



Office of Audits
Office of Inspector General
U.S. General Services Administration

GSA's Robotic Process Automation Program Lacks Evidence to Support Claimed Savings

Report Number A210057/B/5/F24001
November 30, 2023

Executive Summary

GSA's Robotic Process Automation Program Lacks Evidence to Support Claimed Savings

Report Number A210057/B/5/F24001

November 30, 2023

Why We Performed This Audit

The Robotic Process Automation (RPA) program was first introduced as an initiative within the GSA Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) in January 2018. GSA formalized its RPA program in June 2019 with the goal of using RPAs (commonly referred to as “bots”) to perform routine tasks, allowing federal employees to spend more time on non-routine tasks that require human judgment. Bots are rules-based software that simulate human actions on a computer, such as copying data, filling in forms, signing into applications, and analyzing data.

This audit was included in our *Fiscal Year 2021 Audit Plan* to evaluate: (1) GSA’s claim that its RPA program reclaimed more than 240,000 work hours annually and (2) the program’s internal controls. Our audit objective was to determine whether GSA effectively uses bots to free up work hours and achieve cost savings.

What We Found

GSA lacks evidence to support its claims that its RPA program is generating savings. We found that GSA is not verifying the actual work hours saved with end-users of its bots. Because of this, GSA’s assertion in its *Fiscal Year 2020 Agency Financial Report* that its RPA program reclaimed more than 240,000 work hours annually was inaccurate and unreliable. We also found that GSA is not tracking the costs associated with its bots, which precludes GSA from determining whether the bots are generating cost savings and a return on investment.

What We Recommend

We recommend that the GSA Chief Financial Officer:

1. Establish a performance evaluation process for its bots to ensure they are performing as intended and that the RPA program is achieving its goals. As part of this effort, the OCFO should develop objective and auditable measures and metrics that support the work hours saved by bots, as described in the *RPA Program Playbook*.
2. Track the costs to develop each bot to allow the RPA program to develop objective statistics, such as return on investment.

The GSA Chief Financial Officer acknowledged our finding and recommendations. The Agency’s comments can be found in their entirety in **Appendix C**.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Results	
<i>Finding – GSA lacks evidence to support its claims that the RPA program is generating savings.....</i>	<i>3</i>
Conclusion.....	7
<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>GSA Comments.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>OIG Response</i>	<i>7</i>
Appendices	
Appendix A – Objectives, Scope, and Methodology.....	A-1
Appendix B – Sampled Bots	B-1
Appendix C – GSA Comments.....	C-1
Appendix D – Report Distribution	D-1

Introduction

We performed an audit of GSA's Robotic Process Automation (RPA) program.

Purpose

The RPA program was first introduced as an initiative within the GSA Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) in January 2018. GSA formalized its RPA program in June 2019 with the goal of using RPAs (commonly referred to as "bots") to perform routine tasks, allowing federal employees to spend more time on non-routine tasks that require human judgment. Bots are rules-based software that simulate human actions on a computer, such as copying data, filling in forms, signing into applications, and analyzing data.

This audit was included in our *Fiscal Year 2021 Audit Plan* to evaluate: (1) GSA's claim that its RPA program reclaimed more than 240,000 work hours annually and (2) the program's internal controls.

Objective

Our audit objective was to determine whether GSA effectively uses bots to free up work hours and achieve cost savings.

See **Appendix A – Objectives, Scope, and Methodology** for additional details.

Background

GSA introduced its RPA initiative in January 2018 to address the *President's Management Agenda* priority goal to shift federal employees "from low-value to high-value work." Examples of low-value work include data entry, repetitive tasks, and routine customer communications. The idea is that if these routine, low-value tasks can be automated, it will free up time for federal employees to do non-routine, high-value work that often involves human judgment. Bots usually require fewer technology resources and can be implemented quickly at a lower cost than traditional software.

