National Industrial Security Program Policy Advisory Committee (NISPPAC)

Meeting Minutes

March 14, 2018

The NISPPAC held its 58th meeting on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), 700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. Mark Bradley, Director, Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO), served as Chair. The minutes of this meeting were certified on May 4, 2018.

I. Welcome:
The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, and then discussed the importance of the NISPPAC Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) requirements. He commented on the FACA mandated submission of annual financial disclosure statements by NISPPAC government members and expressed his appreciation for this year’s submissions. After introductions by all attendees, the Chair expressed his appreciation to outgoing Department of Defense (DoD) NISPPAC primary member, Ben Richardson, for his dedication to the NISPPAC. The Chair then recognized the newest government NISPPAC members:

- Richard Townsend, (Primary member), Department of Commerce (DOC)
- Kishla Braxton, (Alternate member), DOC
- Christoph Heilig, (Alternate member), Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
- Tracy Kindle, (Alternate member), Department of Energy (DOE)

He also expressed appreciation to the following three outgoing government members for their dedication and service to the NISPPAC:

- Thomas Predmore, (Primary member), DOC
- Will Ewald, (Alternate member), NRC
- Mark Pekrul, (Alternate member), DOE

List of meeting attendees is provided (Attachment 1).

The Chair turned to Greg Pannoni, NISPPAC Designated Federal Official (DFO), to address administrative items and old business.

II. Administrative Items

Mr. Pannoni reminded attendees that all presentations and handouts were provided in electronic format prior to the meeting and that the transcript, along with the minutes and presentations for this meeting, would be posted to the ISOO website. He also informed attendees that all NISPPAC meetings are announced in the Federal Register 30 days prior to the meeting.
III. Old Business

Action Items from Previous Meetings
Mr. Pannoni addressed and provided updates to the NISPPAC action items from the November 1, 2017 meeting:

- ISOO to ensure NISPPAC government members have submitted annual financial disclosure statements.
  STATUS: CLOSED. ISOO has received the requested information from all NISPPAC government members.

- Defense Security Service (DSS) to inquire on the capability of the National Industrial Security System (NISS) to have a “best practices” section for users.
  STATUS: OPEN. DSS to provide follow up during this meeting.

- Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) to inquire on the capability of the Defense Information System for Security (DISS) to have a “best practices” section for users.
  STATUS: OPEN. DMDC to provide follow up during this meeting.

- DMDC to determine how to incorporate the remaining Executive branch agencies into the DISS.
  STATUS: OPEN. DMDC to provide follow up during this meeting.

- DOE to determine releasability of the DOE/DoD Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
  STATUS: OPEN. DoD to provide follow up during this meeting.

IV. Reports and Updates

Update on the National Background Investigations Bureau (NBIB)
Charlie Phalen, NBIB, provided an update (Attachment 2) on the clearance backlog, current statistics, and strategies for improvement. He stated the current backlog remains at approximately 700,000, but that the general perception that all of those applicants cannot work, is inaccurate.

He explained that of the 700,000 cases, 164,000 are quick turnaround tasks which can be resolved easily and in a manner of hours or a few days. Approximately 209,000 of these cases are periodic reinvestigations (PR) and involve applicants who are currently working.

The remaining 337,000 cases, 38,000 of which are industry requests, are initial investigations. There are approximately 170,000 initial applicants with interim clearances.

Mr. Phalen expressed his displeasure with the current statistics and provided the following three strategies NBIB is using to improve clearance processing times: continued increase in NBIB personnel (current total is 7,200); collaboration with the government and industry to work a large
volume of cases, all in the same area; and hubbing, which involves working a large number of cases in one specific location.

Mr. Phalen also explained that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) recently reinitiated an old program, Trusted Workforce, now Trusted Workforce 2.0, to review the clearance process and find the most effective method of ensuring that those with clearances continue to be trustworthy. The program will attempt to identify those indicators that may bring a cleared person’s trustworthiness into question.

Mr. Phalen identified two dependencies directly correlated with decreasing the clearance backlog: careful management of cases during the 2 to 3-year transition of investigations to DoD; and the creation of the National Background Investigation Services, a Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) system which will conduct suitability, security, and credentialing investigations for DoD. Mr. Phalen concluded his presentation by stating he believes that by the end of this year, the clearance backlog will decrease by 15-20%.

Michelle Sutphin, Industry Spokesperson, asked if NBIB plans to share best practices on the new investigative model once the mission is transferred to DSS. Mr. Phalen stated that NBIB is already collaborating with DSS and plans to continue throughout the transition.

Dennis Keith, Industry, asked Mr. Phalen for clarification on what the 15-20% decrease in clearance inventory encompasses. Mr. Phalen explained that those cases with field work as well as Tier (T) 3 investigations would be most affected. Mr. Keith asked if the 65,000 industry members awaiting initial clearances would be prioritized over PRs when the hubbing concept is applied. Mr. Phalen stated prioritization is determined by the government, but that most customers are interested in the completion of initial investigations.

Mr. Pannoni asked if the 15 to 20% decrease in the overall backlog would also result in a 15 to 20% decrease in the timeliness of these cases. Mr. Phalen explained that due to system tracking methods, some would show a decrease and others, an increase. Over time, the decrease will begin to show in the overall numbers.

Linda Kiser, Industry, asked why the Top Secret processing times are continuing to increase. Mr. Phalen stated he would have to do significant research to provide a valid reason. He said he believes it is due to prioritization.

Industry Presentation

Ms. Sutphin, provided an industry update (Attachment 3). She introduced the new Intelligence and National Security Alliance representative, Kathy Pherson, and stated there have been no additional changes to the NISPPAC industry group. She explained that industry’s concerns remain the same as stated at the November 2017 meeting. Industry is concerned with the large number of policy-related changes as well as its ability to implement in a timely manner. It is also frustrated by the continuing backlog of clearance investigations but is appreciative of the opportunity to work with NBIB during this time. Ms. Sutphin expressed industry’s desire to
comply with the changes, but asked that the government provide sufficient lead time so that it can prepare for the new procedures.

Ms. Sutphin stated industry received and appreciated the detailed presentation on DSS in Transition (DIT) by Gus Greene, DSS. Industry is interested in feedback from the 60 companies that will participate this year in a full DIT based review. Industry is also following the effect of DIT on small companies, as well as DSS recommendations outside the scope of the NISP.

Ms. Sutphin stated industry has reviewed the draft Industrial Security Letters (ISL) for Security Executive Agent Directives (SEAD) 3 and 4. It has provided feedback on SEAD 4 and will be doing the same with SEAD 3.

