



Independent Audit on the Effectiveness of EXIM's Information Security Program and Practices Report for Fiscal Year 2025



OIG-AR-25-04
August 22, 2025

Office of Inspector General (OIG)
Export-Import Bank of the United States



To: Howard Spira
Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer

From: Eric Rivera **ERIC RIVERA**
Assistant Inspector General for Audits

Subject: Independent Audit on the Effectiveness of EXIM's Information Security Program and Practices – Fiscal Year 2025

Date: August 22, 2025

Digitally signed by ERIC RIVERA
Date: 2025.08.22 18:00:28 -04'00'

This memorandum transmits the final report of the independent audit on the effectiveness of the Export-Import Bank of the United States' (EXIM) information security program and practices for fiscal year (FY) 2025. Under a contract monitored by this office, we engaged the independent public accounting firm of KPMG LLP (KPMG) to conduct a performance audit. The objective of the audit was to determine whether EXIM developed and implemented an effective information security program and practices, as required by the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA).

KPMG conducted the audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and is responsible for the findings and conclusions expressed in this report. As part of this engagement, KPMG did not express opinions on EXIM's internal controls or draw conclusions on compliance or other matters.

We appreciate the cooperation and courtesies provided to KPMG and this office during the audit. If you have questions, please contact me at (202) 565-3219.



KPMG LLP
1801 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

Telephone +1 202 533 3000
Fax +1 202 533 8500
kpmg.com

Eric Rivera
Assistant Inspector General for Audits
Export Import Bank of the United States
811 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20571

Re: Independent Audit on the Effectiveness of EXIM’s Information Security Program and Practices Report – Fiscal Year 2025

Dear Mr. Rivera,

We are pleased to submit this report, which presents the results of our independent performance audit of the Export-Import Bank of the United States (EXIM) to determine whether their information security program and practices were effective for fiscal year (FY) 2025, as of August 22, 2025, in accordance with the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA). FISMA requires federal agencies, including EXIM, to have an annual independent evaluation performed of their information security programs and practices and to report the results of the evaluation to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). OMB has delegated its responsibility for the collection of annual FISMA responses to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). DHS, in conjunction with OMB and the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), developed the *FY 2025 Inspector General Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) Reporting Metrics* (DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics). EXIM Office of Inspector General (OIG) contracted with KPMG LLP (KPMG) to conduct this independent performance audit. OIG monitored our work to ensure generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) and contractual requirements¹ were met.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with GAGAS. Those 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 that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

In addition to GAGAS, we conducted this performance audit in accordance with Consulting Services Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). This performance audit did not constitute an audit of financial statements, or an attestation level report as defined under GAGAS and the AICPA standards for attestation engagements.

The objective for this independent performance audit was to determine whether EXIM developed and implemented an effective information security program and practices, as required by FISMA. KPMG evaluated EXIM’s security plans, policies, and procedures in place for

¹ Contract No. 47QRAD19DU208 Order Number 83310123F0013, Item 2001, dated February 22, 2023, and subsequent contract modifications.



effectiveness as required by applicable federal law and regulations, guidance issued by OMB and standards and guidelines contained in the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publications (SP) and Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS).

We based our independent performance audit work on a selection of EXIM-wide security controls and system-specific security controls applicable to one selected EXIM information system. As part of our audit, we responded to the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics* and assessed the metric maturity levels on behalf of the EXIM OIG. Additional details regarding the scope of our independent performance audit are included in the Objective, Scope, and Methodology section, Appendix A, *Scope and Methodology*, and Appendix C, *Status of Prior-Year Recommendations*.

Consistent with applicable FISMA requirements, OMB policy and guidance, and NIST standards and guidelines, EXIM established and maintained its information security program and practices for its information systems for the six Cybersecurity Functions² and ten FISMA Metric Domains.³

Based on the results of our performance audit procedures, all six of EXIM's Cybersecurity Functions were assessed at Level 4: Managed and Measurable. Therefore, the information security program was considered effective according to the instructions detailed within Appendix F, *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics*.

