National Industrial Security Program Policy Advisory Committee (NISPPAC)

Meeting Minutes

July 18, 2019

The NISPPAC held its 62nd meeting on Thursday, July 18, 2019, 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 to the meeting were certified on October 24, 2019.

I. Welcome:

The Chair welcomed everyone, and reminded participants that this was a public meeting and was being recorded. The Chair recognized outgoing Industry spokesperson Quinton Wilkes, for his valuable service and dedication to the NISPPAC. The Chair also thanked outgoing NISPPAC Industry member Dennis Keith for his great service.

II. Administrative Items

Greg Pannoni, ISOO and Designated Federal Official (DFO) mentioned that all of the committee members should have received the presentations and handouts 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 mentioned that NISPPAC meeting announcements are posted on the federal register approximately 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 March 13, 2019 meeting:

- Valerie Heil, Department of Defense (DoD) will provide an update on status of NISPOM Change 3 for Security Executive Agency Directive (SEAD) 3.
  
  STATUS: CLOSED. The update was provided at the meeting, and Ms. Heil will keep everyone apprised on any ongoing discussions with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI).

- ODNI to host a meeting on March 28 to discuss Industry inclusion in Trusted Work Force.
  
  STATUS: CLOSED. The meeting occurred on March 28. Valerie Kerben, ODNI, provided details later in the meeting.

- Industry requested to have a meeting to discuss DSS in transition.
  
  STATUS: OPEN. Quinton Wilkes, Industry, provided details later in the meeting.

- Industry to provide ISOO instances of delayed National Interest Determination (NID) processing by Cognizant Security Agency (CSA)/CSO.
  
  STATUS: OPEN. ISOO received metric data from industry. ISOO will convene a NISPPAC NID working group meeting in the near future with industry, CSAs, and...
Defense Counterintelligence Security Agency (DCSA) to address the challenges in the NID process.

- DCSA is in process of internal and formal coordination of an Industrial Security Letter (ISL) that will replace ISL 2016-02.
  **STATUS: OPEN.** Industry is consolidating all of their comments and expects to have them sent to DCSA shortly.

- The Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) Office was going to host a Stakeholder’s meeting on April 17 as well as an Industry day on June 21.
  **STATUS: CLOSED.** These meetings were held and the slides for the stakeholders meeting is on the blog on the CUI webpage.

- CUI office was going to inform when the NIST Special Publication 800-171-Rev 2 will be available for public comment in the summer.
  **STATUS: CLOSED.**

- Patricia Stokes, DCSA, offered to meet with Kim Baugher, Department of State (State), to provide requirements and prepare a roadmap for the future.
  **STATUS: OPEN.** Ms. Stokes will continue to work this issue with the State Department. She advised that there was a recent meeting between a high level DCSA Representative and the new State Department Senior Coordinator for the Security Infrastructure Directorate within the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. Ms. Stokes advised she will be discussing a more inclusive shared services model with the State Department with regard to access to Defense Information System for Security (DISS).

- Ms. Stokes was going to take an action item for the DCSA Enterprise Business Support Office (EBSO) to hold a stakeholder’s group meeting.
  **STATUS: OPEN.** There was going to be a stakeholder’s forum on July 29 and July 30. Defense Vetting Directorate (DVD) also will continue to engage with NISPPAC to understand issues and concerns. Ms. Stokes mentioned the possibility of hosting a symposium in 2020.

**IV. Reports and Updates**

**DoD update**
Jeff Spinnanger, DoD, referred to the ISL and said that he appreciated the continued commitment from NISPPAC Industry for the candor they have received in the feedback. He focused on two items, mentioning the NIDs and expressed a desire to delve into this issue much deeper at the working group level. He also discussed the various packages that were processed by DCSA, and that the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) has signed waivers to accelerate no NIDs for proscribed information under the control of the Secretary of Defense (Top Secret, COMSEC or SAP). These accelerate waivers refer to section 842 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) which will remove the NID requirement for U.S. cleared companies with a Special Security Agreement effective in October, 2020. This waiver will make a dent in the timeliness of NID packages. Finally, Mr. Spinnanger expressed an interest in continuing engagement with the CUI office.