Ms. Sutphin listed the following additional industry concerns:

- **Clearances:** Issues include clearance reform, transition of investigations from NBIB to DoD, Continuous Evaluation (CE), and proper funding and resources, especially during the parallel processing period of the investigations transfer to DoD.
- **Small contractor lack of resources:** Small contractors do not have the resources to meet the multitude of new requirements and may opt out of the NISP.
- **Use of consultants by small contractors:** In an effort to meet the new requirements, small contractors need the assistance of consultants. Industry would like DSS to ensure consistency in handling these types of arrangements.

Ms. Sutphin discussed the new clearance-related systems:

- **NISS:** There is concern that the system will be deployed while a large percentage of industry does not have access and cannot get PKI cards to work.
- **DISS:** Industry needs sufficient training to use the system. As of now, there is no comprehensive training available.
- **NISP Contracts Classification System (NCCS):** Once there are more government agencies with established accounts, more contractors will follow, create accounts, and begin actively using the system.
- **eApp:** Industry is waiting for a go-live date and is interested in viewing a demo so that it can provide feedback.

Ms. Sutphin listed the following legislative initiatives and provided industry concerns/questions:

- **NDAA 2017 Section 1647, Formation of an “Advisory Committee on Industrial Security and Industrial Base Policy”**: Industry was informed that this committee is moving forward. Industry is prepared to assist, be involved, and have representation on the committee.
- **NDAA 2018 Section 805, Formation of “Defense Policy Advisory Committee on Technology”**: Industry would like to know more about the objective of this committee and is prepared to participate and have representation on the committee.

Jane Dinkel, Industry, asked how the Advisory Committee on Industrial Security and Industrial Base Policy would work with the NISPPAC. Chris Forrest, DSS, explained that the committee is in the beginning stages and that that determination has not yet been made. He assured Ms. Dinkel that the NISPPAC would be represented. Mr. Richardson, DoD, explained that before the
committee can determine its primary role, it must first identify the members who will make those decisions.

Kim Baugher, State Department, stated her office is seeing more companies with security services consultants and requested information on how to handle them. Keith Minard, DSS, stated DSS realizes it must review the issues associated with this type of arrangement and determine the best methods by which to manage security services consultants, while also ensuring cleared contractors maintain their responsibility for meeting the requirements of the NISP. Ms. Sutphin stressed that industry’s intent is to obtain consistent treatment and procedures for consultants so that all parties understand and adhere to the same guidelines. Ms. Sutphin stated industry provided a white paper on this topic to DSS and is looking forward to discussing the issue.

**Department of Defense (DoD) Update**

Ben Richardson, DoD, stated the transfer of investigations to DoD has begun and that NBIB and DSS are working together to ensure a successful transition. The transfer will be a 3-year phased process. Currently, DSS is focusing on DoD background investigations at the Secret level and on PRs using the CE model.

Mr. Richardson explained that a priority of DoD is the protection of critical technology which is being addressed via DIT. He referenced the white paper submitted by industry on consultants and assured industry that DSS will work to resolve the inconsistencies in handling consultants.

Mr. Richardson provided feedback on the DoD/DoE Reciprocity MOU and informed industry that DoD plans to issue an ISL with details. He stated the MOU itself cannot be released but that the ISL will provide sufficient details. Industry will have the opportunity to review and provide input before the ISL is released.

Mr. Richardson stated no decisions have been made on the Fee for Service proposal and that DoD has learned it needs to continue its study on the feasibility of this option. He also discussed SEAD 3 and stated DoD must first implement before it levies requirements on industry. One issue is ensuring there is an automated method by which foreign travel is reported. He explained that the intent is to provide guidance via NISP Operating Manual (NISPOM), Change 3, which is currently in the formal coordination phase. DoD is working on an ISL to provide guidance on passports. In the short term, DSS has provided guidance on its website.

Mr. Richardson addressed the status of the Advisory Committee on Industrial Security and Industrial Base Policy by reaffirming its status as a very new committee. Before it can move forward, members must be identified. There are five focus areas for this committee: personnel security, information security, cyber security, industrial base issues and physical security.

Mr. Keith asked if DoD would share more details with appropriately cleared personnel on the prioritization of technologies. Mr. Richardson stated there has been discussion on sharing but that there are issues with the aggregation of data which often results in a Top Secret classification. He offered that prioritization will be realized by industry as DSS continues to focus on certain technologies. Bob Harney, Industry, suggested that briefings in lieu of the
prioritization list would help to obtain industry buy-in. Mr. Richardson stated DoD is in discussion with DoD Acquisitions on this topic.

Ms. Dinkel stated industry is becoming concerned with the vulnerabilities associated with the compilation of asset-related data such as asset identification, protection of those assets and the impact of the loss of the assets. She asked if DoD had considered these same concerns. Mr. Greene stated DSS is building a repository to store the information but that eventually the data will be stored in the NISS.

Mr. Pannoni asked if the referenced technologies are limited to DoD. Mr. Richardson stated the information being provided to DSS is from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the Joint Staff. DoD is providing this list of technologies to other branches of government for informational purposes.

Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) Update
Valerie Kerben, ODNI, provided updates on SEADs 6, 7 and 8. SEAD 6, Continuous Evaluation, was signed on January 12, 2018 and agencies should be in the process of implementing the requirements for those with T5 investigations. SEAD 7, Reciprocity, is currently in the informal review stage and once completed, will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for formal coordination. SEAD 8, Temporary Access, is also in the informal review process.

Defense Security Service (DSS) Update
Keith Minard, DSS, provided an update on the insider threat program and stated core requirements have been implemented by 95% of industry. Phase 2 of the program is in development and will focus on evaluating the effectiveness of industry programs. DSS expects to begin pilot evaluations in mid-2018. Mr. Minard informed industry that DSS had just posted guidance on the foreign passports portion of SEAD 4.

Mr. Minard stated DSS has removed the Electronic Control Plan (ECP) phone requirements from those Foreign Ownership, Control, or Influence companies with ECPs. He also informed attendees that the new Certificate Pertaining to Foreign Interests, SF 328, would be released soon for a 60-day notice. He explained the changes are minimal and that the questions on the form have not changed.

NISP Contract Classification System (NCCS) Update
Ryan Deloney, DSS, provided an update on the NCCS. Mr. Deloney stated the system now hosts 40 government agencies and 150 contractors. DoD issued a memo on February 8, 2018, mandating use of the system by all DoD components by September 14, 2018. To assist DoD with meeting that deadline, DSS is creating job aids and web-based training. It is also establishing help desks and call center support for system users.

