

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the American public relies on Federal supervisors to lead a workforce that provides high-quality customer service and faithful execution of the law.

These expectations and standards require a level of professionalism that can be improved by strengthening relevant education offerings available to Federal supervisors. My bill would do just that, by bolstering existing requirements in Federal law governing Federal workforce training.

Various reports and memos from agencies such as the GAO, Office of Personnel Management, and the Merit Systems Protection Board indicate a need to improve relevant educational opportunities for Federal supervisors.

The Federal Supervisor Education Act, a bipartisan bill dating back to the 114th Congress, articulates and executes best practices in relation to Federal supervisory training, including how to effectively manage employees with unacceptable performance.

These are basic, nonpartisan concepts that are generally available to private-sector business supervisors and, if implemented, would advance the interests of good government and strengthen the Federal workforce on behalf of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5810, the Federal Supervisor Education Act of 2025. The bill was reported favorably by the Oversight Committee unanimously on December 2 with bipartisan support.

The bill would require Federal agencies to create and implement training and development programs for agency supervisors. These programs will help improve their management skills, communicate with their colleagues, and mentor fellow employees. It will also help them when it comes to knowing what is prohibited when it comes to personnel practices, employee rights, and how those rights must be protected.

A lot of these Federal agency supervisors actually live in my district. Those supervisors should know that they won't have to do this annually. This is once every 3 years. This will be beneficial to our agencies and to the supervisors as well.

I thank the majority for incorporating feedback from the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WALKINSHAW) and committee Democrats prior to the bill

reaching the floor. Due to this, committee Democrats unanimously supported this legislation in markup.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I also thank the House Oversight Committee for unanimously supporting my legislation in a recent markup. Given the bill's advancement of good-government principles, I urge my colleagues to vote for this long overdue legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5810, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING AGENCY MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF SOFTWARE ASSETS ACT

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5457) to improve the visibility, accountability, and oversight of agency software asset management practices, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5457

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Agency Management and Oversight of Software Assets Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code, except that such term does not include an element of the intelligence community.

(3) CLOUD COMPUTING.—The term "cloud computing" has the meaning given the term in Special Publication 800-145 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or any successor document.

(4) CLOUD SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term "cloud service provider" has the meaning given the term in section 3607(b) of title 44, United States Code.

(5) COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT.—The term "comprehensive assessment" means a comprehensive assessment conducted pursuant to section 3(a).

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term "intelligence community" has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

(8) PLAN.—The term "plan" means the plan developed by a Chief Information Officer, or equivalent official, pursuant to section 4(a).

(9) SOFTWARE ENTITLEMENT.—The term "software entitlement" means any software that—

(A) has been purchased, leased, or licensed by or billed to an agency under any contract or other business arrangement; and

(B) is subject to use limitations.

(10) SOFTWARE INVENTORY.—The term "software inventory" means the software inventory of an agency required pursuant to—

(A) section 2(b)(2)(A) of the Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016 (40 U.S.C. 11302 note; Public Law 114-210); or

(B) subsequent guidance issued by the Director pursuant to that Act.

SEC. 3. SOFTWARE INVENTORY UPDATE AND EXPANSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, and not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief Information Officer of each agency, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, the Chief Acquisition Officer, the Chief Data Officer, and General Counsel of the agency, or the equivalent officials of the agency, shall complete a comprehensive assessment of the software paid for by, in use at, or deployed throughout the agency, which shall include—

(1) the current software inventory of the agency, including software entitlements, contracts and other agreements or arrangements of the agency, and a list of the largest software entitlements of the agency separated by provider and category of software;

(2) a comprehensive, detailed accounting of—

(A) any software used by or deployed within the agency, including software developed or built by the agency, or by another agency for use by the agency, including shared services, as of the date of the comprehensive assessment, including, to the extent identifiable, the contracts and other agreements or arrangements used by the agency to acquire, build, deploy, or use such software;

(B) information and data on software entitlements, which shall include information on any additional fees or costs, including fees or costs for the use of cloud services, that are not included in the initial costs of the contract, agreement, or arrangement—

(i) for which the agency pays;