We did not render an opinion on EXIM's internal controls over financial reporting or over financial management systems as part of this performance audit. We caution that projecting the results of our performance audit to future periods or other EXIM information systems not included in our selection is subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in technology or because compliance with controls may deteriorate. This report is intended solely for the use and reliance of EXIM, EXIM OIG, DHS, and OMB.

Sincerely,

KPMG LLP

Washington, D.C.

August 22, 2025

² OMB, DHS, and CIGIE developed the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics* in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officers Council. In FY 2025, the ten IG FISMA Metric Domains were aligned with the six Cybersecurity Functions of Govern, Identify, Protect, Detect, Respond, and Recover as defined in the NIST *Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity*.

³ As described in the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics*, the ten FISMA Metric Domains are: cybersecurity governance, cybersecurity supply chain risk management, risk and asset management, configuration management, identity and access management, data protection and privacy, security training, information security continuous monitoring, incident response, and contingency planning.



**Office of Inspector General
Export-Import Bank of the United States**

OIG-AR-25-04

Why OIG Did This Audit

The Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA or the Act) requires agencies to develop, document, and implement an agency-wide information security program to protect their information and information systems, including those provided or managed by another Federal agency, contractor, or source. In addition, FISMA requires offices of inspectors general to provide an independent assessment of the effectiveness of an agency's information security program.

To fulfill its FISMA responsibilities, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) contracted with KPMG LLP (KPMG) for an independent audit of the effectiveness of the Export-Import Bank of the United States' (EXIM) information security program. The objective of this performance audit was to determine whether EXIM developed and implemented an effective information security program and practices as required by FISMA.

What OIG Found

Under a contract monitored by our office, we engaged KPMG to conduct a performance audit. KPMG did not identify any findings as a result of testing; however, KPMG included an opportunity to improve the effectiveness of EXIM's information security program.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Independent Audit of EXIM's Information Security Program and Practices Effectiveness – FY 2025
OIG-AR-25-04, August 22, 2025**

What OIG Found

KPMG determined that EXIM's information security program and practices were effective overall as a result of the testing of the fiscal year (FY) 2025 Inspector General FISMA Reporting Functions, for which all (Govern, Identify, Protect, Detect, Respond, and Recover) were assessed at Level 4: Managed and Measurable as described by the DHS criteria. Consistent with applicable FISMA requirements, OMB's policy and guidance, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publications (SPs) and Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS), EXIM's information security program and practices for its systems were established and maintained for the six Cybersecurity Functions and ten FISMA Metric Domains. Appendix F contains EXIM's information security program summary results of the DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics (the Metrics).

Additionally, as outlined in Appendix E, 25 NIST SP 800-53, Revision 5, *Security and Privacy Controls for Information Systems and Organizations*, controls were tested in addition to those identified within the Metrics for one randomly selected system and KPMG determined that EXIM effectively designed and implemented these controls.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY	1
BACKGROUND	1
AUDIT RESULTS	4
FINDINGS & OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT.....	5
APPENDICES	6
Appendix A: Scope and Methodology.....	6
Appendix B: Federal Laws, Regulations, and Guidance	8
Appendix C: Status of Prior-Year Recommendations	10
Appendix D: Management’s Response	11
Appendix E: Security Controls Section	12
Appendix F: DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Results	13
Appendix G: System Selection Approach.....	21
ABBREVIATIONS	22

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Domains.....	3
Table 2: Inspector General Assessed Maturity Levels	4
Table 3: Status of Prior Audit Recommendations.....	10
Table 4: Additional Security Controls and Testing Results	12
Table 5: EXIM’s FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Results	13

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the independent audit conducted by KPMG LLP (KPMG) of the effectiveness of the information security program and practices of the Export-Import Bank of the United States (EXIM) for fiscal year (FY) 2025. The objective was to determine whether EXIM developed and implemented an effective information security program and practices in accordance with the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA).