Ms. Baugher asked if there is a deadline for using the new DD 254, DOD Contract Security Classification Specification form, and if the old DD 254 would be rejected by DSS. Mr. Deloney acknowledged that DSS expects customers to use the new DD 254, but that if there is a valid justification for using the old form, customers can work with DSS for an exception.
NISS
Mr. Deloney gave an update on the NISS, the replacement system for the Industrial Security Facilities Database (ISFD) and eFCL. The system currently has 2,000 users and is currently live and in a testing state. Mr. Deloney referenced a registration error which affected 10% of industry users. DSS has rectified the issue with most users and will continue to work on resolving the remaining systems with errors.

Mr. Deloney stated that this Spring, DSS expects to provide a deployment date for NISS and that customers will have 30 days to transition to the new system. In addressing an Action Item from the last NISPPAC meeting, Mr. Deloney informed attendees that a best practices section in NISS is feasible. To obtain details on the information in this section, DSS is creating a requirements committee, comprised of DSS, industry and the government to ensure the system offers the assistance most needed by users.

Defense Information System for Security (DISS)
Nick Levasseur, DMDC, began by stating all Army, Navy and Air Force components are now system users. Industry will be included in the next deployment which will occur in late May. Mr. Levasseur referenced an issue with Personal Identity Verification cards preventing the industry working group from accessing the system. DISA is working to resolve the issue as quickly as possible.

Mr. Levasseur addressed an Action Item from the previous NISPPAC meeting regarding the creation of a best practices section in the system. DMDC will be updating its frequently asked questions (FAQ) on the website and has requested a system add with the capability to link users to applicable sections of the Users’ guide for assistance.

Ms. Baugher asked if the other Executive branch, non-DoD agencies would be included for access to the system. Mr. Levasseur stated DMDC is working that issue and is currently adding the Social Security Administration to the system. He stated other agencies have been identified but that he would need to inquire to provide a detailed list of names. [ACTION ITEM].

eAPP
Nick Morin, DISA, discussed the development of eApp (Attachment 4) and explained its focus is on acquiring better data upfront to decrease the number of times an applicant is contacted for more information. Mr. Morin showed a system demonstration (Attachment 4a) so that attendees could view it and see the enhancements in the system. He stated the goal is to begin adding approximately 2,000 users to the system during this fiscal year (FY). The system will be released to the user community with a goal of full operation by October 1, 2019.

Quinton Wilkes, Industry, asked if eApp would be part of DISS. Mr. Morin stated it would not be part of DISS, but that DISA is working to ensure a seamless process. The details of that process have not yet been discussed.

Ms. Baugher asked if the data in eQIP would be transferred over to eApp so that applicants’ previous entries are pre-populated. Mr. Morin explained the two systems are not compatible to
allow for parallel transfers of data. The current users are populating the system as DISA explores methods to resolve the issue.

Ms. Sutphin, Industry, explained that whenever there is a change in eQIP, it requires the applicant to redo all the yes/no questions. She asked if eAPP would correct that requirement. Mr. Morin stated there have been discussions on this, but that no decisions have been made.

Natasha Wright, DOE, asked how often the system auto saves the populated information. Mr. Morin explained that each time the user moves to the next page, the system is updated so that all previous data is saved.

Mr. Pannoni asked if the system contains adequate security features to prevent compromise of the information. Mr. Morin stated authentication and security controls are currently being considered and that individual encryption is a potential solution.

Mr. Harney asked if the link to the system contains any type of security. Mr. Morin stated the link is on the web, but that it is a point-to-point connection. He also explained that before deployment, the system security would be tested and approved by cyber security experts. Mr. Harney asked if the system demo was available for release. Mr. Morin stated he would inquire.  **[ACTION ITEM]**

**Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) Update**

Patrick Viscuso, ISOO, provided an update (Attachment 5) on the CUI program. He stated the program is in a phased implementation stage and that based on annual report submissions, full implementation will take about 3-4 years. The CUI office is reaching out to those agencies that failed to submit an annual report and is assisting those who have not established governance for the program.

Dr. Viscuso stated his office is currently revising the CUI registry so that it is simpler and easier to use. There are tools on the registry and training materials available, if needed. In addition, Dr. Viscuso’s office is in the process of creating a more user-friendly CUI markings handbook which will be released in early Spring 2018. A CUI blog is available on the ISOO website and serves as the primary means of communication on program progress and provides FAQs, general information, and discussion rooms. Dr. Viscuso stated his office has also been working on development of the CUI Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clause and has been part of a working group to create a draft which should be complete within the next 2 months when it will be sent through the FAR federal rulemaking process.

Dr. Viscuso stated his office is very active in outreach activities and he encouraged attendees to request briefings, when needed. He reminded attendees of the training tools available and offered them as an alternative to in person briefings.

Mr. Wilkes asked for the number of agencies who have implemented the program. Dr. Viscuso stated that no agencies have fully implemented the program, but several have submitted plans for implementation.
Leonard Moss, Industry, asked who the oversight for the CUI program would be once it is fully implemented. Dr. Viscuso stated that as the CUI Executive Agent (EA), his office would provide oversight.

Ms. Wright asked where she can find the CUI You Tube videos. Dr. Viscuso stated all training can be accessed by going to the CUI website.

**NISP Implementing Directive**

Mr. Pannoni provided an update on the 32 CFR 2004, NISP Implementing Directive. He explained that ISOO had reviewed the second round of comments, provided responses and sent it back to OMB for review. ISOO is hopeful that OMB will accept the ISOO responses and will send it back to ISOO for a final review by NARA senior management. If approved, the document will be sent to the federal register and published within 30 days.

**V. Working Group Updates**

**Insider Threat Working Group**

Mr. Pannoni gave a brief update on the Insider Threat Working Group. He explained that the group is dormant until DoD implements Phase 2 to evaluate the effectiveness of program execution at contractor locations. As Phase 2 evolves and piloting begins, the working group will begin meeting again to discuss shared concerns and best practices.

**Clearance Working Group Report**

Laura Aghdam, ISOO, provided an update on the Clearance Working Group. She stated that the topics discussed at the working group are precursors to that information briefed at the NISPPAC meeting. Ms. Aghdam listed the topics presented during the working group: personnel clearance processing statistics and timelines, NISPOM Change 3 status, SEAD 3 guidance for industry, setup of the DISS Working Group, NISS deployment, and industry’s proposed list of topics for today’s meeting.

**Updates and Processing Statistics**

**ODNI**

Gary Novotny, ODNI, began his presentation (*Attachment 6*) by explaining what specifically is being measured when clearance timeliness metrics are provided. He stated tracking begins when the application is received and ends when the adjudicative decision is made and uploaded to the system. Metrics do not include pre-submission actions or post-decision tasks, but the government is beginning to look at those metrics in order to obtain a true picture of end-to-end processing times.