In its Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 *Agency Financial Report* (AFR), GSA reported on its RPA program by highlighting the progress of deployed bots. The report stated that over 70 bots automated a diverse number of tasks and "they allow GSA to reclaim more than 240,000 work hours every year."

In 2019, GSA's Chief Financial Officer took the lead role within the RPA Community of Practice for the federal community. The RPA Community of Practice wrote a best practices guide called the *RPA Program Playbook* to assist GSA and other federal agencies in implementing RPA programs and bot usage. The OCFO created the RPA Office within GSA to manage and create bots for the entire Agency.

The *RPA Program Playbook* establishes guidelines to select processes that are the most impactful for bot development and deployment (that is, what activities can bots perform quicker and cheaper than humans). One of these guidelines is to estimate the bot's annualized capacity, which is the total number of hours in a year an employee performs the task. Currently within GSA, the bot's process owner, often a supervisor, provides the calculation to the RPA program by estimating how long the task takes to complete, how many employees perform the task, and how often the task is performed.

GSA's RPA program uses several other guidelines to support developing a potential bot, including the following: (1) the bot can be used by multiple regions, (2) no alternate solutions already exist, (3) the bot leverages GSA-approved technologies, and (4) the potential to reclaim work hours.

Once the bots are deployed, the *RPA Program Playbook* recommends evaluating the bots through the following steps:

Performance – Proactively monitor bots' performance for effectiveness and efficiency. Ensure the bots are providing their intended value to customers.

Cost and Impact Documentation – Calculate a reliable return on investment. Maintain cost and impact data.

Establish an Approved, Clearly Defined RPA Program Strategy – Gauge whether an RPA program is performing as intended. To do this, strong foundational documents need to convey the following: (1) clear, targeted goals for the RPA program in terms of scope and desired outcomes; (2) alignment between the RPA program's goals and mission and customer priorities; and (3) strategic metrics for the RPA program.

Report Initial RPA Program Metrics – Begin collecting metrics on RPA program performance. Suggested metrics include the following: (1) annualized capacity created in labor hours, (2) new capabilities deployed with workload savings, (3) total investment spent to date, and (4) average cost per deployed bot.

Capture Cost and Value Management Metrics – Capture costs and value management metrics to determine productivity and return on investment.

The *RPA Program Playbook* recognizes that different agencies are at different points in their RPA program development. The playbook provides a program maturity model to determine the robustness of internal controls required. The four levels of program maturity are: (1) start-up, (2) emerging, (3) impactful, and (4) high-performing. OCFO officials stated they assessed their RPA program at the high-performing level.

The *RPA Program Playbook* says high-performing programs have the following characteristics: (1) a robust plan to proactively test bots and (2) robust operations metrics. The playbook states that a key control objective is auditability at both the program level and individual automation level.

Results

Finding – GSA lacks evidence to support its claims that the RPA program is generating savings.

GSA lacks evidence to support its claims that its RPA program is generating savings. We found that GSA is not verifying the actual work hours saved with end-users of its bots. Because of this, GSA's assertion in its FY 2020 AFR that its RPA program reclaimed more than 240,000 work hours annually was inaccurate and unreliable. We also found that GSA is not tracking the costs associated with its bots, which precludes GSA from determining whether the bots are generating cost savings and a return on investment.

We describe these deficiencies below.

GSA Is Not Verifying Actual Work Hours Saved by Its Bots

GSA is not verifying the actual performance of its bots with end-users to determine whether the bots are generating actual work hours saved. Instead, the savings that GSA reports in the AFR are based on estimates that are created by the bot owners. While the RPA program has survey results showing that the bot owners stated the end result did meet or exceed their expectations, GSA did not include the end-users' assessment of the bots' performance in its evaluation. This is problematic because GSA's current procedures do not provide an actual assessment of the effectiveness of GSA's bots and has resulted in inaccurate and unreliable reporting.