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The objective of this audit was to determine whether EXIM developed and implemented an effective information security program and practices in accordance with FISMA. To address our objective, we evaluated EXIM's security program, plans, policies, and procedures in place for effectiveness as required by applicable federal law and regulations and guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Using evaluation guidance prescribed by the *FY 2025 Inspector General Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) Reporting Metrics (DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics)*, we evaluated agency and system level security control policies, procedures, and practices associated with the following DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Domains:

- Govern – Cybersecurity Governance and Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management;
- Identify – Risk and Asset Management;
- Protect – Configuration Management, Identity and Access Management, Data Protection and Privacy, and Security Training;
- Detect – Information Security Continuous Monitoring;
- Respond – Incident Response; and
- Recover – Contingency Planning.

We selected one EXIM information system for our performance of system level security control testing procedures: EXIM Online (EOL).

See Appendix A for more details on the scope and methodology of our performance audit.

BACKGROUND

The Export-Import Bank of the United States is an independent agency and a wholly owned U.S. government corporation that was first organized as a District of Columbia banking corporation in 1934. EXIM is the official export credit agency of the United States.

The mission of EXIM is to support U.S. exports by providing export financing through its loan, guarantee, and insurance programs in cases where the private sector is unable or unwilling to provide financing, or where such support is necessary to level the competitive playing field for U.S. exporters due to financing provided by foreign governments to their exporters. All EXIM

obligations carry the full faith and credit of the U.S. government. The mission-critical information technology (IT) systems supporting these programs and EXIM's mission are:

1. Financial Management System – Next Generation (FMS-NG)
2. Infrastructure General Support System (GSS)
3. EXIM Online (EOL)
4. EXIM Loan Management System (ELMS)
5. Application Processing System (APS)
6. Database General Support System (GSS)

EXIM's network infrastructure consists largely of networking devices with various servers running different operating system platforms. Enterprise managed personal computers and laptops use the Windows operating system. The networks are protected from external threats by a range of IT security devices and software, including data loss prevention tools, firewalls, intrusion detection and prevention systems, antivirus, software, and spam-filtering systems.

Federal Laws, Roles, and Responsibilities. On December 17, 2002, the President signed into law the E-Government Act, Pub. L. 107-347, which included the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002. FISMA, as amended,¹ permanently reauthorized the framework established in the Government Information Security Reform Act of 2000 (GISRA), which expired in November 2002. FISMA continues the annual review and reporting requirements introduced in GISRA. In addition, FISMA includes additional provisions aimed at further strengthening the security of the federal government's information and information systems, such as the development of minimum standards for agency systems. NIST has been tasked to work with federal agencies in the development of those standards. NIST issues these standards and guidelines as Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) and Special Publications (SPs). FIPS provide the minimum information security requirements that are necessary to improve the security of federal information and information systems, and SP 800 and selected 500 series SPs provide computer security guidelines and recommendations. For instance, FIPS Publication 200, *Minimum Security Requirements for Federal Information and Information Systems*, requires agencies to adopt and implement the minimum-security controls documented in NIST SP 800-53, as amended. Federal agencies are required to develop, document, and implement an agency-wide information security program to protect their information and information systems, including those provided or managed by another agency, contractor, or other source. FISMA provides a framework for establishing and maintaining the effectiveness of management, operational, and technical controls over information technology that support operations and assets. FISMA also provides a mechanism for improved oversight of federal agency information security programs, as it requires agency executives, in coordination with their Chief Information Officers and agency Information Security Officers, to report the security status of their information systems to Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and OMB, which

¹ On December 18, 2014, FISMA was amended by the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014. Pub. L. 113-283. The amendment: (1) included the reestablishment of the oversight authority of the Director of OMB with respect to agency information security policies and practices, and (2) set forth the authority for the Secretary of DHS to administer the implementation of such policies and procedures for information systems.

is accomplished through DHS' CyberScope tool. CyberScope, operated by DHS on behalf of OMB, replaces the legacy paper-based submission process and automates agency reporting. In addition, OIGs provide an independent assessment of the effectiveness of an agency's information security program. OIGs must also report their results to DHS and OMB annually through CyberScope.

DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics. DHS created the metrics for IGs to use in conducting their annual independent evaluations to determine the effectiveness of the information security program and practices of their respective agencies. The metrics are intended to provide agencies with a common structure for identifying and managing cybersecurity risks across the enterprise, as well as to provide IGs with guidance for assessing the maturity of controls to address those risks. In addition, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) developed and published maturity models for Cybersecurity Governance, Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management, Risk and Asset Management, Configuration Management, Identity and Access Management, Data Protection and Privacy, Security Training, Information Security Continuous Monitoring, Incident Response and Contingency Planning. Table 1, below, contains a description of the associated DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Domains.

Table 1: DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Domains²

Cybersecurity Framework Security Functions	DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Domains
Govern	Cybersecurity Governance Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management
Identify	Risk and Asset Management
Protect	Configuration Management Identity and Access Management Data Protection and Privacy Security Training
Detect	Information Security Continuous Monitoring
Respond	Incident Response
Recover	Contingency Planning

The maturity models have five levels: Level 1: Ad-Hoc, Level 2: Defined, Level 3: Consistently Implemented, Level 4: Managed and Measurable, and Level 5: Optimized. Table 2, below, provides the descriptions for each maturity level.

² DHS Reporting Metrics, https://www.cisa.gov/sites/default/files/2025-04/Final%20FY%202025%20IG%20FISMA%20Reporting%20Metrics_Ver%202.0_April%202025-508_0.pdf

Table 2: Inspector General Assessed Maturity Levels³

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

The maturity level for a domain is based on a calculated average scoring model approach, wherein the average of the metrics in a particular domain will be used by IGs to determine the effectiveness of individual function areas (Govern, Identify, Protect, Detect, Respond, and Recover) and the overall program. A security program is considered effective if the majority of the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics* are assessed at Level 4: Managed and Measurable. We used this assessment method in our formation of a conclusion on the effectiveness of EXIM’s information security program and practices. For information about our conclusion and the results of our performance audit, see the section immediately below.

AUDIT RESULTS

Consistent with applicable FISMA requirements, OMB’s policy and guidance, the NIST SP and FIPS, EXIM’s information security program and practices for its systems were established and have been maintained for the six Cybersecurity Functions and ten FISMA Metric Domains. We calculated the average of the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics* for the six Cybersecurity Functions at Level 4: Managed and Measurable and therefore found that EXIM’s information security program and practices were effective, as prescribed by the DHS criteria.

A summary of the results for the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics* assessment is in Appendix F.

³ DHS Reporting Metrics, https://www.cisa.gov/sites/default/files/2025-04/Final%20FY%202025%20IG%20FISMA%20Reporting%20Metrics_Ver%202.0_April%202025-508_0.pdf

FINDINGS & OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT

Findings

No findings were identified during the performance of the FY 2025 FISMA performance audit.

Opportunity for Improvement

Over the span of several years, KPMG has observed improvement in EXIM's information security program and practices across all six Cybersecurity Functions (Govern, Identify, Protect, Detect, Respond, and Recover) and ten FISMA Metric Domains (Cybersecurity Governance, Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management, Risk and Asset Management, Configuration Management, Identity and Access Management, Data Protection and Privacy, Security Training, Information Security Continuous Monitoring, Incident Response, and Contingency Planning) to achieve an average maturity level of Level 4: Managed and Measurable rating in FY 2025. During the performance of the FY 2025 FISMA performance audit, KPMG assessed two metrics at Level 3: Consistently Implemented. These metrics are (1) metric 19 (Protect and Identity and Access Management) and (2) metric 30 (Respond and Incident Response). As these metrics were assessed at a maturity level lower than Level 4: Managed and Measurable, the overall rating for the program, we have identified the following opportunity for improvement that management may consider relative to EXIM's ability and intention to potentially achieve a Level 4 for these two metrics:

EXIM management should assess, and pending the results of such an assessment and in consideration of resource constraints and organizational prioritization, implement event logging 2 (EL2) capabilities within their information security program. We present this opportunity for improvement because the implementation of EL2 capabilities offers EXIM management increased log security and greater granularity and flexibility in log reporting, thereby facilitating enhanced analysis and security event response.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Scope and Methodology

To evaluate the effectiveness of EXIM's information security program and its compliance with FISMA, KPMG conducted a performance audit that was focused on the information security controls, program, and practices at the agency level (entity level) and for a selected information system.