**DCSA update (note the DCSA update was provided by seven presenters)**
Mr. Bradley acknowledged the new title of Charles Phalen, the Acting Director of DCSA. Mr. Phalen mentioned that the President signed an Executive Order, in which the National
Background Investigations Bureau (NBIB) merged with DCSA. He acknowledged and thanked outgoing DCSA director, Dan Payne for his contributions to the NISPPAC. Mr. Phalen described the challenges of the transition from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to DoD and the immense changes occurring within DCSA. He praised the Secretary of Defense and the USDI for the support that he has received.

Mr. Phalen proceeded to discuss the clearance investigation inventory numbers, noting that in April of 2018, there were 725,000 cases in the inventory, and now the caseload has dropped to 386,000. Tier three investigations now stand at 138,000, while tier five investigations currently stand at 53,000.

Ms. Stokes, (DVD) was the next speaker for DCSA. She seconded Mr. Phalen’s remarks that there is great momentum in successfully integrating the business operations function with the NBIB operation. She added that the ESBO is working very closely with the national background investigations. ESBO was going to develop the requirements, test the capabilities, and interact with the user community to gauge test fee capabilities.

Ms. Stokes continued the discussion noting that ESBO is developing a training requirements aid and reorganizing the upfront training while recognizing the need to communicate it with the customers. She observed that DVD is integrating with all of the operational components with the objective of forming into a single end to end enterprise.

Ms. Stokes addressed the two outstanding items that were in the action items from the last meeting. The first action item was the follow-up with Ms. Baugher. She expressed her concern about non-DoD agencies being able to gain access to the Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS). Ms. Stokes replied that the system would include DISS and access to the elements of DISS that are needed to perform her job. She added that DVD has more to discuss about the shared service model moving forward. Zadayyah Taylor-Dunn, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), also expressed her concern that her agency had not been contacted and wanted to get involved with the process.

The next DCSA speaker was Heather Maradaga, Vetting Risk Operations Center (VROC). She announced that the center has processed over 100,000 investigation submissions, and the current investigations inventory stands at 17,000. In addition, they have issued over 73,000 interim determinations, at an average of 15-20 days. She added that they are working to expand both the population into Continuous Evaluation (CE) and the data sources. She informed that there were 351,551 individuals enrolled in CE. These data sources primarily cover financial, criminal, public records, and eligibility.

Ms. Maradaga also addressed CE alerts. There were over 83,000 alerts and approximately 57% of them are valid. She mentioned that her unit has provided an updated frequently asked questions on the periodic reinvestigation deferment activity on the DCSA website. In conclusion, she emphasized the importance of obtaining a DISS account prior to August 1. Staff provisioning instructions are provided on the first page of the DCSA website.
Catherine Kaohi, Industry (NCMS President), mentioned that she is seeing many occasions in which people are listed in JPAS, but not in DISS, and after August 1, they won’t be able to submit the SF 312, “Classified Information Non-Disclosure Agreement.” She asked for clarification as to how this is supposed to be implemented. Ms. Maradaga advised that it won’t actually be enforced until August 1 and to send it to the VROC mailbox. Leonard Moss, Industry, followed by stating that he is experiencing problems with data in the new system, in that there is a lot of data missing. He inquired as to what is being done with quality control. Ms. Maradaga replied that she is working to ensure these data systems match up, and added that she has staff available who will be able to address those issues.

David Wright, DCSA, provided a presentation on behalf of DoD CAF, which is now a part of DCSA. He explained that in his slide, he divided it into three portfolios; Readiness, Risk, and Deferred adjudications. For the second portfolio, the risk arrangement is engineered to address the threat of risk to the DoD. It addresses the periodic re-investigations that have been deemed medium or high risk by NBIB. For the third portfolio, they have created a deferred population, for those whose adjudication has been delayed. Among the priorities are reducing and addressing the aging inventory, as well as improving the quality and consistency of the adjudications. Mr. Pannoni inquired if the deferred population is low risk, and Mr. Wright replied in the affirmative, low risk as evaluated by NBIB, and reflected as a seriousness code within the investigation case file.

