loss will be determined in context, to determine if risk of harm exists as a result of the breach. If risk of harm exists, notification may help individuals take steps to protect themselves from the consequences of the breach.

15.06.05 Policy

A. The Deputy Commissioner or equivalent level official is responsible for ensuring that the component responds to the PII breach in accordance with this policy. The component that experiences the breach will work in consultation with the PII Breach Response Group (BRG). (See AIMS, GAM 15.01.05.)

B. SSA's BNP requires agency decision-makers to determine if a breach of PII puts an individual at risk of harm. To determine if we should notify affected individuals, the BNP requires us to consider the likely risk of harm and the level of impact. Our analysis of the likely risk of harm and the level of impact will determine when, what, how and who we should notify.

C. If the breach involves an information system, SSA will follow existing procedures to take steps to mitigate further compromise of the system(s) involved in a breach. In addition to containing the breach, if circumstances warrant, we will take appropriate countermeasures, such as monitoring system(s) for misuse of the PII and for patterns of suspicious behavior. We also may consider whether we should give notice to the public at large.

D. In deciding whether to provide notice, we should give greater weight to the likelihood that the PII is accessible and usable and to the likelihood that the breach may lead to harm. If we analyze the

factors (see "Factors to Consider" below) in a fact specific context, it is likely that we only will provide notification in instances where there is a likely risk of harm.

15.06.06 Is There Likely Risk of Harm – Factors to Consider

A. The decision-maker is to consider the specific facts, circumstances, and the context of the breach to evaluate the likely risk of harm and the level of impact on the individual(s). The decision-maker will use this information to determine whether notice should be given and to determine the nature and extent of the notice.

B. However, the fact that information has been lost or stolen does not necessarily mean it has been or can be accessed by unauthorized individuals. If information is properly protected (e.g., consistent with NIST standards and guides) the risk of compromise of the information may be low to non-existent.

15.06.07 Factors that Determine the Risk of Harm

A. Nature of the Data Elements Breached.

Identify the type of data breached. We consider the data elements in light of their context and the broad range of potential harms that may result from their potential use by unauthorized individuals.

B. Number of Individuals Affected.

The number of individuals affected is not determinative of the risk of harm. We will consider the number of affected individuals when determining the type or method(s) we use to provide notification.

C. Can an Unauthorized Person Access the Information?

We use NIST "Level of Impact" guidelines (see Definitions, 15.01.08) and consider answers to the questions below to assess the likelihood the breached information is accessible and will be used for malicious purposes.

1. Circumstances of the loss. How did the loss occur? Is the loss the result of a criminal act or is it likely to result in harm to the individual?

2. How easy or difficult is it to access the information in light of how the information is protected? For example, information on a protected (i.e., encrypted) device is less vulnerable than "hard copies" and unencrypted devices and files.

3. Is there evidence that the breached information is being used to harm the individual?

4. What is the likelihood unauthorized individuals will know the value of the information or sell it to others?

D. Can the Information Be Used to Cause Harm to Individuals?

1. **Broad Reach of Potential Harm.** The Privacy Act requires agencies to protect against any anticipated threats or hazards to the security or integrity of records which could result in "substantial harm, embarrassment, inconvenience, or unfairness" to any individual on whom information is maintained. SSA considers a number of possible harms associated with the breach of information:

   - Economic Identity Theft;

   - Medical Identity Theft;

- Theft;
- The effect of a breach of confidentiality on fiduciary responsibility;
- The potential for blackmail;
- The disclosure of private facts;
- Mental pain and emotional distress;
- Physical harm, e.g., disclosure of address information for victims of abuse;
- The potential for secondary uses of the information which could result in fear or uncertainty for the subject individuals; and/or
- The unwarranted exposure of information leading to humiliation or loss of self-esteem.

2. **Likelihood Harm Will Occur.** We ascertain if the type of information breached typically is used to cause harm to individuals. We may consult with law enforcement and/or the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to assess the risk of harm to the individual.

   After evaluating these factors, we review and reassess the level of impact (low, moderate or high) that previously we assigned to the information (see 15.06.07.C above) using the NIST impact levels. The NIST impact levels (see Definitions, 15.01.08) will determine when and how we should provide notification.

15.06.08 Whether Breach Notification Is Required

In situations when there is little or no risk of harm, we generally will not issue notice. When the risk of harm is low, we also will consider the costs to individual and businesses, e.g., financial institutions, associated with responding to notices.

A. When: When warranted, we give notice without unreasonable delay (no later than 45 calendar days from the date of the PII incident report)." Permissible delays are limited only to those situations that involve law enforcement or national security considerations, or the need to restore the integrity of information systems prior to notification. Decisions to delay notification will be made by the Commissioner of Social Security (COSS) or his/her designee.

B. Who and How: We decide how to provide notice based on the number of people affected and the urgency with which they need to receive notice. We describe below the types of notice we may use exclusively or in combination. In general, breach notifications to individuals will be by letter or by telephone and we will use public notification in the event of a large scale (regional or national) breach.

We determine if we need to notify any third parties; e.g., those with oversight responsibilities, other agencies that may be affected by the breach and/or that may help mitigate the breach, the public, and/or the media.

15.06.09 Content of Notification

A. We will use plain language. We will include the following information in all our breach notification materials, regardless of the medium or method.

B. An apology;

C. A brief description of what happened, including the date(s) of the breach and the date that we discovered it;

D. A description of the types of PII involved in the breach (e.g., full name, Social Security number, date of birth, home address, disability information);

E. A statement whether the information is protected;

F. What steps individuals might wish to take to protect themselves from potential harm;

G. What we are doing to investigate the breach, to mitigate losses, and to protect against any further breaches; and

H. Who affected individuals should contact for more information, which may include a toll-free telephone number, and/or postal address.

15.06.10 SSA Official Responsible for Notification

A. The COSS or his/her designee will sign the written notices that we send to individuals. See AIMS GAM 15.06.02.F Notification must be compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. The law may require us to establish a Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) and/or to post a large print notice on the Agency's web site.

B. If the breach involves a Federal contractor or a public-private partnership operating a system of records on our behalf, we will determine who is responsible for notification and ensure that corrective actions are taken. We include appropriate Federal Acquisition Regulation language regarding Federal Information Security Management Act requirements and PII loss reporting responsibilities in all contracts and other acquisition documents.

15.06.11 How SSA Provides Notice

As stated in 15.06.08, in general breach notifications to individuals will be by letter or by telephone. The best means for providing notification will depend on the number of individuals affected and what contact information is available about the affected individuals. Notice provided to individuals affected by a breach should be commensurate with the number of people affected and the urgency with which they need to receive notice. The following examples are types of notices that we may use.

NOTE: The Office of Communications, the Office of Legislative and Congressional Relations and Office of General Counsel/Office of Privacy and Disclosure must be consulted when preparing a notice (other than the one in Attachment A); likewise any component considering web posting, existing government wide services, newspapers or other public media outlets or substitute notice must confer with these offices as part of the development of the product.

A. **Telephone:** Telephone notification may be appropriate in those cases where urgency may dictate immediate and personalized notification and/or when a limited number of individuals are affected.

B. **First-Class Mail:** We will provide written notice by first-class mail. We will send the notice separately from other SSA mailings so that it is obvious to the recipient that it pertains to SSA and that the matter is urgent.

C. **E-Mail**: We may use e-mail notification exclusively only if the individual has provided an e-mail address to us and expressly has given his or her consent to use e-mail as the primary means of communication with us. We may use e-mail in conjunction with written notice if the circumstances of the breach warrant such an approach. E-mail notification may include links to the Agency and http://www.usa.gov/ web sites, where the notice may be "layered" so that the most important summary facts are up front with additional information provided under link headings.

D. **Web Posting:** Depending on the circumstances, we may post information about the breach and notification on our home page. The posting may include a link to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and other information to assist the public's understanding of the breach and of the notification process. The information also may appear on the http://www.usa.gov/ web site. We may consult with the General Services Administration's (GSA) USA Services regarding using their call center.