GSA does not determine the actual work hours saved. The *RPA Program Playbook* addresses the need to ensure bot performance. It asserts that the key element of performance is "knowing whether the automations are performing as intended." The playbook also recommends proactively monitoring bots' performance for effectiveness to ensure that bots are providing intended value to customers.

However, GSA does not determine actual work hours saved when assessing the performance of its bots. Instead, GSA uses an estimate of work hours saved as part of its process to prioritize which bots to develop. These estimates quantify potential hours reclaimed by estimating how many people perform the task, how much time it takes to perform the task, and how often the task is performed. These numbers are annualized to calculate only estimated work hours saved.

For example, GSA estimated that one bot, the Monster to GCIMS [GSA Credential and Identity Management System] bot, would save 7,500 work hours per year. The table on the next page breaks down the total estimated hours.

Calculating the Monster to GCIMS Bot's Annual Work Hour Savings Estimate

<p>1. Determine the amount of time it takes the staff to perform the task per week.</p> <p>Multiply the number of people performing the task by the time needed to perform the task per week.</p>	<p>50 staff members x 3 hours per week = 150 work hours per week to perform the task</p>
<p>2. Annualize the weekly work hour savings.</p> <p>We calculated GSA used 50 weeks to annualize.</p>	<p>150 work hours per week x 50 weeks = 7,500 potential work hours saved per year</p>

GSA subsequently uses these estimates for reporting actual performance. To confirm the bot operates as designed, GSA relies on surveys of the process owners without actually assessing the effectiveness of the bots. GSA claims that the results of the process owner surveys demonstrate the RPA program is effective. GSA also pointed to the survey results indicating 80 percent of process owners responded that the bot exceeded or met their expectations while only 20 percent responded “lower.”

However, two risk assessments of the RPA program advised GSA to ensure the bots operate effectively and are evaluated on a periodic basis. According to the risk assessments, the RPA program needed to ensure that the “bot operates as designed” and that “bots are evaluated on a periodic basis to validate their compliance and operational effectiveness.”

While the survey results can be an effective feedback tool, this confirmation process does not fully address the issues identified in the risk assessments because the results are not verified with end-users’ actual performance, and there are no independent, objective measures that confirm the estimated work hours saved.

Inaccurate and unreliable reporting. GSA’s reliance on estimated—and not actual—work hours saved by its bots adversely affects its reporting on the RPA program. Specifically, we found that the work hours saved that GSA reported in its FY 2020 AFR were inaccurate and unreliable.

In its FY 2020 AFR, GSA claimed that its bots saved 240,000 work hours annually. To attempt to verify GSA’s claimed savings, we selected a sample of 10 bots among those with the highest amount of claimed work hours saved. The claimed savings for these 10 bots totaled 107,242 hours, or approximately 45 percent of GSA’s claimed work hours saved.¹

¹ $107,242 \div 240,000 = 44.7$ percent

We then asked the users of the 10 bots the following questions, which are similar to those GSA uses to determine its original estimated savings for the bots:

- How often do you perform the task?
- How much time to perform the task?
- Does the bot save any time?

We found that the actual results varied from the estimates for 9 of the 10 bots we sampled.² For example:

- Users consistently responded that the PBS Leasing Document Population bot, which GSA had estimated would save 3,650 work hours, did not save any time.
- Two bots with combined estimated savings of 15,000 work hours, the Fingerprint Adjudication/Notification and the Monster to GCIMS bots, were retired after 4 months. Therefore, these bots did not generate a year's worth of savings as projected in GSA's estimates, and the reported savings were overstated.
- The OCFO Project Closeout bot had estimated savings based on the task taking 90 minutes, whereas users reported time savings only averaged approximately 30 minutes.
- GSA claimed savings of 6,000 work hours for the Purchase Card Logging bot; however, this was 10 times the original estimate, which was based on five people saving 10 work hours per month—totaling 600 work hours per year.