We conducted the performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and with Consulting Services Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Those 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 that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

To assess EXIM's information security controls and practices, we applied procedures to test agency and system level controls, the latter of which were associated with EXIM Online (EOL), the one information system we selected for our performance audit. Using the evaluation guidance prescribed in the *FY 2025 Inspector General Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) Reporting Metrics (DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics)* and the methodology steps outlined below for each of the six Cybersecurity Functions and ten FISMA Metric Domains from the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics*, we:

- Requested that EXIM management communicate its self-assessed maturity levels, where applicable, to help us confirm our understanding of the FISMA-related policies and procedures, guidance, structures, and processes established by EXIM.
- Performed procedures designed to assess whether agency and EOL system-level controls were suitably designed and operating effectively to address requirements associated with Level 3: Consistently Implemented maturity models for all ten FISMA Metric Domains. If, based on the results of testing performed, we determined that one or more controls did not meet such requirements, we assessed such controls as Level 1: Ad Hoc or 2: Defined for the associated FISMA Metric Domain questions.
- For controls that, based on testing performed, met requirements associated with Level 3: Consistently Implemented maturity models, performed additional procedures designed to assess whether agency and EOL system-level controls were suitably designed and operating effectively to address requirements associated with Level 4: Managed and Measurable maturity models for applicable FISMA Metric Domain questions.
- For controls that, based on testing performed, met requirements associated with Level 4: Managed and Measurable maturity models, performed additional procedures designed to assess whether agency and EOL system-level control were suitably designed to address requirements associated with Level 5: Optimized maturity models for applicable FISMA Metric Domain questions. The test procedures associated with this assessment focused specifically on the evaluation of the design of the controls.

As prescribed in the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics*, a FISMA Metric Domain is considered effective if it is at Level 4: Managed and Measurable or at Level 5: Optimized. See Appendix F, *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Metric Results*.

In addition to the procedures above, we selected 25 additional NIST SP 800-53, Rev. 5, security controls that were not referenced in the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics* and developed and executed test procedures to test such controls for EOL. See Appendix E, *Security Controls Selection*, for a list of the controls that were selected for testing.

To assess the effectiveness of the information security program and practices of EXIM, we performed various procedures, including:

- Inquiries of information system owners, information system security managers, system administrators, and other relevant individuals to walk through each control process.
- An inspection of the information security practices and policies established by EXIM's Office of Information Management and Technology.
- An inspection of the information security practices, policies, and procedures in use across EXIM.
- An inspection of IT artifacts to determine the implementation and operating effectiveness of security controls.

We relied on computer-generated data as part of performing this audit. We assessed the reliability of the data by (1) observing the generation of the data, (2) inspecting parameters or logic used to generate the data, and (3) interviewing EXIM officials knowledgeable about the data. We determined that the data was sufficiently reliable for testing purposes.

We performed our fieldwork with EXIM management and IT personnel during the period of April 9, 2025, through July 30, 2025. During our audit, we met with EXIM management to provide a status of the engagement and discuss our preliminary conclusions.

See Appendix B for the federal laws, regulations, and guidance used as criteria for the performance audit.

Appendix B: Federal Laws, Regulations, and Guidance

Our performance audit of the effectiveness of EXIM's information security program and practices was guided by applicable federal laws and regulations related to information security, including but not limited to the following:

- Government Accountability Office (GAO) Government Auditing Standards, July 2018 Revision (GAO-18-568G)
- Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (Pub. L. 113-283, §2(a), 128 Stat. 3073, 3075-3078, Dec. 18, 2014)
- OMB Memorandum 23-03, *Fiscal Year 2023 Guidance on Federal Information Security and Privacy Management Requirements*
- OMB Circular A-130, *Managing Information as a Strategic Resource*
- OMB Circular A-123, *Management's Responsibility for Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control*
- OMB Memorandum 07-18, *Ensuring New Acquisitions Include Common Security Configurations*
- OMB Memorandum 07-16, *Safeguarding Against and Responding to the Breach of Personally Identifiable Information*
- OMB Memorandum 07-11, *Implementation of Commonly Accepted Security Configurations for Windows Operating Systems*
- OMB Memorandum 06-19, *Reporting Incidents Involving Personally Identifiable Information and Incorporating the Cost for Security in Agency Information Technology Investments*
- OMB Memorandum 06-16, *Protection of Sensitive Agency Information*
- OMB Memorandum 05-24, *Implementation of Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD) 12 – Policy for a Common Identification Standard for Federal Employees and Contractors*
- OMB Memorandum 13-02, *Improving Acquisition through Strategic Sourcing*
- OMB Memorandum 11-11, *Continued Implementation of Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 – Policy for a Common Identification Standard for Federal Employees and Contractors*
- OMB Memorandum 14-03, *Enhancing the Security of Federal Information and Information Systems*
- OMB Memorandum 15-14, *Management and Oversight of Federal Information Technology*
- OMB Memorandum 17-12, *Preparing for and Responding to a Breach of Personally Identifiable Information*
- OMB Memorandum 17-25, *Reporting Guidance for Executive Order on Strengthening the Cybersecurity of Federal Networks and Critical Infrastructure*
- OMB Memorandum 19-03, *Strengthening the Cybersecurity of Federal Agencies by Enhancing the High Value Asset Program*
- OMB Memorandum 19-17, *Enabling Mission Delivery through Improved Identity, Credential, and Access Management*
- OMB Memorandum 19-26, *Update to the Trusted Internet Connections (TIC) Initiative*

- OMB Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP) Policy Memo, *Security Authorization of Information Systems in Cloud Computing Environments*, Dec. 8, 2011
- *DHS FY 2025 Inspector General Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA) Reporting Metrics*
- NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 2.0
- NIST SP 800-53, Rev. 5, *Security and Privacy Controls for Information Systems and Organizations*
- NIST SP 800-53A, Rev. 1, *Guide for Assessing the Security Controls in Federal Information Systems and Organizations: Building Effective Security Assessment Plans*
- NIST SP 800-30, Rev. 1, *Guide for Conducting Risk Assessments*
- NIST SP 800-34, Rev. 1, *Contingency Planning Guide for Federal Information Systems*
- NIST SP 800-37, Rev. 1, *Guide for Applying the Risk Management Framework to Federal Information Systems: A Security Life Cycle Approach*
- NIST SP 800-61, Rev. 2, *Computer Security Incident Handling Guide*
- NIST SP 800-137, *Information Security Continuous Monitoring for Federal Information Systems and Organizations*
- FIPS 199: *Standards for Security Categorization of Federal Information and Information Systems*
- FIPS 200: *Minimum Security Requirements for Federal Information and Information Systems*

Appendix C: Status of Prior-Year Recommendations

No exceptions were identified in the prior year that resulted in the issuance of Notice of Findings and Recommendations (NFRs).

Table 3: Status of Prior Audit Recommendations

Finding	Recommendation	FY Identified	Status
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Appendix D: Management's Response



Helping American Businesses Win the Future

DATE: August 12, 2025

TO: Eric Rivera, Assistant Inspector General for Audits

THROUGH: Ravi Singh, Senior Vice President Chief Financial Officer

FROM: Howard Spira, Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer

SUBJECT: EXIM Management Response to the draft Report
Independent Audit of EXIM's Information Security Program and Practices Effectiveness - FY 2025 (Report No. OIG-AR-25-04)

RAVI SINGH

Digitally signed by RAVI SINGH
Date: 2025.08.14
15:39:42 -0400

HOWARD SPIRA

Digitally signed by HOWARD SPIRA
Date: 2025.08.12
12:39:03 -0400

Dear Mr. Rivera,

Thank you for providing the Export-Import Bank of the United States ("EXIM" or "EXIM Bank") management with the Office of Inspector General's ("OIG") *Independent Audit of EXIM's Information Security Program and Practices Effectiveness - FY 2025 (Report No. OIG-AR-25-04)*, dated August 22, 2025 (the "Report"). The OIG contracted with KPMG, LLP ("KPMG") to conduct a performance audit of EXIM's information security program and practice effectiveness.