Mr. Novotny provided statistics for the first quarter of the FY and explained the numbers are consistent with Mr. Phalen’s metrics. Initial Secret and PR processing times remain steady; however, Top Secret showed an increase in processing time. Processing statistics for clearances and PRs in the Intelligence Community are as follows: 119 days for Secret and approximately 170 days for Top Secret and PRs.
Mr. Pannoni asked if the statistics presented represent the fastest 90% in processing time. Mr. Novotny confirmed that the numbers are the fastest 90%.

Mr. Novotny ended his presentation by informing attendees that he is being transferred to another position and that his replacement will present at the next NISPPAC.

**Personal Security Management Office for Industry (PSMO-I)**
Heather Green, DSS PSMO-I gave the update (Attachment 7) for her office. She stated the PSMO-I budget has been fully funded for this FY, but that until the end of the Continuing Resolution (CR), the office continues its work with limited resources. Initial clearance investigations are the current top priority, with PRs, a close second. Once the CR ends, Ms. Green believes her office will be able to process at a steady state which means investigations will be processed within 1-2 days of receipt.

Ms. Green reminded industry to submit all T5 Reinvestigations (R) over the 6-year mark. She stated there are currently over 16,000 industry T5Rs in this category. Interim clearances are now being processed in an average of 30 days. Ms. Green provided the following suggestions for avoiding clearance issuance delays: Ensure clearance submissions are necessary; check applications for errors; use click to sign feature; and submit electronic fingerprints at the time of, or just before, application submission. Ms. Green noted that PSMO-I will not release initial investigation requests without the receipt of electronic fingerprints.

**DoD Consolidated Adjudication Facility (CAF)**
Ned Fish, DoD CAF, stated his organization is in a steady state of processing with only 300 cases backlogged. The DoD CAF adjudicates approximately 130,000 Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) cases per year, 30,000 of which are from the NISP community. Mr. Fish informed attendees that the DoD CAF is now using the DISS to process SCI determinations for industry and predicted that as personnel are trained to use the system, there may be a slight increase in processing times. Mr. Fish stated his office is also in a steady state of processing for Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) cases and that there are currently 400 cases awaiting determination.

The transfer of investigations from NBIB to DoD may affect the DoD CAF’s processing times. As investigative roles are shifted from NBIB to DoD, both agencies will be sending cases to the DoD CAF. Mr. Fish stated his organization will work with DoD and NBIB to prepare for the upcoming changes.

Valerie Heil, DoD, asked if those SCI cases in DISS were also in the Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS) since it is currently the system of record. Mr. Fish confirmed that the cases are in both systems.

**DOHA**
Perry Russell-Hunter, DOHA, began his presentation by stating the number of cases awaiting determination by an administrative judge have decreased since the last NISPPAC meeting. Additionally, cases involving statement of reason legal reviews remain below 200. Mr. Hunter stated DOHA’s volume and processing times are dependent on resolution of case issues during
the investigative process. He asked that efforts to resolve those issues early in the process continue.

As part of the effort to resolve issues at the earliest possible point in a case, Mr. Russell-Hunter asserted that the ability to electronically adjudicate clean cases and cases with no actionable issues would not only result in decreased processing times but would also have the additional benefit of allowing adjudicators to focus on the real issue cases which can and should take more time.

**NISP Information Systems Authorization (NISA) Working Group**

**DSS**

Karl Hellmann, DSS, provided an update on the activities of his office, as related to the objectives of the NISA Working Group. On January 1, 2018, DSS began requiring that all industry submissions for classified information system authorizations be submitted via the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Risk Management Framework (RMF) standards. The second priority initiative for his office during this FY is the transition to the DISA system of record, Enterprise Mission Assurance Support Service (eMASS), for RMF authorizations. The NISA working group will assist and provide feedback on both efforts.

Mr. Hellmann displayed a slide depicting monthly metrics for system authorization decisions. He explained that due to an influx of industry submissions before the January deadline for the NIST RMF requirement, there was a small increase in authorization processing times. Routine approval times are normally 30 days, but the increased submissions in January caused a temporary spike resulting in a temporary 40-day turnaround time. With the passing of the deadline, processing times will normalize and return to a 30-day turnaround time.

Mr. Moss asked for the cause of the increased processing times for system authorizations. Mr. Hellmann explained that the spike was due to increased submissions for authorizations before the RMF requirement became mandatory.

Mr. Pannoni observed that although the Northern Region is not the highest in authorization submission numbers, it is the highest in processing times. He asked if there is a basis for those statistics. Mr. Hellmann stated it was due to decreased staff resources as well as the presence of newer, less experienced personnel in that region.

**VI. General Open Forum/Discussion**

The Chair opened the meeting for anyone to present new business or to speak to the committee.

[Unknown] asked for an update on the State Department’s request for access to DOD’s personnel clearance information. Ms. Baugher stated her office had just received a draft MOU between State Department and DoD for 20 JPAS accounts for the entire State Department.

Ms. Sutphin asked if there were plans to provide the SEADs in draft for industry or NISPPAC industry to review. Mr. Pannoni explained ISOO has asked ODNI for a meeting to discuss this request. [ACTION ITEM].
Ms. Sutphin asked Mr. Fish if, with the transition of investigations to DoD, the DoD CAF would report to DSS. Mr. Fish affirmed that the DoD CAF would fall under DSS by the end of 2019.

VII. Closing Remarks and Adjournment
The Chair asked for additional questions and with none, announced the remaining two dates for the 2018 NISPPAC meetings: July 19th and November 15th, all to be held in the Archivist’s Reception Room. The chair adjourned the meeting.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

- DMDC to provide list of other Executive branch, non-DOD agencies with access to the DISS.
- DISA to inquire on releasability of the eApp system demo.
- ISOO to meet with ODNI on the need to coordinate with industry prior to release of SEADs.
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<td>Martin Strones</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Timmons</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Vaughn</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Admin</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Ware</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Weaver</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enita Williams</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Woodson</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ervin</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Ingenito</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Keith</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton Wilkes</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred “Cory” Klein</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Kirby</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Moss</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Poulsen</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Keith</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Kipp</td>
<td>MOU Representative</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Mackey</td>
<td>MOU Representative</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Arriaga</td>
<td>MOU Representative</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Hollandsworth</td>
<td>MOU Representative</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Peters-Carr</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teleconference Attendees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Brooks</td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Brady</td>
<td>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Clay</td>
<td>Department of the Navy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Heilig</td>
<td>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince Jarvie</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindy Kyser</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Kaley</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Keller</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Rainer</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Bland</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dockins</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Cicirelli</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Yen</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
<td>Attendee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Quarterly Timeliness Performance Metrics for Submission, Investigation & Adjudication* Time