The deficiencies described above demonstrate that the claimed savings GSA reported in its FY 2020 AFR were inaccurate and the estimates that GSA used were unreliable.

GSA's RPA Program Does Not Track Individual Bot Costs

The *RPA Program Playbook* describes the differentiating characteristics of a program as it advances from start-up to high-performing. One characteristic of a start-up program is tracking costs and developing statistics, such as return on investment, for each developed bot and for the program. The playbook recommends that a program design “cost and value metrics that enable accurate tracking of program return.”

Notwithstanding these recommendations, GSA's RPA program does not track individual bot costs, and is therefore unable to verify whether its bots are saving costs or providing a return on investment. The RPA program's survey of individual bot's owners indicated 74 percent of bots resulted in no cost avoidance. This is the same survey GSA used to claim that 80 percent of respondents replied that the bot met or exceeded their expectations.

² See **Appendix B** for details of how the number of estimated work hours saved was calculated for each of the 10 bots in our sample and a summary of the user feedback we obtained.

In sum, GSA lacks evidence to support its claims that the bots developed through its RPA program are generating savings. Accordingly, the OCFO should augment the processes it uses to demonstrate the RPA program is achieving the established goals of freeing up work hours and producing cost savings. The OCFO should develop the means to evaluate the effectiveness and work hours savings of the bots in GSA's RPA program. Developing a robust evaluation process or risk assessment that includes feedback from a bot's end-users would not only lead to accurate reporting of work hours saved, but could also lead to better decision-making on which bots to develop in the future.

Conclusion

GSA lacks evidence to support its claims that its RPA program is generating savings. We found that GSA is not verifying the actual work hours saved with end-users of its bots. Because of this, GSA's assertion in its FY 2020 AFR that its RPA program reclaimed more than 240,000 work hours annually was inaccurate and unreliable. We also found that GSA is not tracking the costs associated with its bots, which precludes GSA from determining whether the bots are generating cost savings and a return on investment.

The RPA program claims to be a high-performing program; therefore, the OCFO should have a robust evaluation system of bots that have been implemented, including getting feedback from the regular users of the bots. Further, tracking the costs of developing the bots will allow the RPA program to develop objective statistics, such as return on investment, as recommended by the *RPA Program Playbook*.

Recommendations

We recommend that the GSA Chief Financial Officer:

1. Establish a performance evaluation process for its bots to ensure they are performing as intended and that the RPA program is achieving its goals. As part of this effort, the OCFO should develop objective and auditable measures and metrics that support the work hours saved by bots, as described in the *RPA Program Playbook*.
2. Track the costs to develop each bot to allow the RPA program to develop objective statistics, such as return on investment.

GSA Comments

The GSA Chief Financial Officer acknowledged our finding and recommendations. The Agency's comments can be found in their entirety in **Appendix C**.

OIG Response

The GSA Chief Financial Officer acknowledged the finding and recommendations in the report. GSA stated the RPA program "has matured significantly" and it has already started to act on the recommendations. However, since these actions were in development or planned during fieldwork, we cannot verify when those actions were put in place. We did not test or review those actions.

Audit Team

This audit was managed out of the Great Lakes Region Audit Office and conducted by the individuals listed below:

Michael Lamonica	Regional Inspector General for Auditing
Franklin Moy	Audit Manager
Robert Lange	Auditor-In-Charge

Appendix A – Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Objective

Our audit objective was to determine whether GSA effectively uses bots to free up work hours and achieve cost savings.

Scope and Methodology

We evaluated GSA's claim in its FY 2020 AFR that its RPA program reclaimed more than 240,000 work hours annually, as well as the program's internal controls.