(ii) that are not deployed or in use by the agency; and

(iii) that are billed to the agency under any contract or business arrangement that creates duplication, or are otherwise determined to be unnecessary by the Chief Information Officer of the agency, or the equivalent official, in the deployment or use by the agency; and

(C) the extent—

(i) to which any software paid for, in use, or deployed throughout the agency is interoperable; and

(ii) of the efforts of the agency to improve interoperability of software assets throughout the agency enterprise;

(3) a categorization of software entitlements of the agency by cost, volume, and type of software;

(4) a list of any provisions in the software entitlements of the agency that may restrict how the software can be deployed, accessed, or used, including any such restrictions on desktop or server hardware, through a cloud service provider, or on data ownership or access; and

(5) an analysis addressing—

(A) the accuracy and completeness of the comprehensive assessment;

(B) agency management of and compliance with all contracts or other agreements or arrangements that include or reference software entitlements or software management within the agency;

(C) the extent to which the agency accurately captures the total cost of software entitlements and related costs, including the

total cost of upgrades over the life of a contract, cloud usage costs, and any other cost associated with the maintenance or servicing of contracts; and

(D) compliance with software license management policies of the agency.

(b) **CONTRACT SUPPORT.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—The head of an agency may enter into 1 or more contracts to support the requirements of subsection (a).

(2) **NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST.**—Contracts under paragraph (1) shall not include contractors with organizational conflicts of interest, within the meaning given that term under subpart 9.5 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(3) **OPERATIONAL INDEPENDENCE.**—Over the course of a comprehensive assessment, contractors hired pursuant to paragraph (1) shall maintain operational independence from the integration, management, and operations of the software inventory and software entitlements of the agency.

(c) **SUBMISSION.**—On the date on which the Chief Information Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Acquisition Officer, the Chief Data Officer, and General Counsel of an agency, or the equivalent officials of the agency, complete the comprehensive assessment, the Chief Information Officer shall submit the comprehensive assessment to the head of the agency.

(d) **SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the head of an agency receives the comprehensive assessment under subsection (c), the head of the agency shall submit the comprehensive assessment to—

(1) the Director;

(2) the Administrator;

(3) the Comptroller General of the United States;

(4) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(5) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(e) **CONSULTATION.**—In order to ensure the utility and standardization of the comprehensive assessment of each agency, including to support the development of each plan and the report required under section 4(e)(2), the Director, in consultation with the Administrator, shall share information, best practices, and recommendations relating to the activities performed in the course of a comprehensive assessment of an agency.

(f) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—For each element of the intelligence community, a comprehensive assessment described under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) conducted separately;

(2) performed only by an entity designated by the head of the element of the intelligence community, in accordance with appropriate applicable laws;

(3) performed in such a manner as to ensure appropriate protection of information which, if disclosed, may adversely affect national security; and

(4) submitted in summary form, not later than 30 days after the date on which the head of the element of the intelligence community receives the assessment, by the head of the element of the intelligence community to—

(A) the Director;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. SOFTWARE MODERNIZATION PLANNING AT AGENCIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief Information Officer of each agency, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, the Chief Acquisition Officer, the Chief Data Officer, and the General Counsel of the agency, or the equiv-

alent officials of the agency, shall use the information developed pursuant to the comprehensive assessment of the agency to develop a plan for the agency—

(1) to consolidate software entitlements of the agency;

(2) to ensure that, in order to improve the performance of, and reduce unnecessary costs to, the agency, the Chief Information Officer, Chief Data Officer, and Chief Acquisition Officer of the agency, or the equivalent officers, develop criteria and procedures for how the agency will adopt cost-effective acquisition strategies, including enterprise licensing, across the agency that reduce costs, eliminate excess licenses, and improve performance; and

(3) to restrict the ability of a bureau, program, component, or operational entity within the agency to acquire, use, develop, or otherwise leverage any software entitlement (or portion thereof) without the approval of the Chief Information Officer of the agency, in consultation with the Chief Acquisition Officer of the agency, or the equivalent officers of the agency.