Average Days of Fastest 90% of Reported Clearance Decisions Made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Initial</th>
<th>Top Secret</th>
<th>Secret/Conf</th>
<th>TS Reinvest.</th>
<th>Secret Reinvest.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication actions taken – 2nd Q FY17</td>
<td>13,209</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>10,645</td>
<td>6,054</td>
<td>6,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication actions taken – 3rd Q FY17</td>
<td>12,537</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>9,958</td>
<td>4,141</td>
<td>4,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication actions taken – 4th Q FY17</td>
<td>16,118</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>13,567</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>5,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication actions taken – 1st Q FY18</td>
<td>16,588</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>13,536</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>7,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The adjudication timeliness includes collateral adjudication by DoD CAF and SCI adjudication by other DoD adjudication facilities.
Industry’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Initial Top Secret Security Clearance Decisions

**GOAL:**
- **Initiation** – 14 days
- **Investigation** – 80 days
- **Adjudication** – 20 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Adjudications Reported</strong></td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</strong></td>
<td>439 days</td>
<td>458 days</td>
<td>469 days</td>
<td>474 days</td>
<td>485 days</td>
<td>479 days</td>
<td>500 days</td>
<td>525 days</td>
<td>527 days</td>
<td>552 days</td>
<td>523 days</td>
<td>539 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Secret/Confidential Security Clearance Decisions (NACLC/T3)

**GOAL:**
- **Initiation – 14 days**
- **Investigation – 40 days**
- **Adjudication – 20 days**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjudications Reported</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>4,163</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>5,337</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>4,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>238 days</td>
<td>272 days</td>
<td>305 days</td>
<td>269 days</td>
<td>238 days</td>
<td>201 days</td>
<td>234 days</td>
<td>224 days</td>
<td>223 days</td>
<td>223 days</td>
<td>212 days</td>
<td>246 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90%
Top Secret Reinvestigation Security Clearance Decisions

**GOAL:**
- **Initiation** – 14 days
- **Investigation** – 150 days
- **Adjudication** – 30 days

**Total Adjudications Reported**
- February 2017: 1,982
- March 2017: 2,167
- April 2017: 1,466
- May 2017: 1,346
- June 2017: 1,329
- July 2017: 1,125
- August 2017: 1,092
- September 2017: 1,101
- October 2017: 1,181
- November 2017: 1,589
- December 2017: 1,192
- January 2018: 1,094

**End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)**
- February 2017: 432 days
- March 2017: 442 days
- April 2017: 498 days
- May 2017: 544 days
- June 2017: 569 days
- July 2017: 585 days
- August 2017: 597 days
- September 2017: 607 days
- October 2017: 627 days
- November 2017: 615 days
- December 2017: 613 days
- January 2018: 671 days
Industry’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Secret Reinvestigation Security Clearance Decisions (T3R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Adjudication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2017</td>
<td>62 days</td>
<td>142 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2017</td>
<td>79 days</td>
<td>115 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2017</td>
<td>83 days</td>
<td>130 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>78 days</td>
<td>173 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2017</td>
<td>79 days</td>
<td>150 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2017</td>
<td>76 days</td>
<td>197 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2017</td>
<td>82 days</td>
<td>185 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2017</td>
<td>84 days</td>
<td>116 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2017</td>
<td>79 days</td>
<td>119 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2017</td>
<td>73 days</td>
<td>134 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
<td>77 days</td>
<td>162 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
<td>83 days</td>
<td>139 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Adjudications Reported**
  - Feb 2017: 1,799
  - Mar 2017: 3,852
  - Apr 2017: 1,837
  - May 2017: 1,291
  - Jun 2017: 1,555
  - Jul 2017: 908
  - Aug 2017: 1,493
  - Sep 2017: 3,010
  - Oct 2017: 3,838
  - Nov 2017: 2,234
  - Dec 2017: 1,477
  - Jan 2018: 3,010

- **End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)**
  - Feb 2017: 236 days
  - Mar 2017: 212 days
  - Apr 2017: 223 days
  - May 2017: 261 days
  - Jun 2017: 236 days
  - Jul 2017: 294 days
  - Aug 2017: 286 days
  - Sep 2017: 207 days
  - Oct 2017: 207 days
  - Nov 2017: 220 days
  - Dec 2017: 258 days
  - Jan 2018: 239 days
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Industry NISPPAC Update
Agenda

• Current NISPPAC/MOU Membership

• Impacts of Policy Changes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Sutphin</td>
<td>BAE Systems</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Strones</td>
<td>Strones Enterprises</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Keith</td>
<td>Harris Corp</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton Wilkes</td>
<td>L3 Communications</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harney</td>
<td>Northrop Grumman</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Poulsen</td>
<td>Leidos</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Arriaga</td>
<td>SRI International</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan McGarvey</td>
<td>Alion Science and Technology</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# National Industrial Security Program

## Industry MOU Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Association</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Steve Kipp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIS</td>
<td>Bob Lilje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSWG</td>
<td>Brian Mackey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFRDC/UARC</td>
<td>Shawn Daley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSA</td>
<td>Kathy Pherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISWG</td>
<td>Marc Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMS</td>
<td>Aprille Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDIA</td>
<td>Mitch Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Matt Hollandsworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impacts of Policy Changes - Overview

• Industry has encountered vast amounts of change in the past year and does not anticipate this slowing. Industry and USG both need increased fidelity on the costs of NISP implementation before additional reforms and new regulations are considered.

• The growing backlog of personnel security investigations and long lead time for meaningful reform to take hold will place national security at risk as both the USG and industry struggle to deliver responsive solutions from a tightening cleared labor market.

• Industry will be responsive to new initiatives, preferably if included in preparatory phases and where intended outcomes are clearly communicated.
New Business: DSS in Transition

- NISPPAC has been participating on a Core Group and a Focus Group in order to partner with DSS on formulating a new methodology.
- We are committed to the mission but concerned about lack of resources or training for implementation on the part of both government and industry.
- We are concerned about the lack of communication and coordination in the field and variances from one field office to the next.
- We are concerned that smaller companies without key technologies will not be seen or reviewed for several iterations.
- We are concerned that companies that can’t afford to make the suggested recommendations will be penalized for items that fall outside the NISP.
- When will written guidance be provided to industry? When will ISL 2006-02 (1-206) be modified to align with this new approach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Oversight Line of Effort</th>
<th>Asset ID</th>
<th>Security Baseline</th>
<th>Use of 12 x 13</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>TSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIT (Comprehensive Security Review)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Security Review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced SVA</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Introduction Only</td>
<td>Introduction Only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Meaningful” Engagement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Business: NDAA 2018

Clearance Reform

• NDAA 2018, Section 938: DOD Investigations transition from NBIB to DSS
  • Will require DSS to conduct all DOD investigations not later than October 1, 2020
  • Will transition the DOD CAF to DSS
  • Will transition the Personnel Security Assurance Division of the DMDC to DSS
• Have these initiatives been funded and what are the timelines for transition?
New Business: Small Business