To accomplish our objective, we:

- Reviewed GSA policies related to its RPA program, including the *RPA Program Playbook*, an addendum to the playbook, and the RPA program charter;
- Reviewed two risk assessments, performed by an independent consulting firm and the GSA Chief Financial Officer's Internal Control Division, and related internal controls;
- Analyzed GSA's claim that its RPA program reclaimed 240,000 work hours annually;
- Selected a judgmental sample of 10 bots to confirm the claimed work hours saved;
- Compared an original estimate of work hours saved for each sampled bot to the current users' reported usage of the bot; and
- Held discussions and corresponded with OCFO officials and bot users.

Data Reliability

We assessed the reliability of work hours saved by comparing the total hours reported in GSA's FY 2020 AFR to the original estimate documents. We surveyed users of the 10 sampled bots regarding their estimated time savings. We determined that the original estimate documents and sampled user responses were sufficiently reliable for the purposes of this audit.

Sampling

To complete our objective, we selected a sample of 10 of the 70 bots GSA claimed saved 240,000 work hours annually in its FY 2020 AFR. We selected the bots from those with the highest amount of claimed work hours saved. GSA reported that these 10 bots saved 107,242 work hours, which is approximately 45 percent of the 240,000 saved work hours reported in the FY 2020 AFR. The 10 sampled bots are listed in ***Appendix B***.

Internal Controls

We assessed internal controls significant within the context of our audit objective against GAO-14-704G, *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*. The methodology above describes the scope of our assessment, and the report finding includes any internal control deficiencies we identified. Our assessment is not intended to provide assurance on GSA's internal control structure as a whole. GSA management is responsible for establishing and maintaining internal controls.

Compliance Statement

We conducted the audit between May 2021 and February 2023 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. 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 finding and conclusions based on our audit objective.

Appendix B – Sampled Bots

SAMPLED BOTS WITH USER FEEDBACK				
Bot Name	Claimed Hours Saved	Basis for the Original Estimated Hours Saved	Summary of User Feedback	Notes
MRAS (Market Research as a Service) Commodity Market Research, Distribution List Comparative Analysis, and Price Analysis Report	36,000	The 2-hour process is performed by 90 people. Each person performs it 200 times per year.	The bot gets used, but with highly variable results—from “does not save me any time” to “substantial” time savings.	1
PBS RETA (RWA Entry Tracking and Application) Request Assignment Process	12,000	“Guesstimated,” based on experience.	The bot has some issues, such as downtime. It is useful and saves a modest amount of time.	1
OCFO Project Close Out	11,400	7,600 projects completed per year; bot is supposed to save 1.5 hours per project.	Consistent feedback that this bot is effective and saves time. Most users estimate time savings is below the 1.5 hours in the original estimate.	1
Total Workplace RPA Process	8,000	160 hours weekly.	We received feedback from only one user. That user finds it helpful, but did not provide support for hours saved.	1
IRIS (Inventory Reporting Information System) Data Entry and Project Updates	8,232	The process will save 1 hour each time it is performed. 24 people each perform the process 343 times per year.	Generally useful bot, inconsistent usage.	1
Fingerprint Adjudication/Notification	7,500	Approximately 60 personnel will save approximately 2.5 hours per week.	The bot was suspended due to concerns about another bot that needed to be run before this bot.	2
Monster to GCIMS (GSA Credential and Identity Management System) Data Migration	7,500	About 50 people perform the task; estimated to save 3-4 hours per person per week.	The bot did not perform as intended during the pilot; therefore, it was suspended and is not in use.	2

SAMPLED BOTS WITH USER FEEDBACK				
Bot Name	Claimed Hours Saved	Basis for the Original Estimated Hours Saved	Summary of User Feedback	Notes
Receiving Reports Process Automation (Phase 1)	7,000	<p>Estimated 0.5 hours (30 minutes) saved per receiving report and then rounded up.</p> <p>There are 1,124 contracts, each with 12 monthly receiving reports, for a total of 13,488 reports.</p> <p>Multiplying 13,488 reports by 30 minutes saved per report is 404,640 minutes saved, or 6,744 hours; rounded to 7,000 hours.</p>	Most respondents used this bot and found it helpful and that it saved time. Most reported 30 minutes of time saved.	3
Purchase Card Logging	6,000	Five people save 10 hours each per month.	Feedback varied from “it saves time” to “it wastes time.”	1, 4
Document Population from Systems/Documents (PBS Leasing Document Population)	3,610	315 people perform the process; no other information (that is, how many times performed, how long each performance takes).	Some users reported “minimal” savings; some users reported no savings at all.	5
Total	107,242			