E. **Existing Government Wide Services:** We may consider Government-wide services already in place to provide support services such as USA Services, including 1-800-FedInfo and http://www.usa.gov/.

F. **Newspapers or other Public Media Outlets:** In rare circumstances, we may supplement individual notices with notifications in newspapers or other public media outlets. We may use toll-free call centers staffed by trained personnel to handle inquiries from the affected individuals and the public.

G. **Substitute Notice:** We may use substitute notice in those instances where we do not have sufficient contact information to provide another means of notification. Substitute notice may consist of a conspicuous posting of the notice on the home page of our web site and/or notification to major print and broadcast media, including major media in areas where the affected individuals reside. The notice to media may include a toll-free phone number where an individual can learn whether or not his or her personal information is included in the breach.

15.06.12 Attachment

Attachment A. Sample PII Breach Notification Letter

Attachment A. (GAM 15.06) Sample PII Breach Notification Letter

Social Security Administration

Important Information

Date:

NAME
MAILING ADDRESS
CITY ST ZIPCODE

We regret to inform you that on (1) _____, (2) _____ _____. The (3) _____ _____ contained personally identifiable information about you including your (4) ____, _____, and _____.

(The above paragraph needs to be very specific in explaining the circumstances of the breach and what PII was compromised)

We apologize for any inconvenience or concern this incident may cause you. In this notice, we tell you what steps you may wish to consider taking to protect yourself, especially if you have any reason to believe that someone is using your personal information.

(In addition, if a crime was involved (i.e. stolen laptop), and the OIG is involved, the following language should be inserted:)

Social Security's Office of the Inspector General is working closely with appropriate law enforcement authorities to investigate this matter.

What Steps You Can Take For Your Protection

- To learn about precautions you can take, please read the enclosed leaflet "Identity Theft and Your Social Security Number."
- If you have reason to believe that someone is using your personal information, including your Social Security number, you should contact the Federal Trade Commission at 1-877-438-4338 or at www.ftc.gov/bcp/edu/microsites/idtheft/.

If You Have Any Questions

If you have any questions, please call us at (5)_____. We can answer most questions over the phone. If you do call, please have this letter with you, it will help us answer your questions. You can also e-mail your questions to (6) _____ or write us at the address shown at the top of this letter. For your own protection, you should not include your Social Security number on any e-mail correspondence.

Our Sincere Apology

The men and women of the Social Security Administration take our obligation to protect the integrity and privacy of your Social Security records very seriously. Please accept our sincere apology for any inconvenience or concern this situation may cause you. We are committed to ensuring that instances such as this do not occur in the future.

Appropriate Deputy Commissioner or Regional Commissioner

FILL-IN INFORMATION

1. *Date of breach*

2. *Describe the breach, including what was lost and how it was lost. For example:*

   - Hearing-related documents were stolen from an employee's vehicle.
   - A laptop computer was stolen from an employee's office.
   - A notice addressed to you was accidentally mailed to someone else's address

3. *Describe whatever was lost or compromised. For example:*

   - Laptop computer
   - Claims file
   - List of social security numbers

4. *List the types of data that were breached. For example:*

   Full name, Social Security number, date of birth, home address, and medical records...

5. *Telephone number and times of service. While it could be local SSA office information, we expect the fill-in language will be the national 800 number in most cases:*

   1-800-772-1213 (TTY 1-800-325-0778) between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

6. *E-mail address of the notifying component, if appropriate for the component.*

Inspector General

Section Report

2014

Annual FISMA Report

Social Security Administration

OIG Office of the Inspector General
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 31, 2014 **Refer To:**

To: The Commissioner

From: Inspector General

Subject: The Social Security Administration's Compliance with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 for Fiscal Year 2014 (A-14-14-24083)

The attached final report summarizes Grant Thornton LLP's (Grant Thornton) Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 audit of the Social Security Administration's (SSA) information security program and practices, as required by Title III of the *E-Government Act of 2002*, Public Law Number 107-347. Title III is also known as the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* (FISMA).

FISMA requires that we, or an independent external auditor as determined by the Inspector General (IG), perform an annual evaluation that includes

- testing the effectiveness of SSA's information security policies, procedures, and practices of a representative subset of the Agency's information systems and
- assessing compliance with FISMA requirements and related information security policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines.

Under a contract we monitored, Grant Thornton, an independent certified public accounting firm, audited SSA's compliance with FISMA for FY 2014. Grant Thornton's report, along with its responses to the FY 2014 IG FISMA reporting metrics developed by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), are submitted through CyberScope pursuant to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-15-01, *Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Guidance on Improving Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Practices*.

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

The objective of Grant Thornton's audit was to determine whether SSA's overall information security program and practices were effective and consistent with the FISMA requirements, as defined by DHS. In addition to FISMA and DHS' guidance, Grant Thornton tested SSA's overall information security program and practices using guidance from OMB and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as well as SSA policy.

Grant Thornton conducted its performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that Grant Thornton plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for its findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives.

Audit Results

For FY 2014, Grant Thornton determined that SSA had established an overall information security program and practices that were generally consistent with the FISMA requirements. However, identified weaknesses limited the program's effectiveness to adequately protect the Agency's information and information systems. Grant Thornton concluded that each of the Agency's metrics was generally consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB guidance, and applicable National Institute of Standards and Technology standards. However, Grant Thornton identified weaknesses in 8 of 11 metrics. The following metrics had identified weaknesses.

Metric 1: Continuous Monitoring Management	Metric 2: Configuration Management	Metric 3: Identity and Access Management	Metric 4: Incident Response and Reporting	Metric 5: Risk Management
Metric 6: Security Training	Metric 9: Contingency Planning	Metric 10: Contractor Systems		

Weaknesses in Sections 2, *Configuration Management;* 3, *Identity and Access Management;* 5, *Risk Management*; and 6 *Security Training* resulted in negative conclusions to components of these metrics. For FY 2014, Grant Thornton concluded that the risk and severity of SSA's information security weaknesses were significant enough to constitute a significant deficiency under FISMA.

OIG Evaluation of Grant Thornton's Audit Performance

To fulfill our responsibilities under the *Inspector General Act of 1978*, we monitored Grant Thornton's performance audit of SSA's FY 2014 compliance with FISMA by

- reviewing Grant Thornton's audit approach and planning;
- evaluating its auditors' qualifications and independence;
- monitoring the audit progress;
- examining Grant Thornton's working papers;
- reviewing Grant Thornton's audit report to ensure it complies with government auditing standards;
- coordinating the issuance of the audit report; and

- performing other procedures as deemed necessary.

Grant Thornton is responsible for the attached auditor's report as well as the work and conclusions expressed therein. The OIG is responsible for technical and administrative oversight regarding Grant Thornton's performance under the terms of the contract. Our monitoring, as described above, disclosed no instances where Grant Thornton did not comply with applicable auditing standards.

If you wish to discuss the final report, please call me or have your staff contact Steven L. Schaeffer, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, at (410) 965-9700.

Patrick P. O'Carroll, Jr.

Attachment

Grant Thornton

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 30, 2014

To: SSA Office of the Inspector General

From: Grant Thornton LLP

Subject: The Social Security Administration's Compliance with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 for Fiscal Year 2014 – A-14-14-24083

In conjunction with the audit of the Social Security Administration's (SSA) Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Financial Statements, the Office of the Inspector General engaged us to conduct the performance audit on SSA's compliance with the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* (FISMA) for FY 2014. The objective was to determine whether SSA's overall information security program and practices were effective and consistent with FISMA requirements as defined by the Department of Homeland Security. We are pleased to report the results of our audit and appreciate the support provided to us in completing this review.