(b) **PLAN REQUIREMENTS.**—The plan of an agency shall—

(1) include a detailed strategy for—

(A) the remediation of any software asset management deficiencies found during the comprehensive assessment of the agency;

(B) the ongoing maintenance of software asset management upon the completion of the remediation;

(C) automation of software license management processes and incorporation of discovery tools across the agency;

(D) ensuring that officers and employees of the agency are adequately trained in the policies, procedures, rules, regulations, and guidance relating to the software acquisition and development of the agency before entering into any agreement relating to any software entitlement (or portion thereof) for the agency, including training on—

(i) negotiating options within contracts to address and minimize provisions that restrict how the agency may deploy, access, or use the software, including restrictions on deployment, access, or use on desktop or server hardware and restrictions on data ownership or access;

(ii) the differences between acquiring commercial software products and services and acquiring or building custom software; and

(iii) determining the costs of different types of licenses and options for adjusting licenses to meet increasing or decreasing demand; and

(E) maximizing the effectiveness of software deployed by the agency, including, to the extent practicable, leveraging technologies that—

(i) measure actual software usage via analytics that can identify inefficiencies to assist in rationalizing software spending;

(ii) allow for segmentation of the user base;

(iii) support effective governance and compliance in the use of software; and

(iv) support interoperable capabilities between software;

(2) identify categories of software the agency could prioritize for conversion to more cost-effective software licenses, including enterprise licenses, as the software entitlements, contracts, and other agreements or arrangements come up for renewal or renegotiation;

(3) provide an estimate of the costs to move toward more enterprise, open-source, or other licenses that do not restrict the use of software by the agency, and the projected cost savings, efficiency measures, and improvements to agency performance throughout the total software lifecycle;

(4) identify potential mitigations to minimize software license restrictions on how such software can be deployed, accessed, or used, including any mitigations that would minimize any such restrictions on desktop or server hardware, through a cloud service provider, or on data ownership or access;

(5) ensure that the purchase by the agency of any software is based on publicly available criteria that are not unduly structured to favor any specific vendor, unless prohibited by law (including regulation);

(6) include any estimates for additional resources, services, or support the agency may need to implement the plan;

(7) provide information on the prevalence of software products in use across multiple software categories; and

(8) include any additional information, data, or analysis determined necessary by the Chief Information Officer, or other equivalent official, of the agency.

(c) **SUPPORT.**—The Chief Information Officer, or other equivalent official, of an agency may request support from the Director and the Administrator for any analysis or developmental needs to create the plan of the agency.

(d) **AGENCY SUBMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the head of an agency submits the comprehensive assessment pursuant to section 3(d), the head of the agency shall submit to the Director, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives the plan of the agency.

(2) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the head of an element of the intelligence community submits the summary assessment pursuant to section 3(f)(4), the head of the element shall separately submit the plan of the element to the Director, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(e) **CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.**—The Director—

(1) in coordination with the Administrator, the Chief Information Officers Council, the Chief Acquisition Officers Council, the Chief Data Officers Council, the Chief Financial Officers Council, and other government and industry representatives identified by the Director, shall establish processes, using existing reporting functions, as appropriate, to identify, define, and harmonize common definitions, terms and conditions, standardized requirements, and other information and criteria to support agency heads in developing and implementing the plans required by this section; and

(2) in coordination with the Administrator, and not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report detailing recommendations to leverage Government procurement policies and practices with respect to software acquired by, developed by, deployed within, or in use at 1 or more agencies to—

(A) increase the interoperability of software licenses, including software entitlements and software built by Government agencies;

(B) consolidate licenses, as appropriate;

(C) reduce costs;

(D) improve performance; and

(E) modernize the management and oversight of software entitlements and software built by Government agencies, as identified through an analysis of agency plans.

SEC. 5. GAO REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on—

- (1) Government-wide trends in agency software asset management practices;
- (2) comparisons of software asset management practices among agencies;
- (3) the establishment by the Director of processes to identify, define, and harmonize common definitions, terms, and conditions under section 4(e);
- (4) agency compliance with the restrictions on contract support under section 3(b); and
- (5) other analyses of and findings regarding the plans of agencies, as determined by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 6. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Federal agencies spend billions of dollars a year on software licenses without a full understanding of what they are purchasing and how it compares to what they are already paying for. The result is wasteful spending on duplicative or unnecessary software licenses.