Charles Barber, EBSO provided the next update. He began his presentation by mentioning that in May, EBSO started usability testing with some of the earlier offerings, such as eApp. In July, they had a kick-off meeting with several of the industry partners. The kick-off was for the Trusted Information Provider (TIP) pilot which maximizes use of upfront information to satisfy investigative and security requirements. In August, they will continue the upgrade and some of the appeals range from prioritizing customer service requests to addressing latency issues that have been reported to Industry spokesperson Mr. Wilkes.

In October, EBSO will finalize the concept of active pilots. For the duration of the year, they will continue transformation and transition activity to include operationalizing and finalizing the TIP concept. In terms of usability testing and migrating to the initiation review, he encouraged participants to reach out to Aleisha Peoples, DCSA.

Ms. Heil noted that the slide indicates that there is a sunset date for JPAS soon. Response was that JPAS would not be sunsetting soon. Ms. Baugher asked where Central Verification System (CVS) fits into the entire process, and Dr. Barber replied that the Low Side Repository have a more robust IT delivery and capability delivery method. Users will access through their NBIS Agency application. He continued that he believes it will be completed by the fourth quarter of 2020.

The next speaker was Terry Carpenter, NBIS, who serves as the program executive officer for the NBIS. He acknowledged that there have been many changes and that there will be more on the way. Mr. Carpenter stated that these things are being incorporated as they build the new service with an underlying IT system to help deliver it.
Mr. Carpenter discussed several pillars, the first of which is making something truly secure in a different way from the inside of the application to protect data as it moves between layers and to the end user. They are building security inside the actual application architecture. The second pillar is about business transformation to ensure the architecture can support the rapid pace of change. The third pillar is user experience. They are trying to coordinate best practices, from federal agencies, DoD and industry partner groups to better enhance the user experience inside the application. Mr. Carpenter reiterated that they are not only transforming process but building a more secure foundation in the application. Lastly, he discussed rolling out regular releases, noting that he found tremendous value in those investigated cases that could be pushed in CE.

The last speaker from DCSA was Chris Forrest. He welcomed the newest agency to the NISP, the Department of Veteran’s Affairs, which is now the 33rd agency to sign an agreement for industrial security services. Mr. Forrest continued by discussing ongoing issues with the National Industrial Security System (NISS), such as latency issues and access, and stated that they are working diligently to resolve those issues. One positive outcome was the creation of a DCSA call center which has been updated for additional function and technical resources.

Mr. Forrest continued that 80% of CAGE Codes for cleared companies under DCSA security cognizance are registered with NISS. There still is a need to provide requirements and recommendations for the system, and there will be a meeting in August scheduled for industry and government to discuss these ongoing issues. The next system is NCCS 254, the NISS Contract Classification System. Mr. Forrest observed that 60% of the information is coming into that system at the current time, and they are still working with their DoD components to increase their NCCS use. He further observed that DoD components continue to update policies and processes to reflect NCCS use within their organizations. He singled out Sharon Dondlinger of Air Force as being a good partner on NCCS issues. Furthermore, he stated that his unit is currently looking at these engineering change proposals, and how it will affect DoD agencies.

Mr. Forrest provided a Center for Development of Security Education (CDSE) update, and mentioned that on July 24, there was going to be a Virtual Security Conference. While this year’s conference will be for only government employees, next year’s conference will include both government and industry employees. There will be several Defense In Transition (DIT) webinars. Mr. Forrest also provided an update on Enterprise Mission Support Service (eMASS), which is part of the initial NISPPAC Information Systems Authorization (NISA) working group. Effective May 6, IS authorizations and re-authorizations had to be submitted to eMASS. He reminded the audience that no later than September 30 of this year, industry partners must transfer their authorization letter and all supporting artifacts for all existing authorization from all Office of the Designated Approving Authority (ODAA) Business Management System (OBMS) to Risk Management Framework (RMF). In addition, he warned the audience to prepare for the move from Windows 7 to Windows 10.