EXIM acknowledges KPMG's conclusion that no findings were identified. However, KPMG noted an opportunity to further strengthen the effectiveness of EXIM's information security program. This suggests that while the program was generally assessed as effective, certain areas could be enhanced. EXIM remains committed to continuously improving its information security program and practices, which are already well-developed and effectively implemented. EXIM looks forward to continuing to strengthen our working relationship with OIG.

CC:

Jim Cruse, Acting President and Chairman of the Board of Directors
Jim Burrows, Acting First Vice President and Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors
Darren Death, Chief Information Security Officer
Kenneth Tinsley, Senior Vice President and Chief Risk Officer
Victoria Coleman, Deputy General Counsel
Michaela Smith, Director of Audit and Internal Controls Program Internal Controls

Appendix E: Security Controls Section

During the planning phase of our performance audit, we identified the NIST SP 800-53, Rev. 5 controls referenced in the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics*. From the remaining NIST SP 800-53, Rev. 5 controls not referenced in the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics*, we selected a nonstatistical sample of 25 controls presented in Table 4 below to test for EOL.

Table 4: Additional Security Controls and Testing Results

No.	NIST SP 800-53 Security Control	Control Name	System	Conclusion
1	AC-19	Access Control for Mobile Devices	EOL	No exceptions noted
2	AC-22	Publicly Accessible Content	EOL	No exceptions noted
3	AC-3	Access Enforcement	EOL	No exceptions noted
4	AC-7	Unsuccessful Logon Attempts	EOL	No exceptions noted
5	AC-8	System Use Notification	EOL	No exceptions noted
6	AT-4	Training Records	EOL	No exceptions noted
7	AU-14	Session Audit	EOL	No exceptions noted
8	AU-8	Time Stamps	EOL	No exceptions noted
9	CM-2	Baseline Configuration	EOL	No exceptions noted
10	CM-5	Access Restrictions for Change	EOL	No exceptions noted
11	CM-9	Configuration Management Plan	EOL	No exceptions noted
12	CP-10	System Recovery and Reconstitution	EOL	No exceptions noted
13	CP-7	Alternate Processing Site	EOL	No exceptions noted
14	CP-9	System Backup	EOL	No exceptions noted
15	IA-2	Identification and Authentication (Organization Users)	EOL	No exceptions noted
16	IA-3	Device Identification and Authentication	EOL	No exceptions noted
17	IR-2	Incident Response Training	EOL	No exceptions noted
18	IR-8	Incident Response Plan	EOL	No exceptions noted
19	IR-9	Information Spillage Response	EOL	No exceptions noted
20	MP-2	Media Access	EOL	No exceptions noted
21	PM-27	Privacy Reporting	EOL	No exceptions noted
22	PM-30	Supply Chain Risk Management Strategy	EOL	No exceptions noted
23	PM-4	Plan of Action and Milestones Process	EOL	No exceptions noted
24	PT-7	Specific Categories of Personally Identifiable Information	EOL	No exceptions noted
25	SI-11	Error Handling	EOL	No exceptions noted

Appendix F: DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Results

On July 21, 2025, we provided EXIM OIG with the assessed maturity levels for each of the 20 core metrics and 5 supplemental metrics outlined in the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics*. The following tables represent each of the FISMA Domains that were assessed to respond to the *DHS FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metrics*. Each of the six Cybersecurity Functions and ten FISMA Domains had specific evaluation questions that were assessed for each metric. We used the results of these assessments to derive a maturity level for each metric, Cybersecurity Function, and FISMA Domain.

Based on the results of our performance audit procedures performed, we assessed all six Cybersecurity Functions and ten FISMA Metric Domains at Level 4: Managed and Measurable. Therefore, we concluded that EXIM’s information security program and practices were effective, as prescribed by the DHS criteria.

The tables below present the derived maturity level for the Cybersecurity Functions and FISMA Domains.