H.R. 5457 requires Federal agencies to take an inventory of their software licenses to better understand how it is used, who uses it, and how many licenses go unused. The bill will also provide Congress with better insights into how our Federal agencies purchase and use software.

The text we are considering today is identical to the text we passed out of the House by voice vote last Congress. This bill improves government software purchasing without unduly limiting the procurement options of Federal agencies.

It requires each agency to better manage its software and develop a plan for addressing any costly, unnecessary licenses. This will reduce wasteful spending and improve government efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. BROWN for bringing this important legislation back to this Congress. I also thank Mr. FALLON and Ms. MACE for their early and continued support of this bill.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a great bill, and I support it. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. BROWN), the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5457, the Strengthening Agency Management and Oversight of Software Assets Act.

The SAMOSA Act is a straightforward, good-government bill that has strong bipartisan support from members of the Oversight Committee. I reintroduced this legislation earlier this year with Congresswoman MACE, the chair of the Oversight Committee's Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation; Congressman PAT FALLON; and Congresswoman APRIL MCCLAIN DELANEY as co-leads. I thank them for their support.

I will also take a moment to recognize the late Congressman CONNOLLY, who worked tirelessly on this legislation and who had introduced the SAMOSA Act prior to his passing.

This is legislation that will improve the acquisition process for Federal agencies, help the government better manage software needs, and ultimately save taxpayer dollars.

□ 1500

Agencies across the Federal Government spend around \$33 billion in taxpayer money on software every year, but right now, many agencies don't actually have a list of what they own, what they are fully using, or whether they are buying the same thing twice.

That doesn't make any sense, and this bill solves the problem.

This bill streamlines how agencies track, manage, and report their software assets by requiring complete assessments on the software paid for, used, or deployed at each agency.

It also requires agencies to submit these assessments to the Office of Management and Budget, the General Services Administration, and Congress so that Congress and these agencies can oversee spending and contracting software practices.

By requiring agencies to do these assessments and review software assets, this bill can improve planning for software management, automate processes, train staff, and improve our cybersecurity.

Here is a key point: Industry experts estimate the bill could save up to \$750 million each year in taxpayer funding. This is real government efficiency, and it is from legislation that has gone through committee with support and input from both sides of the aisle.

As the legislative year comes to a close, let's pass the SAMOSA Act and lower costs for taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation that will reduce wasteful spending and improve government efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5457, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF UNITED STATES ARMY SPECIALIST SARAH BECKSTROM AND UNITED STATES AIR FORCE STAFF SERGEANT ANDREW WOLFE, WHO WERE TRAGICALLY SHOT IN WASHINGTON, D.C., IN A TARGETED ASSAULT AGAINST UNITED STATES SERVICE MEMBERS ON NOVEMBER 26, 2025

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 923) a resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of United States Army Specialist Sarah Beckstrom and United States Air Force Staff Sergeant Andrew Wolfe, who were tragically shot in Washington, D.C., in a targeted assault against United States servicemembers on November 26, 2025, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 923

Whereas, on the afternoon of November 26, 2025, members of the National Guard on patrol in Washington, D.C. as part of the D.C. Safe and Beautiful Task Force were violently assaulted with gunfire in a vicious, targeted attack;

Whereas United States Army Specialist Sarah Beckstrom and United States Air Force Staff Sergeant Andrew Wolfe, both members of the West Virginia National Guard, sustained severe gunshot wounds during the attack;

Whereas Specialist Beckstrom succumbed to her injuries and passed away surrounded by her loved ones on November 27, 2025, making the ultimate sacrifice in service to her country;

Whereas Staff Sergeant Wolfe was hospitalized before a transfer to an in-patient rehabilitation facility;

Whereas United States Army Specialist Sarah Beckstrom, who was 20 years old at the time of her passing, was from Summersville, West Virginia, enlisted on June 6, 2023, weeks after graduating with honors from Webster County High School, and was assigned to the 863rd Military Police Company, 11th Engineer Brigade of the West Virginia Army National Guard;