Our report is intended solely for the information and use of SSA management, SSA's Office of the Inspector General, the Office of Management and Budget, the Government Accountability Office, and Congress and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Grant Thornton LLP

Alexandria, Virginia
October 30, 2014

Grant Thornton

The Social Security Administration's Compliance with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 for Fiscal Year 2014 (A-14-14-24083)

Report Summary

Objective

Our objective was to determine whether the Social Security Administration's (SSA) overall information security program and practices were effective and consistent with the requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* (FISMA), as defined by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

Background

SSA's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) engaged us, Grant Thornton LLP (Grant Thornton), to conduct the Fiscal Year 2014 FISMA performance audit in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, commonly referred to as the "Yellow Book," which sets forth generally accepted government auditing standards. We assessed the effectiveness of SSA's information security policies, procedures, and practices on a representative subset of the Agency's information systems by leveraging work performed as part of the financial statement audit and through additional testing procedures as needed. We determined whether SSA's overall information security program and practices were effective and consistent with the requirements of FISMA and supporting applicable regulations, standards, and guidance applicable during the audit period.

Our Findings

We determined that SSA had established an overall information security program and practices that were generally consistent with FISMA requirements. However, weaknesses in some of the program's components limited the program's effectiveness to adequately protect the Agency's information and information systems. We concluded that these weaknesses constituted a significant deficiency under FISMA.

Our Recommendations

- Implement requirements or appropriately justify deviations associated with the United States Government Configuration Baseline for Windows components.
- Continue, as part of the SSA threat and vulnerability management processes, prioritization and implementation of risk mitigation strategies and plans of action and milestones.
- Develop comprehensive policies and procedures related to application and system-software change management that address issues noted during the audit.
- Develop a comprehensive program to identify and monitor high-risk programs operating on the mainframe.
- Analyze access authorization and removal processes to determine whether current controls mitigate the risk of unauthorized access and modify controls considering automation and control monitoring.
- Continue, as part of the SSA profile quality program, additional profile content reviews and profile improvement initiatives.
- Enhance current information technology oversight and governance processes to ensure SSA information technology risk management requirements are effectively and consistently implemented.
- Address security awareness training weaknesses identified as well as other weaknesses noted within the comments of Appendix B by implementing our recommendations provided throughout the audit.

SSA agreed with our recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Objective 1

Background 1

Scope and Methodology 2

Results of Review 3

Agency Efforts to Resolve Weaknesses and Potential Cause for the FY 2014 FISMA Significant Deficiency 6

Conclusions and Recommendations 7

Views of Responsible Officials 8

Appendix A – Scope and Methodology A-1

Appendix B – Response to Fiscal Year 2014 Inspector General *Federal Information Security Management Act* Reporting Metrics B-1

Appendix C – The Social Security Administration's General Support Systems and Major Applications C-1

Appendix D – Metrics Defined D-1

Appendix E – Major Contributors E-1

ABBREVIATIONS

DDS	Disability Determination Services
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standards
FISMA	*Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002*
FSA	Financial Statement Audit
FY	Fiscal Year
GAO	Government Accountability Office
Grant Thornton	Grant Thornton LLP
IG	Inspector General
ISCM	Information Security Continuous Monitoring
IT	Information Technology
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
PIV	Personal Identity Verification
POA&M	Plan of Action and Milestones
POMS	Program Operations Manual System
Pub. L. No.	Public Law Number
RO	Regional Office
SA&A	Security Assessment and Authorization
SDLC	System Development Lifecycle
SP	Special Publication
SSA	Social Security Administration
U.S.C.	United States Code
USGCB	United States Government Configuration Baselines

OBJECTIVE

Our objective was to determine whether the Social Security Administration's (SSA or Agency) overall information security program and practices were effective and consistent with the requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* (FISMA) as defined by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

To achieve this objective, we assessed the effectiveness of SSA's information security policies, procedures, and practices on a representative subset of the Agency's information systems. We then determined whether SSA's overall information security program and practices were effective and consistent with the requirements of FISMA and other regulations, standards, and guidance applicable during the audit period.

BACKGROUND

In conjunction with the audit of SSA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Financial Statements,[1] SSA's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) engaged us, Grant Thornton LLP (Grant Thornton), to conduct the FY 2014 FISMA performance audit. FISMA, Title III of the *E-Government Act of 2002* (Pub. L. No. 107-347, December 17, 2002), includes the following key requirements.

- Each agency must develop, document, and implement an agency-wide information security program.[2]
- Each agency head is responsible for providing information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of agency information and information systems.[3]
- The agency's Inspector General (IG), or an independent external auditor, must perform an independent evaluation of the agency's information security program and practices to determine their effectiveness.[4]

[1] Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Contract Number GS-23F-8196H, December 3, 2009.

[2] Pub. L. No. 107-347, Title III, Section 301 § 3544(b); 44 U.S.C. § 3544(b).

[3] Pub. L. No. 107-347, Title III, Section 301 § 3544(a)(1)(A); 44 U.S.C. § 3544(a)(1)(A).

[4] Pub. L. No. 107-347, Title III, Section 301 §§ 3545(a)(1) and (b)(1); 44 U.S.C. §§ 3545(a)(1) and (b)(1).

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

DHS issued 11 reporting metrics, dated December 2, 2013[5] for the IG's FY 2014 FISMA submission. The following DHS reporting metrics were included in the scope of the performance audit:

FY 2014 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Metrics
1. Continuous Monitoring Management
2. Configuration Management
3. Identity and Access Management
4. Incident Response and Reporting
5. Risk Management
6. Security Training
7. Plan of Action & Milestones (POA&M)
8. Remote Access Management
9. Contingency Planning
10. Contractor Systems
11. Security Capital Planning

We conducted the FY 2014 SSA FISMA performance audit in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, also known as the "Yellow Book." The Yellow Book sets forth generally accepted government auditing standards. We followed the Government Accountability Office's (GAO), *Federal Information System Controls Audit Manual* which provides guidance for evaluating Electronic Data Processing general, and application controls in a Federal audit under generally accepted government auditing standards. We leveraged work performed as part of the FY 2014 Financial Statement Audit (FSA), conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, and performed additional procedures as required to assess the reporting metrics listed above.

This report informs those charged with governance about SSA's security performance, as required by FISMA, and fulfills the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and DHS requirements under FISMA to submit an annual report to Congress. Refer to Appendix A for additional information on our scope and methodology.

[5] Metrics posted by DHS on e-Government Community Website.

RESULTS OF REVIEW

For FY 2014, we determined that SSA had established an overall information security program and practices that were generally consistent with FISMA requirements.[6] However, we identified weaknesses that limited the program's effectiveness to adequately protect the Agency's information and information systems. We concluded that each metric was generally consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB guidance, and applicable National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) standards. However, we identified weaknesses in 8 of the 11 metrics. The following metrics had identified weaknesses:

Metric 1: Continuous Monitoring Management	Metric 2: Configuration Management	Metric 3: Identity and Access Management	Metric 4: Incident Response and Reporting	Metric 5: Risk Management
Metric 6: Security Training	Metric 9: Contingency Planning	Metric 10: Contractor Systems		

Refer to Appendix B for additional information on metrics.

Weaknesses in Metric 2, *Configuration Management*, Metric 3, *Identity and Access Management*, Metric 5, *Risk Management*, and Metric 6, *Security Training*, resulted in negative conclusions for the following metrics.

Configuration Management

- Metric 2.1.5 - For Windows-based components, United States Government Configuration Baselines (USGCB) secure configuration settings are fully implemented, and any deviations from USGCB baseline settings are fully documented.
- Metric 2.1.9 – Configuration-related vulnerabilities, including scan findings, have been remediated in a timely manner, as specified in organization policy or standards.

[6] We based our conclusion was based on our assessment of SSA's compliance with DHS' *FY 2014 Inspector General Federal Information Security Management Act Reporting Metrics*. As indicated in Appendix B, we determined that SSA established all 11 security program components, which were generally consistent with Federal guidance. The 11 components established by SSA included the vast majority of attributes identified by DHS. However, we also noted various issues in our assessment that, which are documented in the comments within Appendix B.