Table 5: EXIM’s FY 2025 IG FISMA Reporting Metric Results

Core Metric Scoring

Function 1A: Govern – Cybersecurity Governance

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	0
Optimized	0

Function 1B: Govern – Cyber - Supply Chain Risk Management

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	1

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Optimized	0

Function 2: Identify – Risk and Asset Management

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	5
Optimized	0

Function 3A: Protect – Configuration Management

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	2
Optimized	0

Function 3B: Protect – Identity and Access Management

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	1
Managed and Measurable	2
Optimized	0

Function 3C: Protect – Data Protection and Privacy

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	2
Optimized	0

Function 3D: Protect – Security Training

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	1
Optimized	0

Function 4: Detect - Information Security Continuous Monitoring

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	2
Optimized	0

Function 5: Respond - Incident Response

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	1
Managed and Measurable	1
Optimized	0

Function 6: Recover - Contingency Planning

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	2
Optimized	0

Supplemental Metric Scoring

Function 1A: Govern – Cybersecurity Governance

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	3
Optimized	0

Function 1B: Govern – Cyber - Supply Chain Risk Management

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	0
Optimized	0

Function 2: Identify – Risk and Asset Management

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	1
Optimized	0

Function 3A: Protect - Configuration Management

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	0
Optimized	0

Function 3B: Protect – Identity and Access Management

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	0
Optimized	0

Function 3C: Protect – Data Protection and Privacy

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	0
Optimized	0

Function 3D: Protect – Security Training

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	0
Optimized	0

Function 4: Detect – Information Security Continuous Monitoring

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Managed and Measurable	1
Optimized	0

Function 5: Respond - Incident Response

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	0
Optimized	0

Function 6: Recover - Contingency Planning

Maturity Level	Count of Metrics
Ad-Hoc	0
Defined	0
Consistently Implemented	0
Managed and Measurable	0
Optimized	0

Calculated Average by Function

Function	Calculated Maturity Level – Core Metrics	Calculated Maturity Level – Non-Core Metrics	FY24 Assessed Value
Govern	4	4	Effective
Identify	4	4	Effective
Protect	3.875	Not Applicable	Effective
Detect	4	4	Effective

Function	Calculated Maturity Level – Core Metrics	Calculated Maturity Level – Non-Core Metrics	FY24 Assessed Value
Respond	3.50	Not Applicable	Effective
Recover	4	Not Applicable	Effective

Appendix G: System Selection Approach

We obtained a schedule of all systems from EXIM's FISMA system inventory and noted that there was a total of 44 systems listed. We sorted the FISMA system inventory to identify systems managed and hosted by EXIM and removed ELMS as it was selected for testing in the 2024 FISMA performance audit. We judgmentally selected a sample of one system, EOL, since that system was categorized as FIPS 199 Moderate risk, maintains financially relevant data, and had never been tested against the supplemental FISMA metrics. For EOL, we also tested 25 NIST 800-53 controls in addition to those identified within the Metrics as detailed in Appendix E, *Security Controls Selection*.

ABBREVIATIONS

AICPA	American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
APS	Application Processing System
CIGIE	Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
ELMS	EXIM Loan Management System
EOL	EXIM Online
EXIM	Export-Import Bank of the United States
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standards
FISMA	Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014
FMS-NG	Financial Management System – Next Generation
FY	Fiscal Year
GAGAS	Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards
GISRA	Government Information Security Reform Act of 2000
GSS	General Support System
HSPD	Homeland Security Presidential Directive
IG	Inspector General
ISCM	Information Security Continuous Monitoring
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
OCIO	Office of the Chief Information Officer
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PII	Personally Identifiable Information
SP	Special Publication
TIC	Trusted Internet Connections

Office of Inspector General
Export-Import Bank of the United States
811 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20571
Telephone 202-565-3908
Facsimile 202-565-3988



HELP FIGHT

FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE

1- 888-OIG-EXIM
(1-888-644-3946)

<https://eximoig.oversight.gov/contact-us>

<https://eximoig.oversight.gov/hotline>

If you fear reprisal, contact EXIM OIG's Whistleblower Protection Coordinator at

oig.whistleblower@exim.gov

For additional resources and information about whistleblower protections and unlawful retaliation, please visit [the whistleblower's resource page](#) at oversight.gov.