- Small businesses starting to discuss terminating FCLs due to complexities with RMF, Insider Threat implementation and now DSS in Transition.
- Higher scrutiny on Security Consultants and Security Service Providers means there is a concern that there will be a gap regarding being able to support small CDCs in their pursuit of NISP compliance.
- Concern over supply chain dwindling as well as foreign entities purchasing these small businesses as they relinquish their FCLs.
- NCMS Security Consultant Working Group submitted a White Paper to DSS for review and comment.
New Business: Systems

• NISS Federal Register Posting: The National Industrial Security System (NISS) will become the repository of records related to the maintenance of information pertaining to contractor facility security clearances (FCL) and contractor capabilities to protect classified information in its possession. *When? Still a lot without access.*

• DISS: Still concern regarding roll-out and lack of available training for both industry and government. Concern regarding mirroring and usage of two systems when SF312 submissions go live in May.

• NCCS: Still awaiting information regarding a help-desk for industry to call with questions.

• eAPP: Awaiting go live date and would like to be able to provide feedback.
Old Business: SEAD 3 & 4

• Draft ISL 3 verbiage still under review by industry.

• Draft ISL 4 verbiage has been reviewed by industry and suggestions have been submitted.
Old Business: Fee for Service Survey

• Led by the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE), DoD completed a study of options related to funding of personnel security investigations exploring:
  • Fee for Service
  • Working Capital Fund
  • Industrial Funding Fee

• 29 small, medium and large cleared companies were selected and interviewed.

• NISPPAC submitted a white paper with our position: the current model, if properly funded, will work. It is not the method of funding causing the problem, but the lack of funding.
Old Business: Legislation Watch

Creation of Committees

• NDAA 2017 Section 1647: Formation of an “Advisory Committee on Industrial Security and Industrial Base Policy”
  • Charter filed April 30, 2017
  • Awaiting more clarification on committee members and funding

• NDAA 2018 Section 805: Formation of an “Defense Policy Advisory Committee on Technology”
  • Committee comprised of Industry and Government to share technology threat information
  • Will meet at least annually from 2018 to 2022
Attachment 4
Agenda

I. eApp
II. Functionality
   I. Validations
   II. User Interface
   III. Form Flow
   IV. Conversational Style
III. Demo
IV. Questions
eApp Functionality

- eApp is the replacement of the SF-86 portion of eQIP. It is the first iteration in the process to replace eQIP. The other forms (SF-85, SF-85p, etc.) will be replaced as well as the Agency portion of eQIP.
- Functionality improvements
  - Increased Validations
    - Addresses
    - In-Laws
    - Etc.
  - Improved Help
  - Improved Save
  - Improved Feedback
  - Support for Mobile
- Form Flow
  - Sections have been reordered to provide a better flow for applicants
- Conversation style
  - Applications walks applicants through the form
  - Information requested is now in smaller chunks
eApp Demo

- Demo of some of the improvements
QUESTIONS
Attachment 4a
(eApp Demo)
Attachment 5
Controlled Unclassified Information Program

- Implementation Projection (3-4 years).
- Implementation Activities (Focus on: Leadership, Policy, Training, and Annual Report to the President).
- Registry and Marking Handbook Revisions.
- CUI Notice 2018-01 (Guidance for drafting agreements).
- CUI Notice 2018-02 (Recommendations for basic training).
- Federal Acquisition Regulation for CUI (FY19).
- Training videos (YouTube).
Attachment 6
Performance Accountability Council (PAC) Security Clearance Methodology

- Data on the following slides reflects security clearance timeliness performance on contractor cases. DoD Industry data is provided by OPM and IC contractor data is provided by the following IC agencies: CIA, DIA, FBI, NGA, NRO, NSA and Department of State.

- Timeliness data is being provided to report the length of time contractor cases are taking - not contractor performance.
- As shown in the diagram, ‘Pre/Post’ casework is not considered in the PAC Timeliness Methodology.
- Unless otherwise specified, Initial Secret data is a combination of legacy investigative types and Tier 3 investigations.

Pre submission Coordination

Post decision Coordination

Initial Secret

Initiate (14 Days)  Investigate (40 Days)  Adjudicate (20 Days)

Initial Top Secret

Initiate (15 Days)  Investigate (150 Days)  Adjudicate (30 Days)

Periodic Reinvestigations
Timeliness Methodology Evolution

**IRTPA (2004)**
- **Initial Secret and Top Secret**
  - Investigate (40 Days)
  - Adjudicate (20 Days)

**PAC (2008)**
- **Initial Secret and Top Secret**
  - Initiate (14 Days)
  - Investigate (40 Days)
  - Adjudicate (20 Days)

- **Periodic Reinvestigations**
  - Initiate (15 Days)
  - Investigate (150 Days)
  - Adjudicate (30 Days)

**PAC/SecEA (2012)**
- **Initial Secret**
  - Initiate (14 Days)
  - Investigate (40 Days)
  - Adjudicate (20 Days)

- **Initial Top Secret**
  - Initiate (14 Days)
  - Investigate (80 Days)
  - Adjudicate (20 Days)

**Periodic Reinvestigations**
- Pre submission Coordination
  - Initiate (15 Days)
  - Investigate (150 Days)
  - Adjudicate (30 Days)

- Post decision Employment Coordination

---

National Counterintelligence Security Center - Special Security Directorate
Timeliness Performance Metrics for IC/DSS

Industry Personnel Submission, Investigation & Adjudication* Time

Average Days of Fastest 90% of Reported Clearance Decisions Made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secret/Confidential</th>
<th>Top Secret</th>
<th>Periodic Reinvestigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q2</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q3</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18Q1</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 2/26/2018

*The adjudication timeliness includes collateral adjudication and SCI, if conducted concurrently.
IC and DoD Industry – Secret Clearances

Average Days of Fastest 90% of Reported Clearance Decisions Made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Initiate 14 Days</th>
<th>Investigate 40 Days</th>
<th>Adjudicate 20 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18Q1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal: 74 Days

As of 2/26/2018
IC and DoD Industry - Top Secret Clearances

SSBI and Tier 5

As of 2/26/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiate 14 Days</th>
<th>Investigate 80 Days</th>
<th>Adjudicate 20 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17Q4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18Q1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal: 114 Days
IC and DoD Industry - Periodic Reinvestigations
SSBI-PR’s and Tier 5R

Average Days of Fastest 90% of Reported Clearance Decisions Made

As of 2/26/2018

UNCLASSIFIED
Intelligence Community Contractor Timeliness

As of 2/26/2018

National Counterintelligence Security Center - Special Security Directorate
Questions?