Identity and Access Management

- Metric 3.1.7 - Ensures that the users are granted access based on needs and separation-of-duties principles.
- Metric 3.1.10 - Ensures that accounts are terminated or deactivated once access is no longer required.

Risk Management

- Metric 5.1.2 - Addresses risk from an organization perspective with the development of a comprehensive governance structure and organization-wide risk management strategy as described in NIST Special Publication (SP) 800-37, Rev. 1.

Security Training

- Metric 6.1.4 - Identification and tracking of the status of security awareness training for all personnel (including employees, contractors, and other organization users) with access privileges that require security awareness training.

We provided management with comments on these key components of SSA's information security program throughout the audit.[7] Refer to Appendix B for additional information on these and other weaknesses and conclusions.

We assessed the significance of these weaknesses individually and in the aggregate to determine the risk to SSA's overall information systems security program and management's control structure. We noted that, while all these findings, in aggregate, impacted risk, the following weaknesses had the most significant impact on our conclusion.

- *USGCB Secure Configuration Settings Deviations* - Documentation for a significant number of Windows deviations from the USGCB settings did not provide sufficient information pertaining to risk analysis and business justification for the deviation. This contributed to the negative conclusion for Metric 2.1.5.
- *Threat and Vulnerability Management* - During our testing of threat and vulnerability management processes we noted issues with network security controls. This contributed to the negative conclusion for Metric 2.1.9 and impacted other metrics in Section 2, *Configuration Management*.
- *Configuration / Change Management* – We noted a lack of comprehensive Agency-wide policy and procedures related to management of application and system-software changes,

[7] We provided Agency management with a Notice of Finding and Recommendation for weaknesses noted during the audit. The Notice of Finding and Recommendation included the condition, criteria, cause, effect, and recommendation.

including identification of all critical types of changes, security categorization and risk analysis for changes, testing requirements based on risk, and requirements for the review and approval of testing results. While this did not contribute to a negative conclusion, metrics within Section 2, *Configuration Management*, were impacted.

- *Mainframe Security* – We noted a lack of controls related to the identification and monitoring of high-risk programs operating on the mainframe.[8] We noted the Agency had not finalized and fully implemented controls associated with ensuring that privileged programs were identified, were approved, could only be modified appropriately, and posed no security risks. While this did not contribute to a negative conclusion, metrics in Section 2, *Configuration Management*, were impacted.

- *Access Controls* - Our testing identified control failures related to appropriate completion of logical access authorization forms and timely removal of location access. Further, we continue to note that SSA did not have an authoritative source to identify and manage all contractors and therefore was unable to supply actual departure dates for contractors to substantiate timely removal of access. Finally, we noted that SSA management continued to make progress in assessing profile[9] content to validate that profiles only provide access to the minimal resources required for users to complete job functions. However, SSA had not completed the review of all profiles that are relevant to critical applications and supporting systems nor had SSA completed other profile quality initiatives including, but not limited to, some control enhancements.

  As a result of these deficiencies, we noted numerous issues of unauthorized and inappropriate access including application developers (programmers) who had unmonitored access to production data and application transactions, key transactions and data, key change management libraries, and other sensitive system software resources. This contributed to the negative conclusion for Metric 3.1.7 and 3.1.10 and impacted other metrics in Section 3, *Identity and Access Management*.

- *IT Oversight and Governance* - During our site visit testing, we noted recurring issues associated with security management, physical access controls, and platform security.[10] Further, we noted areas where the Program Operations Manual System (POMS)[11] guidance was ambiguous or not sufficiently documented, which resulted in inconsistent

---

[8] International Business Machines Corp. defines a mainframe as computers that can support thousands of applications and input/output devices to simultaneously serve thousands of users. A mainframe is the central data repository, or hub, in a corporation's data processing center, linked to users through less powerful devices, such as workstations or terminals.

[9] A profile is one of SSA's primary access control mechanisms. Each profile contains a unique mix of facilities and transactions that determines what access to systems resources a specific position requires.

[10] Information system security associated with configurations and privileged access.

[11] POMS is a primary source of information used Social Security employees to process benefit claims for Social Security. It also includes SSA requirements and guidance for implementation of security controls.

implementation or noncompliance with POMS. Finally, we noted that an information system selected for testing, which was developed in a regional office, did not consistently follow SSA's System Development Lifecycle (SDLC) and Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) requirements. This contributed to the negative conclusion for Metric 5.1.2 and impacted other metrics in Metric 5, *Risk Management*.

- *Security Training Issues* – Our testing noted that initial, refresher, and specialized security training was not completed or was not completed in a timely fashion for all employees and contractors. Further, we noted that SSA did not have an authoritative system to identify and track the completion of training for all users. This contributed to the negative conclusion for Metric 6.1.4.

For FY 2014, we concluded that the risk and severity of SSA's information security weaknesses, including those listed above, and other weaknesses outlined in Appendix B, were significant enough to constitute a significant deficiency under FISMA[12]. These security deficiencies, when aggregated, created a weakness in SSA's overall information systems security program that we concluded significantly compromised the security of its information and information systems. These weaknesses could impact the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of SSA information systems and data.[13]

Agency Efforts to Resolve Weaknesses and Potential Cause for the FY 2014 FISMA Significant Deficiency

While SSA continued executing its risk based approach to strengthen controls over its systems and address weaknesses, our FY 2014 testing identified similar control issues in both design and operation of key controls. We believe that, in many cases, these deficiencies continue to exist because of one, or a combination, of the following:

- Risk mitigation strategies and related control enhancements require additional time to be fully implemented or to effectuate throughout the environment.

---

[12] OMB defines a FISMA significant deficiency as, ". . . a weakness in an agency's overall information systems security program or management control structure, or within one or more information systems, that significantly restricts the capability of the agency to carry out its mission or compromises the security of its information, information systems, personnel, or other resources, operations, or assets. In this context, the risk is great enough that the agency head and outside agencies must be notified and immediate or near-immediate corrective action must be taken." OMB, M-14-04, FY 2013 Reporting Instructions for the *Federal Information Security Management Act* and Agency Privacy Management, November 18, 2013, page 8.

[13] **Confidentiality** means preserving authorized restrictions on access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information. **Integrity** means guarding against improper information modification or destruction, and includes ensuring information nonrepudiation and authenticity. **Availability** means ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information. Pub. L. No. 107-347, Title III, Section 301 § 3542(b)(1)(A) to (C), 44 U.S.C. § 3542(b)(1)(A) to (C).

- SSA focused its limited resources on higher risk weaknesses and therefore was unable to implement corrective action for all aspects of the prior year deficiencies.
- The design of enhanced or newly designed controls did not completely address risks and recommendations provided over past audits.
- Oversight and governance were not sufficient to address continuing operational effectiveness issues.

SSA continues implementing corrective actions to address remaining deficiencies, which, in many cases, is a continuation of previously established risk based strategies.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For FY 2014, we determined that SSA had established an overall information security program and practices that were generally consistent with FISMA requirements. However, weaknesses in some of the program's components limited the program's effectiveness to adequately protect the Agency's information and information systems. We noted weaknesses in Section 2, *Configuration Management*; Section 3, *Identity and Access Management;* Section 5, *Risk Management;* and Section 6, *Security Training*, that resulted in negative answers to metrics and various other issues that resulted in comments to the FISMA metrics in Appendix B. Based on these factors, we concluded that these weaknesses constituted a significant deficiency under FISMA.

SSA needs to protect its mission-critical assets. Without appropriate security, the Agency's systems and the sensitive data they contain are at risk. Some weaknesses identified in this report could cause the Agency's systems and data to lose confidentiality, integrity, and availability to some degree. To mitigate the risks of the issues noted in the significant deficiency, management should consider the following:

- Implement requirements or appropriately justify deviations associated with the USGCB for Windows components.
- Continue, as part of the SSA threat and vulnerability management processes, prioritization and implementation of risk mitigation strategies and plans of action and milestones.
- Develop comprehensive policies and procedures related to application and system-software change management that address issues noted during the audit.
- Develop a comprehensive program to identify and monitor high-risk programs operating on the mainframe.
- Analyze access authorization and removal processes to determine whether current controls mitigate the risk of unauthorized access and modify controls considering automation and control monitoring.