Lastly, Mr. Forrest discussed the Advisory Committee on Industrial Security and Industrial Base Policy. They are still in the process of vetting both government and industry members. He also addressed the concern of DCSA representation on the NISPPAC committee, and stated that he was certain there would be representation at a fairly high level.
Industry update
Mr. Wilkes expressed his gratitude for the opportunity to represent Industry, as well as expressing his appreciation to departing Industry member, Mr. Keith. He proceeded to discuss membership in the NISPPAC and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) groups. He mentioned that there will be upcoming emails on the process of how to submit a name for the process. He acknowledged the two new members of the MOU, Ms. Kaohi and Charles Sowell.

Mr. Wilkes provided a slide presentation and the first slide reflected policy changes and one area of concern is the differing of investigations that are pending adjudication at the CAF. He would like something in place so that members in the field know the case is being deferred. Next, he discussed a draft ISL for the accountability for Top Secret materials in electronic form. The ISL is presently available for comment.

Mr. Wilkes continued that the NISPPAC Chairman has pushed the working groups and they are now seeing results. There are several ISL’s that are out for comment. One of the ISL’s had comments with investment reporting and Ms. Heil said that DoD is working the issue. He expressed his desire to have another working group to discuss the Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) piece.

Mr. Wilkes mentioned that Industry is waiting to see how the cyber security maturity model is going to impact CUI moving forward, and then gathering information from industry partners. They submitted the information on current methods of assessment and provided it to the CUI office in June. Mr. Wilkes moved on to discussing DIT and Industry has expressed concerns about Tailored Security Plans (TSP), and how long it takes to put them in place. Out of a handful of companies that have been through comprehensive security reviews, only 50 have TSP’s in place. He added that the process for TSP’s need to be refined. He proceeded to discuss a working group that was held in March to address some of the concerns, and he would like to see if these concerns are being addressed.

Continuing the discussion, Mr. Wilkes discussed the March meeting with the ODNI that discussed Trusted Work Force. Industry discussed solutions to move forward and what Industry could do to make the process better and to create processes that will prove to be effective in the end. He raised the possibility of conducting table top exercises based on some of the ideas and see the impact of those ideas moving forward. He explained that Industry is heavily engaged with NISS, and are trying to ensure there is representation in all of the meetings, so that an Industry representative will be able to address concerns.

Mr. Wilkes continued his discussion, stating that Industry is experiencing latency problems with a lot of the systems and there are data problems in the transition from JPAS to DISS. He expressed the concern that in the transition to DISS, it would be very difficult for Industry to submit to some of the government’s request for personal information. He also expressed concern that many of the BETA systems that are being tested at the current time only work with a Common Access Card (CAC), which makes it very hard for Industry to participate. He advocated for systems that work with both CAC and Public Key Infrastructure (PKI).
The next issue was a white paper that discussed consultants and what they can actually do. Industry asked DCSA to provide some policy on consultants and they did provide some guidance. Industry is still waiting for some answers such as whether consultants can become account managers. Mr. Wilkes moved onto discussing the SEAD, and is waiting for information on the SEAD 3 SL. Industry is working with ODNI to share information and will continue to have meetings with ODNI in the future.

The last slide referred to the Advisory committee which Mr. Forrest had already discussed, and Mr. Wilkes reiterated his desire to have some type of industry participation at the highest level. Jane Dinkel, Industry, asked Mr. Wilkes about the TS accountability letter, and he replied that it had been released last Thursday. Mr. Wright inquired of the different populations for the adjudication and Mr. Wilkes suggested to post the information on the website. Ms. Stokes interceded and said that she will put the information in the VROC call center and the CAF frequently asked questions webpage. As of August 1, they will start moving forward in transformation and into the new records system. Ms. Stokes acknowledged that change is hard, but they have a team ready to help with these issues. She also addressed her support for the deferrals in the business plans. They want to build based on the risk portfolio of these cases and update the business rules to address the issue.