Notes:

1. Six bots (total claimed work hours saved = 81,632): Bots had users with a variety of feedback. Some bots had most users report that the bot saved time, yet less time than the original estimate used. Other bots in this group had some users report lots of time saved, while other users of the same bot reported no time saved. We conclude that either the estimate is overstated or that there is not enough information to confirm the full amount of the original estimate. For example, the RPA program does not confirm the actual list of users or how often the task is performed.
2. Two bots (total claimed work hours saved = 15,000): Bots were suspended after 4 months.
3. One bot (total claimed work hours saved = 7,000): Bot had consistent feedback of saving the original estimated time.
4. One bot (total claimed work hours saved = 6,000): Original estimate for this bot was for 600 hours estimated time, but was claimed to have saved 6,000 hours.
5. One bot (total claimed work hours saved = 3,610): Bot had consistent feedback of not saving time, with insufficient information to support original estimate calculation. Therefore, we consider the work hours saved to be overestimated.

Appendix C – GSA Comments

DocuSign Envelope ID: 9D37E8C8-E47F-4069-88A8-B59DF000B593



Office of the Chief Financial Officer

October 23, 2023

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL LAMONICA
REGIONAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITING
GREAT LAKES REGION AUDIT OFFICE (JA-5)

FROM: NIMISHA AGARWAL *(Signature)*
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER (B)

SUBJECT: Response to the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Draft Report,
*GSA's Robotic Process Automation Program Lacks Evidence to Support
Claimed Savings*, Assignment Number A210057

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Office of the Inspector General's draft report, *GSA's Robotic Process Automation Program Lacks Evidence to Support Claimed Savings*, (A210057).

GSA OCFO founded its Robotic Process Automation (RPA) Program approximately five years ago, and since its inception, the program has continuously evolved, adapted, and enhanced its capabilities to meet the needs of GSA. The RPA Program now includes process optimization, intelligent automation, and non-RPA automation (e.g., scripting, sensory tools). Throughout that time, the main objective of the program has remained the same: to simplify and automate regularly occurring routine tasks and processes to allow employees to focus on higher-value, non-routine work. In fact, the program is now part of the Process Optimization and Automation Division where RPA is one of the many ways in which OCFO pursues efficiencies across the agency.

The OIG began its review of the program shortly after it was established with the stated objective "to determine whether GSA effectively uses bots to free up work hours and achieve cost savings." Even though the fieldwork and interviews for the draft report concluded approximately two years ago, the GSA OCFO has continued to evolve and

U.S. General Services Administration
Street Address of the FROM official
City, State Zip
www.gsa.gov

be a Government pioneer in RPA. The GSA OCFO has since become the first Federal agency to serve as an enterprise RPA provider and to implement RPA and other emerging automation technologies across multiple business functions.

The RPA Program has matured significantly in the five years that have elapsed since its creation and many of the capabilities identified as lacking in the report were either in development or planned during the initiation and fieldwork work stages of the audit and have now become fully operational. The responses to the individual recommendations below provide additional data points and quantifiable results that show that the program is now operating as intended.

For this reason, the OCFO believes the report finding and recommendations may summarize a less mature Program and that in its current state, the GSA RPA program has addressed the recommendations offered by the OIG. We look forward to working with the OIG as this program continues to mature.

Additional information specific to each recommendation is contained below.