- Continue, as part of the SSA profile quality program, additional profile content reviews and profile improvement initiatives.
- Enhance current information technology (IT) oversight and governance processes to ensure SSA IT risk management requirements are effectively and consistently implemented.
- Address security awareness training weaknesses identified as well as other weaknesses noted within the comments of Appendix B by implementing our recommendations provided throughout the audit.

VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS

We discussed our conclusions with SSA officials who generally agreed with our findings and recommendations. SSA's official responses will be included in their comments to the independent auditor's report on the audit of SSA's FY 2014 financial statements.[14]

[14] Grant Thornton, *Independent Auditor's Report* on SSA's FY 2014 financial statements will be released in November 2014.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* (FISMA) directs each agency's Inspector General (IG) to perform, or have an independent external auditor perform, an annual independent evaluation of the agency's information security programs and practices, as well as a review of an appropriate subset of agency systems.[1] The Social Security Administration's (SSA) IG contracted with us, Grant Thornton LLP (Grant Thornton), to audit SSA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 financial statements.[2] Because of the extensive internal control system work that is completed as part of that audit, the FISMA review requirements were incorporated into our financial statement audit (FSA) contract. To maximize efficiencies and minimize the impact to SSA management during the FISMA performance audit, we used Appendix IX – *Application of FISCAM to FISMA* from the GAO *Federal Information System Controls Audit Manual* to leverage testing performed during the SSA FSA. In some cases, FISMA tests were unique from those of the FSA; therefore, we designed test procedures to deliver adequate coverage over those unique areas.

Testing was performed in accordance with specific criteria as promulgated by the following:

- FISMA law;
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance;
- OMB Circular A-130, *Management of Federal Information Resources*, Appendix III, Security of Federal Automated Information Resources;
- Standards and guidelines issued by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) – including, NIST Special Publication (SP) 800-53 Revision 4 *Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations;* Federal Information Processing Standards Publication (FIPS) - 199, *Standards for Security Categorization of Federal Information and Information Systems*, FIPS-200 *Minimum Security Requirements for Federal Information and Information Systems*, FIPS- 201-1, *Personal Identity Verification (PIV) of Federal Employees and Contractors;*
- OMB Memorandum 15-01, *Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Guidance on Improving Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Practices*;
- Federal guidance and standards cited in the DHS annual FISMA IG reporting metrics; and
- local SSA policies.

[1] Pub. L. No. 107-347, Title III, Section 301 §§ 3545(a)(1), (a)(2)(A), (a)(2)(B); and (b)(1), 44 U.S.C. §§ 3545(a)(1) (a)(2)(A), (a)(2)(B); and (b)(1).

[2] Office of the Inspector General Contract Number GS-23F-8196H, December 3, 2009.

We conducted this audit in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. These standards require that 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 objectives. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives.

Appendix B – Response to Fiscal Year 2014 Inspector General *Federal Information Security Management Act* Reporting Metrics

Section 1: CONTINUOUS MONITORING MANAGEMENT

1.1. Has the organization established an enterprise-wide continuous monitoring program that assesses the security state of information systems that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

1.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for continuous monitoring (NIST SP 800-53: CA-7). (AP)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

1.1.2. Documented strategy for information security continuous monitoring (ISCM). (AP)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

1.1.3. Implemented ISCM for information technology assets. (AP)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

1.1.4. Evaluate risk assessments used to develop their ISCM strategy. (AP)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that a risk assessment was not completed for one application selected for testing that was developed in a regional office. Therefore, risks associated with this application may not have been considered as part of continuous monitoring processes

1.1.5. Conduct and report on ISCM results in accordance with their ISCM strategy. (AP)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

1.1.6. Ongoing assessments of security controls (system-specific, hybrid, and common) that have been performed based on the approved continuous monitoring plans (NIST SP 800-53, 800-53A). (AP)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that the SSA continuous monitoring strategy includes manual control assessments and automated reporting mechanisms. Per the strategy, security controls currently selected for automated continuous monitoring are primarily technical controls that automated support tools can monitor and controls that may change frequently due to architectural or environment modifications as updates and upgrades to hardware or software configurations.

1.1.7. Provides authorizing officials and other key system officials with security status reports covering updates to security plans and security assessment reports, as well as a common and consistent POA&M program that is updated with the frequency defined in the strategy and/or plans (NIST SP 800-53, 800-53A). (AP)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

1.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Continuous Monitoring Management Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY 2014 Conclusion: We noted that SSA continued enhancing automated continuous monitoring capabilities in FY 2014. Further, SSA developed a plan to transition from its current 3-year re-authorization cycle to a time- and event-driven security authorization process. The current transition timeline, as documented in the ISCM strategy, noted conversion to ongoing authorization to be completed by FY 2018

Section 2: CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT

2.1. Has the organization established a security configuration management program that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

2.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for configuration management. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted a lack of comprehensive Agency-wide policy and procedures related to management of application and system software changes, including identification of all critical types of changes, security categorization and risk analysis for changes, testing requirements based on risk, and requirements for the review and approval of testing results.

2.1.2. Defined standard baseline configurations. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that SSA established a list of authorized infrastructure software (platforms), developed baselines for the majority of authorized platforms, and continued to progress in developing additional configuration baselines in FY 2014. However, the Agency had not developed a configuration baseline for one platform selected for testing.

2.1.3. Assessments of compliance with baseline configurations. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that, while the Agency developed baseline configurations for the majority of authorized platforms, it had not developed a configuration baseline for one platform selected for testing and had not developed procedures to monitor production settings against a baseline for another platform selected for testing. Finally, we noted additional issues during vulnerability assessments.

2.1.4. Process for timely (as specified in organization policy or standards) remediation of scan result deviations. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: During our testing of threat and vulnerability management processes, we noted issues with network security controls.

2.1.5. For Windows-based components, USGCB secure configuration settings are fully implemented, and any deviations from USGCB baseline settings are fully documented. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: No

Comments: Documentation for a significant number of Windows (specifically Windows 7 and Vista) deviations from the USGCB settings did not provide sufficient information pertaining to risk analysis and business justification for the deviation.

2.1.6. Documented proposed or actual changes to hardware and software configurations. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: While we noted that proposed and actual changes were generally identified and documented, our testing identified system software documentation weaknesses including a lack of completion of risk assessments, test plans, and retention of testing output. For application changes, we noted instances where evidence to support testing and other requirements, such as approvals, could not be provided.

In addition, the Agency had not finalized and fully implemented controls associated with ensuring that mainframe privileged programs were identified, approved, could only be modified appropriately, and pose no security risks.

2.1.7. Process for timely and secure installation of software patches. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: While we noted that processes were in place for patch management for various platforms selected for testing, the OIG Audit Report A-14-14-14043, *Effectiveness of the Social Security Administration's Server Patch Management Process*, noted that SSA did not have a comprehensive server patch management program.[1]

[1] The OIG report and our testing revealed that patch management processes were in place, however, a comprehensive program was not per the OIG report.

2.1.8. Software assessing (scanning) capabilities are fully implemented (NIST SP 800-53: RA-5, SI- 2). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that SSA implemented robust internal and external scanning processes. However, we noted instances where scanning processes could be enhanced.

2.1.9. Configuration-related vulnerabilities, including scan findings, have been remediated in a timely manner, as specified in organization policy or standards (NIST SP 800-53: CM-4, CM- 6, RA-5, SI-2). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: No

Comments: During our testing of threat and vulnerability management processes, we noted issues with network security controls.