In concluding his talk, Mr. Wilkes said they have sent out reminders and emails to their members every time they post something on their website. He acknowledged that the other problem is how long before it becomes the system of record. Mr. Pannoni thanked Mr. Wilkes for his expertise and outlined the process for becoming a NISPPAC member. The process is outlined on the NISPPAC website and the NISPPAC bylaws outline the process on how people are nominated for membership. Mr. Bradley voiced his support for the working groups, and for their ability to get the mission accomplished.

CUI update
Devin Casey, ISOO provided the next update on the CUI and observed that agencies are still implementing CUI. He observed significant progress in the annual report where agencies have reported their findings from last year. He also observed that perhaps the most important thing from the report is that most agencies are in the process of creating policies within the next 6-12 months, which is the biggest hurdle for the CUI program.

Mr. Casey mentioned two events, the public notice and public comment period for the NIST Special Publications 800-171 and 800-171B. The comment period for the NIST 800-171 is open until August 2. For the NIST SP 800-171B, an attachment is being added to the 171 which includes additional controls to address advanced persistent threats on contracts that are high value assets. He reminded there is a blog post on the website which instructs when and how to comment.

Mr. Casey discussed the Industry day, sponsored by ISOO, which was geared to providing Industry with solutions for the implementation of CUI, and touted the success of the event. There is also a stakeholder's update on the blog. He further explained that there will be another Webinar for agencies, academia, and any stakeholders in the CUI program. He also discussed the position description for CUI that agencies can use to hire individuals who are fulfilling the
program manager position at agencies. There is also a destruction notice that is being revised to clarify issues and questions about single-step destruction. Furthermore, there is also a new registry committee which helps advise on changes, updates and modifications to the CUI registry, and helps to streamline the process.

Mr. Casey added that there is no further information on the CUI Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clauses. He advised that once the FAR comes out for public comment there will be an ad hoc stakeholder’s meeting to better understand the FAR. Finally, Mr. Casey informed that they are looking for standardization across the executive branch to include the non-federal entities.

**ODNI update**

Valerie Kerben, ODNI provided an update on the SEADs. She discussed SEAD 8, which focuses on temporary eligibility access to the various levels of collateral clearances. ODNI did reach out to the security executive agent advisory committee (SEC) group for comments. They have adjudicated those comments, and SEAD 8 has come back from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review. The goal is to get the policy signed and implemented before the end of the year.

Ms. Kerben continued the discussion by introducing SEAD 9, which covers whistleblower protections and retaliatory revocation of national security eligibility. ODNI did receive comments to SEAD 9, and will get the comments out to the SEC to see how they have been adjudicated and they are trying to get it through to OMB. The two SEADS are in the process of coordination. Ms. Kerben moved on to discuss Trusted Work Force, mentioning that the executive steering group continues to meet every month. The biggest issue at the present time is the national security presidential memo, which has been at the White House for several months, awaiting signature.

Ms. Kerben referred to the meeting that was held at ODNI last March in which the executive agents and Performance Accountability Council (PAC) hosted the meetings to discuss the state of trusted work force. The meetings were highly productive in which the concerns of industry were addressed and they committed to meeting periodically with the NISPPAC members. They were planning for a future meeting in the fall.

**NRC update**

Darrell Parsons, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) observed the distinction, in which the contractor pays NRC for their licenses, versus the government paying them. He stated that two years ago, NRC oversaw approximately ten classified networks. He mentioned that the state of the nuclear energy economy is depressed at the present time, and that some of the NRC licenses have cut back on their classified networks. Mr. Parsons added that NRC does have an accreditation program and as a regulator, they don’t necessarily want to sign as the approving authority. Furthermore, NRC collaborates greatly with the Department of Energy on these types of networks. Finally, he mentioned that NRC was going to have a public meeting on CUI the following week.

**Working Group updates**
Mr. Pannoni provided an update on the Clearance Working Group, noting that much of his presentation has already been discussed. However, he did bring up the issue of cybersecurity, specifically the level of cyber assurance for NCCS, and if the system meets the moderate level of confidentiality. He asked DoD to take this issue back to confirm what the level of confidentiality, integrity, and availability for that system is or is planned to be.