Gary Novotny  
NCSC/SSD/PSG  
Oversight Chief  
Phone: 301-243-0462  
Email: GARYMN@dni.gov  

Karl Fritz  
Metrics POC  
Phone: 301-243-0461  
Email: SecEAmetrics@dni.gov
Attachment 7
Personnel Security Briefing

Government Stakeholders and NISPPAC

Heather Green

Personnel Security Management Office for Industry (PSMO-I)

March 12 & 14, 2018
PSI-I Inventory and Timeliness

- Effective immediately, Industry should submit all Tier 5 Reinvestigations (T5R) whose investigation close date is six years or older; caveat T5Rs should continue to be submitted at the five year mark (T5Rs over 6 years: 16,562)
- Interims Determinations being made in an average of 30 days
In light of current processing timelines, please keep in mind what you can do to reduce delays:

- Ensure e-QIP is actually required
- Encourage the applicant to review information in the e-QIP for completeness and accuracy prior to submitting
- FSO, conduct thorough review of e-QIP for completeness prior to submission to PSMO-I
- Use Click to Sign for all forms associated with the e-QIP
- Electronic fingerprints should be submitted at the same time or just before an investigation request is released to DSS in JPAS. You can confirm that the National Background Investigations Bureau has processed the fingerprints by checking SII in JPAS which indicates a "SAC" closed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation Type Submitted</th>
<th>PSMO-I Rejection Rate</th>
<th>NBIB Rejection Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinvestigations</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common PSMO-I e-QIP Reject Reasons

- Financial information 11%
- HSPD-12 requests 14%
- Spouse SSN 15%
- Cohab SSN 20%
- Employment verification 15%
- Signature pages not received, contains errors, or wrong subject 25%

Common NBIB Investigation Request Reject Reasons

- Fingertprints Not Submitted / Expired 76%
- Subject Information Discrepant 7%
- Mailing Address Incomplete 10%
Department of Defense
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NISPPAC WORKING GROUP

UNCLASSIFIED
INDUSTRIAL CASES PENDING ADJUDICATION

Since the last NISPPAC meeting in Nov-17:
- Backlog has increased slightly +382 (+17%)
- LSR Due Process cases increased to 405 (+21%)
- With planned DISS deployment in May-18, the DoD CAF expects an increase in NISP backlog until normal OPS is achieved

NOTE: Re-baselined starting Q4 FY16; Now includes all NISP cases to include Legacy 4th Estate TS/SCI
1 Age based on date case received at the DoD CAF; data as of 20 Feb 18
2 Data as of 20 Feb 18

OPR: Metrics Team | Slide Revised: 27 Feb 18
**INDUSTRY**

Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act Performance

(Based on OPM Reporting from Sep 16 – Jan 18)

- Compared to FY17, the average timeliness decreased for Initials by -1 day, PRs by -4.
- Expect PR timelines to remain steady for the next quarter of FY18; likely to increase after DISS deployment with steady state thereafter.
- Increase in Initials timeliness due to eAdjudication failures, IT outages, training (DISS/initial/refresher).

**Avg for FY 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg for FY 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jan 18: PR = 23 days**

**Jan 18: Initial = 26 days**

**OPR: Metrics Team**

Data as of: 31 January 2018 | Slide Revised: 08 March 2018
KEY TAKEAWAYS

• NISP portfolio at DoD CAF remains relatively healthy and steady

• Impacts from deployment of DISS for NISP TS/SCI adjudications, and prep for May 17 deployment for collateral cases, beginning to show impacts

• At the next NISPPAC, expect:
  – Increased NISP work-in-progress/backlog
  – Increased IRTPA timeliness

• CAF, in conjunction with USDI, continues to focus on being properly postured for any/all future workload surges
Department of Defense
Consolidated Adjudications Facility

QUESTIONS???
Attachment 9
NISP Authorization Office Update

• **Risk Management Framework (RMF)**
  
  — Starting January 1, 2018 all classified Information Systems (IS) under DSS cognizance are authorized using the NIST RMF process and security controls.
  
  
  — DSS continues to request and review input regarding processes and metrics through the NISA WG.
  

• **Transition to Enterprise Mission Assurance Support Service (eMASS)**
  
  — Transition to eMASS will occur sometime in late 2018. Currently the eMASS pilots with Industry are ongoing and we continue to work with DISA on items impacting Industry use.
Number of ATOs Issued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Region</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Region</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Region</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NAO – 2017OCT13
Average Number of Days to ATO

Average Number of Days Per Region/Month

Source: NAO – 2017OCT13
Attachment 10
Timeliness Performance Metrics for Submission, Investigation & Adjudication Time

DOE

March 2018
Quarterly Timeliness Performance Metrics for Submission, Investigation & Adjudication Time

Average Days of Fastest 90% of Reported Clearance Decisions Made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Initial</th>
<th>Top Secret</th>
<th>Secret/Conf</th>
<th>TS Reinvest.</th>
<th>Secret Reinvest.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>281 300 319 300</td>
<td>264 291 307 324 344</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>439 521 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>227 251 275 264</td>
<td>45 35 30 17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>477 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 21 24 21</td>
<td>149 157 174 177</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>398 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 24 22 14</td>
<td>12 13 12 11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>328 439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 11</td>
<td>153 128</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>398 513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initiate | Investigate | Adjudicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY17-Q2</th>
<th>FY17-Q3</th>
<th>FY17-Q4</th>
<th>FY18-Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY17-Q2</th>
<th>FY17-Q3</th>
<th>FY17-Q4</th>
<th>FY18-Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOE’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90%
Initial Top Secret Security Clearance Decisions

**GOAL:**
- **Initiation:** 14 days
- **Investigation:** 80 days
- **Adjudication:** 20 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>373 days</td>
<td>362 days</td>
<td>364 days</td>
<td>354 days</td>
<td>381 days</td>
<td>377 days</td>
<td>376 days</td>
<td>375 days</td>
<td>362 days</td>
<td>397 days</td>
<td>394 days</td>
<td>403 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOE’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Secret/Confidential Security Clearance Decisions (NACLC/ANACI/T3)

**GOAL:**
- **Initiation** – 14 days
- **Investigation** – 40 days
- **Adjudication** – 20 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Adjudications Reported</strong></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</strong></td>
<td>182 days</td>
<td>206 days</td>
<td>183 days</td>
<td>203 days</td>
<td>192 days</td>
<td>205 days</td>
<td>205 days</td>
<td>199 days</td>
<td>173 days</td>
<td>164 days</td>
<td>204 days</td>
<td>212 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOE’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Top Secret Reinvestigation Security Clearance Decisions