2.1.10. Patch management process is fully developed, as specified in organization policy or standards (NIST SP 800-53: CM-3, SI-2). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: Refer to 2.1.7.

2.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Configuration Management Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Conclusion: N/A

Comments: N/A

2.3. Does the organization have an enterprise deviation handling process and is it integrated with the automated capability. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that SSA identified deviations to software through configuration management, patch management, and vulnerability management processes. However, the Agency did not provide sufficient risk analysis and business justification for USGCB Windows deviations, had not developed a robust configuration baseline process for software used in software development projects, and we noted deviations from configuration baselines in our assessment of some platforms selected for testing.

2.3.1. Is there a process for mitigating the risk introduced by those deviations? (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: Refer to comments above.

Section 3: IDENTITY AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT

3.1. Has the organization established an identity and access management program that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines and which identifies users and network devices? Besides the improvement opportunities that have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

3.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for account and identity management (NIST SP 800- 53: AC-1). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

3.1.2. Identifies all users, including Federal employees, contractors, and others who access organization systems (NIST SP 800-53, AC-2). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: Although the Agency was able to identify all users, including contractors, with access to the mainframe and all user accounts with access to the network, our testing identified control failures related to the appropriate completion of authorization forms for new hires, transferred employees, and contractors.

3.1.3. Identifies when special access requirements (e.g., multi-factor authentication) are necessary. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that SSA identified when special access requirements were necessary; however, we also noted instances in our testing when these requirements were not followed.

3.1.4. If multi-factor authentication is in use, it is linked to the organization's PIV program where appropriate (NIST SP 800-53, IA-2). (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

3.1.5. Organization has planned for implementation of PIV for logical access in accordance with government policies (HSPD 12, FIPS 201, OMB M-05-24, OMB M-07-06, OMB M-08-01, OMB M-11-11). (AP)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

3.1.6. Organization has adequately planned for implementation of PIV for physical access in accordance with government policies (HSPD 12, FIPS 201, OMB M-05-24, OMB M-07-06, OMB M-08-01, OMB M-11-11).

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

3.1.7. Ensures that the users are granted access based on needs and separation-of-duties principles. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: No

Comments: We identified numerous issues with logical access controls that resulted in inappropriate and/or unauthorized access, including application developers (programmers) with unmonitored access to production and application transactions, key transactions and data, key change management libraries, and other sensitive system software resources.

3.1.8. Identifies devices with IP addresses that are attached to the network and distinguishes these devices from users. (For example: IP phones, faxes, and printers are examples of devices attached to the network that are distinguishable from desktops, laptops, or servers that have user accounts.) (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: The OIG Audit Report A-14-13-13050, *The Social Security Administration's Process to Identify and Monitor the Security of Hardware Devices Connected to its Network*, noted that while the Agency had a process to

identify hardware devices connected to its network, we [the OIG] determined the Agency's inventory was incomplete and inaccurate. Additionally, SSA did not approve all of the hardware devices connected to its network. Moreover, although SSA had processes to monitor the security level of connected devices, they were inconsistent with Agency policy in effect at the time of our [the OIG] audit.

3.1.9. Identifies all user and non-user accounts. (Refers to user accounts that are on a system. Data user accounts are created to pull generic information from a database or a guest/anonymous account for generic login purposes. They are not associated with a single user or a specific group of users.) (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that SSA was able to identify user and non-user accounts. However, we noted a lack of requirements to periodically review and change passwords for system accounts and issues associated with the management of vendor accounts.

3.1.10. Ensures that accounts are terminated or deactivated once access is no longer required. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: No

Comments: We identified control failures related to the timely removal of terminated employees' logical access to the mainframe, network, and other supporting systems. Additionally, SSA did not have an authoritative source to identify departure dates for individual contractors and therefore, SSA was unable to supply actual departure dates for contractors to substantiate timely removal of access.

3.1.11. Identifies and controls use of shared accounts. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

3.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Identity and Access Management Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Comments: We noted the following:

- A number of employees and contractors gained access to SSA systems before attaining a suitability clearance.

- The OIG Audit Report A-15-13-13092, *Contractor Access to Social Security Administration Data*, noted that SSA did not have a comprehensive, integrated process to identify all of its contractors…We [the OIG] determined that SSA (1) granted systems access to some contractors in excess of what they needed to complete their job functions and (2) did not always terminate contractors' system access timely.

- The OIG Audit Report A-14-14-14051, *Mobile Device Security*, noted that SSA's security of mobile devices did not always conform with Federal standards and business best practices to mitigate unauthorized access to Agency sensitive information. Specifically, we found the Agency lacked a comprehensive, consolidated mobile device policy, did not secure all mobile devices, and provided minimal mobile device security training.

Section 4: INCIDENT RESPONSE AND REPORTING

4.1. Has the organization established an incident response and reporting program that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

4.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for detecting, responding to, and reporting incidents (NIST SP 800-53: IR-1). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

4.1.2. Comprehensive analysis, validation, and documentation of incidents. (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

4.1.3. When applicable, reports to US-CERT within established timeframes (NIST SP 80053, 800- 61; OMB M-07-16, M-06-19). (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

4.1.4. When applicable, reports to law enforcement within established timeframes (NIST SP 800-61). (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted the incident reporting policy and procedure included information about reporting incidents to appropriate law enforcement groups, including the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), Federal Protective Services (FPS), and local law enforcement. However, it was noted that the policy did not specify the established timeframes in which the various types of incidents should be reported and to whom.

4.1.5. Responds to and resolves incidents in a timely manner, as specified in organization policy or standards, to minimize further damage (NIST SP 800-53, 800-61; OMB M07-16, M-06- 19). (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted the incident response procedures did not provide guidance nor directives associated with prioritizing incidents, establishing timeframes and/or general guidance in which incidents should be resolved, and escalation processes should incidents not be addressed in a timely fashion. Additionally, we noted that the agency is developing procedures regarding resolving incidents; however, these documents are in draft form.

4.1.6. Is capable of tracking and managing risks in a virtual/cloud environment, if applicable. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

4.1.7. Is capable of correlating incidents. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

4.1.8. Has sufficient incident monitoring and detection coverage in accordance with government policies (NIST SP 800-53, 800-61; OMB M-07-16, M-06-19). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

4.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Incident Management Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Comments: N/A

Section 5: RISK MANAGEMENT

5.1. Has the organization established a risk management program that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

5.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for risk management, including descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of participants in this process. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

5.1.2. Addresses risk from an organization perspective with the development of a comprehensive governance structure and organization-wide risk management strategy as described in NIST SP 800-37, Rev. 1. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: No

Comments: During our site visit testing, we noted recurring issues associated with security management, physical access controls, and platform security. Further, we noted areas where the Program Operations Manual System (POMS) guidance was ambiguous or not sufficiently documented, which resulted in inconsistent implementation or noncompliance with POMS. Finally, we noted that an information system selected for testing, which was developed in a regional office, did not consistently follow SSA's System Development Lifecycle (SDLC) and Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) requirements.

5.1.3. Addresses risk from a mission and business process perspective and is guided by the risk decisions from an organizational perspective, as described in NIST SP 80037, Rev. 1. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

5.1.4. Addresses risk from an information system perspective and is guided by the risk decisions from an organizational perspective and the mission and business perspective, as described in NIST SP 800-37, Rev. 1. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: While we noted that SA&A processes were not consistently followed for a RO application selected for testing, SSA had developed overarching policy and procedures associated with SA&A activities.

5.1.5. Has an up-to-date system inventory. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

5.1.6. Categorizes information systems in accordance with government policies. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

5.1.7. Selects an appropriately tailored set of baseline security controls. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted for an application selected for testing, which was developed in a regional office, that SA&A requirements were not consistently followed, including development of a system security plan (SSP) that identifies and describes the tailored set of baseline security controls.