Mr. Pannoni also addressed the issue of CE which will affect nearly 1.4 million people. December 20 is the target date for everyone to be enrolled in CE. He also briefly mentioned metric data and timelines.

Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) update
Perry Russell-Hunter, DOHA, provided an update on metrics. He mentioned that they are reviewing 233 individual statements which means they are working within the 30 day parameter. The exception to this is when they need to go back and retrieve information. He added that this is a small percentage of the overall population. The CAF is providing some resources to DOHA in the form of contractors, providers and scanners that will allow users to work more easily within the DISS. This will enable DOHA to issue statements of reasons directly without having to send them back to the CAF.

Mr. Russell-Hunter mentioned that they were working on a small percentage of cases that involve a mental health evaluation. The appeal board has concluded that the mental health evaluations that the CAF has been getting are an admissible document in the proceedings which means they can use taxpayer dollars to conduct the mental health evaluations.

Final statements
The Chairman opened the floor to questions. Stan Borgia, Industry, discussed the NID waivers. He mentioned that the National Defense Authorization Act, and that he is anxious in moving forward with other parts of the Act. He offered his assistance to provide some clarification and move issues forward.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 12:35, reminding participants that the next NISPPAC meeting is on Wednesday, November 20.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

- Industry to provide instances of delayed NIDs processing by CSA/CSO.
- DCSA is still in process of internal and formal coordination of an ISL that will replace the current ISL 2016-02
- ISOO will convene a NISPPAC NID working group meeting in the near future with Industry reps. DCSA to address the challenges in the NID process.
- Ms. Stokes, DCSA, mentioned there was going to be a stakeholder’s forum on July 29 and July 30.
• Mr. Forrest, DCSA, stated there will be a meeting in August for industry and government to discuss ongoing issues with the NISS.
• ODNI to host a meeting in the fall to discuss the state of Trusted Work Force to address the concerns of Industry.
• Mr. Pannoni, ISOO asked DoD to take the issue of cyber assurance back to confirm what level of confidentiality, integrity, and availability for the national contractor classification system is or is planned to be.
• DoD will provide an update on Critical Technology Protection.
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<td>Halfhill, Heather</td>
<td>Sickmond, Stephanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>Industry-WSP</td>
<td>Buswell, Beverly</td>
<td>Hall, Brent</td>
<td>Sidney-Miles, Sharon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaohi</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Industry-NCMS</td>
<td>Hamilton, Pamela</td>
<td>Hamilton, Angelique</td>
<td>Simmons, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Agency or Group</td>
<td>NCMS (via WEBEX-Last, First Name)</td>
<td>Last, First Name</td>
<td>Last, First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Industry- Harris</td>
<td>Charles, Grace, Grace, Hare</td>
<td>Simms, Zachary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerben</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>ODNI</td>
<td>Callier, Jewel, Hasselbrink, Dean</td>
<td>Smith, Artis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Industry-Deloitte</td>
<td>Carney, Gail, Hawkes, Terrie</td>
<td>Smith, Berette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klink</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>NARA-ISOO</td>
<td>Carter, Edward, Hayes, Mary</td>
<td>Smith, Cheryl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Industry-NCMS</td>
<td>Caruso, Chris, Helton, Alicia</td>
<td>Smith, Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowy</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Industry-Boeing</td>
<td>Caudle, Robert, Henderson, Kaila</td>
<td>Snyder, Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardaga</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>DCSA</td>
<td>Cerys, Daniel, Hernandez, Aimee</td>
<td>Spann, David Anthony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matchett</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>NDM Technologies</td>
<td>Chapman, James, Hernandez, Paul</td>
<td>Spencer, Chuck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGarvey</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Alion Science and Technology</td>
<td>Chappell, Samantha, Herrera, Leonel</td>
<td>Standard, Manicia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGlone</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>DOD-OUUSD(I)</td>