OCFO Response to IG Report Findings

IG Recommendation 1: "We recommend that GSA's Chief Financial Officer: Establish a performance evaluation process for its bots to ensure they are performing as intended and that the RPA program is achieving its goals. As part of this effort, the OCFO should develop objective and auditable measures and metrics that support the work hours saved by bots, as described in the RPA Program Playbook." (Completed)

The GSA RPA Program established the following measurement tools during and after the audit fieldwork:

- Routine automation impact survey, initiated in March 2021, that leverages process owners to assess the effectiveness of bots in operation post-deployment.
 - To date, more than 80 percent of process owners (from 71 automations) indicated the automation met or exceeded customer expectations for workload elimination.
 - Process and system owners have increasingly sought to leverage automation, as conveyed by the significant growth in the RPA project pipeline. These statistics indicate high customer satisfaction and tangible impact achieved by deployed automations.
- Advanced operational metrics dashboarding capabilities that provide daily insights into automation execution impact for the RPA Program, including but not limited to:
 - Monitoring automation job performance, successes and failures.
 - Error monitoring to address recurring issues.
 - Custodian run automation impacts.
 - Process timeline and usage tracking.
 - Detailed metrics on transactions within queues.
- Formal acceptance criteria implemented as part of the automation intake process, including documentation requirements for all phases of RPA assessment and development. New criteria assessed for every potential automation include:
 - Cost (e.g., money savings, avoidance, FTE time savings)
 - Speed (e.g., improved cycle time, improved lead time)
 - Quality (e.g., error proofing, customer experience and satisfaction, compliance)
 - Mission alignment (e.g., criticality of function, alignment with organizational goals)
 - Suitability for automation (e.g., IT systems impacted, process complexity, volume)

IG Recommendation 2: "Track the costs to develop each bot to allow the RPA program to develop objective statistics, such as return on investment." GSA concurs with the tracking of costs, but not at the automation level. (Completed)

The OCFO Process Optimization and Automation Division collects and will continue to monitor automation costs and impacts of automations at the program level. One of the key objectives of the program is to automate low-value repetitive tasks and calculating a typical return on investment (ROI) for individual automations can be cost prohibitive. The initial RPA Program designed the Eliminate-Optimize-Automate framework that became part of the President's Management Agenda—CAP Goal 6—and was introduced as a governmentwide best practice. As mentioned above, the program has since evolved to focus on more than just RPA as a means to optimize and automate business processes.

A typical ROI for business process improvement efforts are long-term savings or benefits such as:

- **Increased Business** - Delivered a series of automation solutions to a GSA program office to streamline how customer agencies research procurement needs, enabling an 819 percent increase in program business volume.
- **Cost Avoidance** - In addition to workload capacity added, enabled a GSA program office to cumulatively avoid \$1.7M over the past 4 years in interest costs through automation.
- **Reusability** - An automation initially developed as a one-time solution to assist the Acquisition community in modifying 8,000+ contracts to satisfy the Section 889 changes to the FAR was able to be reused multiple times for future unilateral mass modifications, thereby increasing the initial estimated workload capacity each time it has been executed with no new development needed.
- **Fostering** - Founded the Government's Federal RPA Community of Practice (COP), a best practices sharing organization, which has grown to over 1,600 members, representing 100+ agencies and sub-components. GSA has mentored many of these agencies to establish and scale their own effective RPA programs, thus upskilling the Federal workforce.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Kathy Hammer at kathy.hammer@gsa.gov.

Appendix D – Report Distribution

GSA Administrator (A)

GSA Deputy Administrator (AD)

Office of Financial Management (BG)

Robotics Process Automation Division (BGR)

Chief Financial Officer (B)

Deputy Chief Financial Officer (B)

Office of Audit Management and Accountability (BA)

Assistant Inspector General for Auditing (JA)

Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Acquisition Audits (JA)

Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Real Property Audits (JA)

Director, Audit Planning, Policy, and Operations Staff (JAO)