**GOAL:**
- **Initiation** – 14 days
- **Investigation** – 150 days
- **Adjudication** – 30 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjudications Reported</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>358 days</td>
<td>379 days</td>
<td>420 days</td>
<td>432 days</td>
<td>472 days</td>
<td>499 days</td>
<td>522 days</td>
<td>552 days</td>
<td>540 days</td>
<td>544 days</td>
<td>562 days</td>
<td>561 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOE’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Secret Reinvestigation Security Clearance Decisions (T3R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>54 days</td>
<td>37 days</td>
<td>39 days</td>
<td>44 days</td>
<td>35 days</td>
<td>36 days</td>
<td>32 days</td>
<td>27 days</td>
<td>26 days</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>110 days</td>
<td>124 days</td>
<td>153 days</td>
<td>170 days</td>
<td>142 days</td>
<td>139 days</td>
<td>131 days</td>
<td>127 days</td>
<td>115 days</td>
<td>133 days</td>
<td>152 days</td>
<td>127 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication</td>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>13 days</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>11 days</td>
<td>17 days</td>
<td>17 days</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>17 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Adjudications Reported
- Feb 2017: 314
- Mar 2017: 545
- Apr 2017: 200
- May 2017: 150
- Jun 2017: 191
- Jul 2017: 209
- Aug 2017: 193
- Sep 2017: 234
- Oct 2017: 369
- Nov 2017: 299
- Dec 2017: 273
- Jan 2018: 376

End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)
- Feb 2017: 172 days
- Mar 2017: 171 days
- Apr 2017: 204 days
- May 2017: 226 days
- Jun 2017: 190 days
- Jul 2017: 185 days
- Aug 2017: 175 days
- Sep 2017: 163 days
- Oct 2017: 155 days
- Nov 2017: 171 days
- Dec 2017: 189 days
- Jan 2018: 161 days
Timeliness Performance Metrics for Submission, Investigation & Adjudication Time
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Quarterly Timeliness Performance Metrics for Submission, Investigation & Adjudication Time

Average Days of Fastest 90% of Reported Clearance Decisions Made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17-Q2</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-Q3</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-Q4</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-Q1</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-Q2</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-Q3</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-Q4</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-Q1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Adjudication actions taken – 2nd Q FY17
- Adjudication actions taken – 3rd Q FY17
- Adjudication actions taken – 4th Q FY17
- Adjudication actions taken – 1st Q FY18
NRC’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Initial Top Secret Security Clearance Decisions

**GOAL:**
- **Initiation** – 14 days
- **Investigation** – 80 days
- **Adjudication** – 20 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>224 days</td>
<td>457 days</td>
<td>485 days</td>
<td>419 days</td>
<td>401 days</td>
<td>322 days</td>
<td>353 days</td>
<td>520 days</td>
<td>578 days</td>
<td>439 days</td>
<td>68 days</td>
<td>12 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>23 days</td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>24 days</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>12 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>412 days</td>
<td>412 days</td>
<td>322 days</td>
<td>353 days</td>
<td>445 days</td>
<td>449 days</td>
<td>345 days</td>
<td>382 days</td>
<td>472 days</td>
<td>847 days</td>
<td>640 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)**
- February 2017: 693 days
- March 2017: 421 days
- April 2017: 598 days
- May 2017: 445 days
- June 2017: 449 days
- July 2017: 345 days
- August 2017: 382 days
- September 2017: 529 days
- October 2017: 607 days
- November 2017: 472 days
- December 2017: 847 days
- January 2018: 640 days
NRC’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Secret/Confidential Security Clearance Decisions (NACLC/ANACI/T3)

**GOAL:**
- **Initiation** – 14 days
- **Investigation** – 40 days
- **Adjudication** – 20 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Adjudication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2017</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2017</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2017</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2017</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2017</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2017</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2017</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Adjudications Reported**
- Feb 2017: 23
- Mar 2017: 35
- Apr 2017: 17
- May 2017: 12
- Jun 2017: 21
- Jul 2017: 19
- Aug 2017: 26
- Sep 2017: 16
- Oct 2017: 31
- Nov 2017: 24
- Dec 2017: 20
- Jan 2018: 22

**End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)**
- Feb 2017: 206 days
- Mar 2017: 295 days
- Apr 2017: 327 days
- May 2017: 179 days
- Jun 2017: 209 days
- Jul 2017: 197 days
- Aug 2017: 243 days
- Sep 2017: 226 days
- Oct 2017: 203 days
- Nov 2017: 250 days
- Dec 2017: 215 days
- Jan 2018: 231 days
# NRC’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Top Secret Reinvestigation Security Clearance Decisions

## GOAL: Initiation – 14 days
- February 2017: 23 days
- March 2017: 9 days
- April 2017: 12 days
- May 2017: 6 days
- June 2017: 7 days
- July 2017: 4 days
- August 2017: 9 days
- September 2017: 8 days
- October 2017: 7 days
- November 2017: 11 days
- December 2017: 15 days
- January 2018: 7 days

## Investigation – 150 days
- February 2017: 428 days
- March 2017: 327 days
- April 2017: 366 days
- May 2017: 370 days
- June 2017: 444 days
- July 2017: 515 days
- August 2017: 472 days
- September 2017: 574 days
- October 2017: 547 days
- November 2017: 509 days
- December 2017: 580 days
- January 2018: 485 days

## Adjudication – 30 days
- February 2017: 11 days
- March 2017: 7 days
- April 2017: 6 days
- May 2017: 6 days
- June 2017: 5 days
- July 2017: 5 days
- August 2017: 9 days
- September 2017: 7 days
- October 2017: 7 days
- November 2017: 15 days
- December 2017: 13 days
- January 2018: 4 days

### Total Adjudications Reported
- February 2017: 5
- March 2017: 12
- April 2017: 17
- May 2017: 12
- June 2017: 12
- July 2017: 10
- August 2017: 10
- September 2017: 9
- October 2017: 13
- November 2017: 8
- December 2017: 11
- January 2018: 7

### End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)
- February 2017: 462 days
- March 2017: 343 days
- April 2017: 388 days
- May 2017: 381 days
- June 2017: 457 days
- July 2017: 526 days
- August 2017: 486 days
- September 2017: 590 days
- October 2017: 561 days
- November 2017: 531 days
- December 2017: 608 days
- January 2018: 496 days
NRC’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Secret Reinvestigation Security Clearance Decisions (T3R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjudications Reported</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>128 days</td>
<td>176 days</td>
<td>281 days</td>
<td>262 days</td>
<td>242 days</td>
<td>328 days</td>
<td>303 days</td>
<td>133 days</td>
<td>166 days</td>
<td>163 days</td>
<td>137 days</td>
<td>151 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>