5.1.8. Implements the tailored set of baseline security controls and describes how the controls are employed within the information system and its environment of operation. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted for an application selected for testing, which was developed in a regional office, that SA&A requirements were not consistently followed, including development of a SSP that identifies and describes the tailored set of baseline security controls. Further, we noted that SSA was in process of implementing control changes based on changes from NIST SP 800-53 revision 3 to revision 4. However, SSA had not documented business justification and/or risk-based determinations for each revision 4 baseline security control that had not been implemented within 1 year since the issuance of the new guidance in April 2013.

5.1.9. Assesses the security controls using appropriate assessment procedures to determine 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 system. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted for an application selected for testing, which was developed in a regional office, that SA&A requirements were not consistently followed, including assessment of security controls.

5.1.10. Authorizes information system operation based on a determination of the risk to organizational operations and assets, individuals, other organizations, and the Nation resulting from the operation of the information system and the decision that this risk is acceptable. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted for an application selected for testing, that was developed in a regional office, that SA&A requirements were not consistently followed, including completing an authorization to operate (ATO).

5.1.11. Ensures information security controls are monitored on an ongoing basis, including assessing control effectiveness, documenting changes to the system or its environment of operation, conducting security impact analyses of the associated changes, and reporting the security state of the system to designated organizational officials. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

5.1.12. Information-system-specific risks (tactical), mission/business-specific risks, and organizational-level (strategic) risks are communicated to appropriate levels of the organization. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

5.1.13. Senior officials are briefed on threat activity on a regular basis by appropriate personnel (e.g., CISO). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

5.1.14. Prescribes the active involvement of information system owners and common control providers, chief information officers, senior information security officers, authorizing officials, and other roles as applicable in the ongoing management of information-system- related security risks. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

5.1.15. Security authorization package contains system security plan, security assessment report, and POA&M in accordance with government policies (NIST SP 800-18, 800-37). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted the following:

- For an application selected for testing, which was developed in a regional office, that SA&A requirements were not consistently followed, including completing an authorization package, including the SSP, security assessment report, and POA&M;
- the SSPs for two applications selected for testing had not been reviewed annually; and,
- the authority to operate (ATO) had expired for one application selected for testing.

5.1.16. Security authorization package contains accreditation boundaries, defined in accordance with government policies, for organization information systems. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted for an application selected for testing, which was developed in a regional office, that SA&A requirements were not consistently followed, including completing a security authorization package.

5.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Risk Management Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Comments: N/A

Section 6: SECURITY TRAINING

6.1. Has the organization established a security training program that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

6.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for security awareness training (NIST SP 80053: AT- 1). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that the SSA security awareness training policy did not include a timeframe for the completion of initial security awareness training upon becoming employed with SSA.

6.1.2. Documented policies and procedures for specialized training for users with significant information security responsibilities. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that specialized training procedures did not specify or provide guidance on the type of training required based on the user's significant information security responsibilities. As such, training for some selected employees and contractors did not correspond to the user's responsibilities and/or security.

6.1.3. Security training content based on the organization and roles, as specified in organization policy or standards. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that specialized training procedures did not specify or provide guidance on the type of training required based on the user's significant information security responsibilities. As such, training for selected users did not correspond to the user's responsibilities and/or security.

6.1.4. Identification and tracking of the status of security awareness training for all personnel (including employees, contractors, and other organization users) with access privileges that require security awareness training. (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: No

Comments: We noted that SSA did not have an authoritative system to identify and track completion of security awareness training for all employees and contractors.

6.1.5. Identification and tracking of the status of specialized training for all personnel (including employees, contractors, and other organization users) with significant information security responsibilities that require specialized training. (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that specialized training policy and procedures did not specify or provide guidance on the type of training required based on the user's significant information security responsibilities. As such, training for selected employees and contractors with significant security responsibilities did not correspond to the user's responsibilities and/or security. Additionally, while SSA requires that individuals with significant information security responsibilities track their own training, we noted that SSA did not have an Agency-wide or comprehensive tracking system for all employees and contractors with significant information security responsibilities.

6.1.6. Training material for security awareness training contains appropriate content for the organization (NIST SP 800-50, 800-53). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

6.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Security Training Program that was not noted in the questions above.

Comments: N/A

Section 7: PLAN OF ACTION & MILESTONES (POA&M)

7.1. Has the organization established a POA&M program that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines and tracks and monitors known information security weaknesses? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

7.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for managing IT security weaknesses discovered during security control assessments and that require remediation. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

7.1.2. Tracks, prioritizes, and remediates weaknesses. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

7.1.3. Ensures remediation plans are effective for correcting weaknesses. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

7.1.4. Establishes and adheres to milestone remediation dates. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

7.1.5. Ensures resources and ownership are provided for correcting weaknesses. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

7.1.6. POA&Ms include security weaknesses discovered during assessments of security controls and that require remediation (do not need to include security weakness due to a risk- based decision to not implement a security control) (OMB M-04-25). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

7.1.7. Costs associated with remediating weaknesses are identified (NIST SP 800-53, Rev. 3, Control PM-3; OMB M-04-25). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

7.1.8. Program officials report progress on remediation to CIO on a regular basis, at least quarterly, and the CIO centrally tracks, maintains, and independently reviews/validates the POA&M activities at least quarterly (NIST SP 800-53, Rev. 3, Control CA-5; OMB M-04- 25). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

7.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's POA&M Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Comments: N/A

Section 8: REMOTE ACCESS MANAGEMENT

8.1. Has the organization established a remote access program that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

8.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for authorizing, monitoring, and controlling all methods of remote access (NIST SP 800-53: AC-1, AC-17). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.2. Protects against unauthorized connections or subversion of authorized connections. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.3. Users are uniquely identified and authenticated for all access (NIST SP 800-46, Section 4.2, Section 5.1). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.4. Telecommuting policy is fully developed (NIST SP 800-46, Section 5.1). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.5. If applicable, multi-factor authentication is required for remote access (NIST SP 800-46, Section 2.2, Section 3.3). (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.6. Authentication mechanisms meet NIST SP 800-63 guidance on remote electronic authentication, including strength mechanisms. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.7. Defines and implements encryption requirements for information transmitted across public networks. (KFM)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.8. Remote access sessions, in accordance with OMB M-07-16, are timed-out after 30 minutes of inactivity, after which re-authentication is required. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.9. Lost or stolen devices are disabled and appropriately reported (NIST SP 800-46, Section 4.3; US-CERT Incident Reporting Guidelines). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.10. Remote access rules of behavior are adequate in accordance with government policies (NIST SP 800-53, PL-4). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.1.11. Remote-access user agreements are adequate in accordance with government policies (NIST SP 800-46, Section 5.1; NIST SP 800-53, PS-6). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

8.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Remote Access Management that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Comments: N/A

8.3. Does the organization have a policy to detect and remove unauthorized (rogue) connections?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

Section 9: CONTINGENCY PLANNING

9.1. Has the organization established an enterprise-wide business continuity/disaster recovery program that is consistent with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

9.1.1. Documented business continuity and disaster recovery policy providing the authority and guidance necessary to reduce the impact of a disruptive event or disaster (NIST SP 800-53: CP-1). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.2. The organization has incorporated the results of its system's Business Impact Analysis (BIA) into the analysis and strategy development efforts for the organization's Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), Business Continuity Plan (BCP), and Disaster Recovery Plan (DRP) (NIST SP 800-34). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that SSA documented recovery time objectives within the enterprise operational assurance assessment and business continuity considerations within continuity of operations plans (COOP). However, SSA did not consistently consider and document business impact analysis based on newly developed applications and significant changes to existing applications. Therefore, impacts to overall recovery objectives and business processes may not effectuate to those charged with recovery responsibilities for systems or business functions.

9.1.3. Development and documentation of division, component, and IT infrastructure recovery strategies, plans, and procedures (NIST SP 800-34). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.4. Testing of system-specific contingency plans. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.5. The documented BCP and DRP are in place and can be implemented when necessary (FCD1, NIST SP 800-34). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.6. Development of test, training, and exercise (TT&E) programs (FCD1, NIST SP 800-34, NIST SP 800-53). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.7. Testing or exercising of BCP and DRP to determine effectiveness and to maintain current plans. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that SSA tested the majority of, but not all, major applications and/or general support systems as part of the disaster recovery exercise.

9.1.8. After-action report that addresses issues identified during contingency/disaster recovery exercises (FCD1, NIST SP 800-34). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.9. Systems that have alternate processing sites (FCD1, NIST SP 800-34, NIST SP 800-53). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.10. Alternate processing sites are not subject to the same risks as primary sites (FCD1, NIST SP 800-34, NIST SP 800-53).

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.11. Backups of information that are performed in a timely manner (FCD1, NIST SP 800-34, NIST SP 800-53). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.1.12. Contingency planning that considers supply chain threats. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

9.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Contingency Planning Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Comments: N/A

Section 10: CONTRACTOR SYSTEMS

10.1. Has the organization established a program to oversee systems operated on its behalf by contractors or other entities, including organization systems and services residing in the cloud external to the organization? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

10.1.1. Documented policies and procedures for information security oversight of systems operated on the organization's behalf by contractors or other entities, including organization systems and services residing in a public cloud. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

10.1.2. The organization obtains sufficient assurance that security controls of such systems and services are effectively implemented and comply with Federal and organization guidelines (NIST SP 800-53: CA-2). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

10.1.3. A complete inventory of systems operated on the organization's behalf by contractors or other entities, including organization systems and services residing in a public cloud. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that a system listed on SSA's information system inventory was not appropriately labeled as a contractor system.

10.1.4. The inventory identifies interfaces between these systems and organization operated systems (NIST SP 800-53: PM-5). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

10.1.5. The organization requires appropriate agreements (e.g., MOUs, Interconnection Security Agreements, contracts, etc.) for interfaces between these systems and those that it owns and operates. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

10.1.6. The inventory of contractor systems is updated at least annually. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

10.1.7. Systems that are owned or operated by contractors or entities, including organization systems and services residing in a public cloud, are compliant with FISMA requirements, OMB policy, and applicable NIST guidelines. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: We noted that before a contractor system was implemented, SSA SA&A processes were not completed, including the ATO CISO Recommendation Letter, the ATO decision letter, and a comprehensive business continuity plan.

10.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Contractor Systems Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Comments: N/A

Section 11: SECURITY CAPITAL PLANNING

11.1. Has the organization established a security capital planning and investment program for information security? Besides the improvement opportunities that may have been identified by the OIG, does the program include the following attributes?

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

11.1.1. Documented policies and procedures to address information security in the capital planning and investment control (CPIC) process. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

11.1.2. Includes information security requirements as part of the capital planning and investment process. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

11.1.3. Establishes a discrete line item for information security in organizational programming and documentation (NIST SP 800-53: SA-2). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

11.1.4. Employs a business case/Exhibit 300/Exhibit 53 to record the information security resources required (NIST SP 800-53: PM-3). (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

11.1.5. Ensures that information security resources are available for expenditure as planned. (Base)

FY2014 Conclusion: Yes

Comments: N/A

11.2. Please provide any additional information on the effectiveness of the organization's Security Capital Planning Program that was not noted in the questions above.

FY2014 Comments: N/A

Appendix C – The Social Security Administration's General Support Systems and Major Applications

	System	Acronym
	General Support Systems[1]	
1	Audit Trail System	ATS
2	Comprehensive Integrity Review Process	CIRP
3	Death Alert Control and Update System	DACUS
4	Debt Management System	DMS
5	Enterprise Wide Mainframe & Distributed Network Telecommunications Services and System	EWANS
6	FALCON Data Entry System	FALCON
7	Human Resources System	HRS
8	Integrated Client Database System	ICDB
9	Integrated Disability Management System	IDMS
10	Quality System	QA
11	Security Management Access Control System	SMACS
12	Social Security Online Accounting & Reporting System	SSOARS
13	Social Security Unified Measurement System	SUMS
	Major Applications[2]	
1	Electronic Disability System	eDib
2	Earnings Record Maintenance System	ERMS
3	National Investigative Case Management System	NICMS
4	Recovery of Overpayments, Accounting and Reporting System	ROAR
5	Retirement, Survivors, Disability Insurance Accounting System	RSDI ACCTNG
6	Supplemental Security Income Record Maintenance System	SSIRMS
7	Social Security Number Establishment and Correction System	SSNECS
8	Title II	T2

[1] Office of Management and Budget Circular A-130, Appendix III, *Security of Federal Automated Information Resources*, Section A.2.c, defines a "general support system" or "system" as an interconnected set of information resources under the same direct management control, which shares common functionality.

[2] Office of Management and Budget Circular A-130, Appendix III, *Security of Federal Automated Information Resources*, Section A.2.d, defines a "major application" as an application that requires special attention to security due to the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the loss, misuse, or unauthorized access to or modification of the information in the application.

Appendix D – METRICS DEFINED

- **Continuous Monitoring Management -** Continuous Monitoring maintains ongoing awareness of information security, vulnerabilities, and threats to support organizational risk management decisions.

- **Configuration Management -** From a security point of view, Configuration Management provides assurance that the system in operation is the correct version (configuration) of the system and that any changes to be made are reviewed for security implications.

- **Identify and Access Management -** Identity and Access Management includes policies to control user access to information system objects, including devices, programs, and files.

- **Incident Response and Reporting -** According to the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Special Publication (SP) 800-12, the two main benefits of an incident-handling capability are (1) containing and repairing damage from incidents and (2) preventing future damage.

- **Risk Management –** Risk Management is "[t]he program and supporting process to manage risk to organizational operations (including mission, functions, image, reputation), organizational assets, individuals, other organizations, and the Nation, and includes: (i) establishing the context for risk-related activities; (ii) assessing risk; (iii) responding to risk once determined; and (iv) monitoring risk over time." *NIST Special Publication 800-53, Rev. 4, page B-11.19.*

- **Security Training -** According to FISMA, Title III of the *E-Government Act of 2002* (Pub. L. No. 107-347, December 17, 2002) an agency wide information security program for a Federal agency must include security awareness training. This training must cover (1) information security risks associated with users' activities and (2) users' responsibilities in complying with agency policies and procedures designed to reduce these risks.

- **Plan of Action and Milestones (POA&M) –** According to OMB M-14-04, "Plan of Action and Milestone (POA&M) (defined in OMB Memorandum M-02-01), a POA&M, also referred to as a corrective action plan, is a tool that identifies tasks that need to be accomplished. It details resources required to accomplish the elements of the plan, any milestones in meeting the task, and scheduled completion dates for the milestones. The purpose of the POA&M is to assist agencies in identifying, assessing, prioritizing, and monitoring the progress of corrective efforts for security weaknesses found in programs and systems."

- **Remote Access Management -** Refers to controls associated with remote access to the information systems from virtually any remote location.

- **Contingency Planning -** Processes and controls to mitigate risks associated with interruptions (losing capacity to process, retrieve, and protect electronically maintained information) that may result in lost or incorrectly processed data.

- **Contractor Systems -** Agencies are responsible for ensuring that appropriate security controls are in place over contractor systems used or operated by contractors or other entities (such as other Federal or state agencies) on behalf of an agency.

- **Security Capital Planning –** According to OMB M-14-04, "Capital Planning and Investment Control Process (as defined in OMB Circular A-130, (6)(C)) A management process for ongoing identification, selection, control, and evaluation of investments in information resources. The process links budget formulation and execution, and is focused on agency missions and achieving specific program outcomes."

Appendix E – MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS

Eveka Rodriguez, Engagement Partner, Grant Thornton

Greg Wallig, Managing Director, Grant Thornton

Cal Bassford, Senior Manager, Grant Thornton

Chris Malarkey, Manager, Grant Thornton

Olga Mason, Senior Associate, Grant Thornton

Jessica Saunders, Senior Associate, Grant Thornton