<td>Cheney, David, Higgins, Holly</td>
<td>Starks-Bey, Neuftearia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>NBIB</td>
<td>Chiappone, Tammi, Hodges, Hope</td>
<td>Stephens, Todd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>ODNI</td>
<td>Ciccotosto, Donna, Hunt, Matthew</td>
<td>Stroup, Darlene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>DynCorp International</td>
<td>Clapp, Julie, Husick, Crystal</td>
<td>Sutton, Jennifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>System High</td>
<td>Clark, Amy, Hynes, Timothy</td>
<td>Svitlitsas, Marigo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oehler</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clark, Danyelle, Indelicato, Charles</td>
<td>Szewc, Stephen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogryscko</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Federal News Network</td>
<td>Clark, J.G., Johnson, Kristin</td>
<td>Rowena- Talaro, Arlene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannoni</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>NARA-ISOO</td>
<td>Clasen, Melissa, Jones, Russell</td>
<td>Talbott, Christine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Darryl</td>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Cochrane, Kyle, Jordan, Ryan</td>
<td>Taube, Nathaniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekrul</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>NBIB</td>
<td>Collins, Lydia, Kamilova, Kamilya</td>
<td>Tavel, Jennifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalen</td>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>NBIB</td>
<td>Connon, Dee, Kamm, Jessica</td>
<td>Taylor, Krystal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pherson</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>INSA- Pherson Associates LLC</td>
<td>Coogan, Sean, Kanuth, Renee</td>
<td>Thibault, Chrystal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Kyla</td>
<td>ODNI</td>
<td>Crouch, Alan, Karl, Danielle</td>
<td>Thibodeaux, Kristie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynor</td>
<td>Dianne</td>
<td>Boeing</td>
<td>Cullen, Becky, Kay, Jasmine</td>
<td>Thomas, Antoinette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renzella</td>
<td>Allyson</td>
<td>DCSA</td>
<td>Dagney, Susan, Keller, Patricia</td>
<td>Thomas, Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell-Hunter</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>OGC/DISA/DOHA</td>
<td>Dahl, Stephanie, Kelley, Andrea</td>
<td>Thompson, B'Linda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Classic</td>
<td>NBIB</td>
<td>Daniel, Cindy, Kennedy, Beverlee</td>
<td>Thornton, Diana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Davis, Hasmig, Kennedy, Christopher</td>
<td>Torres, Elvira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowell</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Iworks-PSC</td>
<td>Davis, Michael, Kerr, Julie</td>
<td>Trotmon, Charmell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinke</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>OGC/DISA/DOHA</td>
<td>Davis-Pickett, Heather, Kibben, Kimberly</td>
<td>Truslow, Cynthia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Agency or Group</td>
<td>NCMS (via WEBEX- Last, First Name)</td>
<td>Last, First Name</td>
<td>Last, First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>DOD-DCSA</td>
<td>Dawson, Michelle</td>
<td>King, Anthony</td>
<td>Ulery, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Industry-RAND</td>
<td>Demers, Michael</td>
<td>Kitchens, Barbara</td>
<td>Vaughan, Barbara Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutphin</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Industry-BAE</td>
<td>Diehl, Theresa</td>
<td>Kitts, Karen</td>
<td>Vaughn, Susie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor-Dunn</td>
<td>Zudayyah</td>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>Dolan, Kathy</td>
<td>Kohler, Alan</td>
<td>Wallace, Crocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>Duke, Christina</td>
<td>Kuriger, Daniel</td>
<td>Ware, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmons</td>
<td>Katharine</td>
<td>Admin Support-VIASAT</td>
<td>Dummars, Kristina</td>
<td>Lamont, Kimberly</td>
<td>Weaver, Gail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tringali</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>NARA-ISOO</td>
<td>Eckel, Mark</td>
<td>Lawhorn, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Wedge, Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>Edwards, Katrina</td>
<td>Laybourne, Krista</td>
<td>Wendt, Suzy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>Epps, Danette</td>
<td>Leblanc, Randal</td>
<td>Wenzel, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolsey</td>
<td>Wallophilia</td>
<td>Industry-Palo Alto Networks</td>
<td>Ervin, Ervin</td>
<td>Lee, Kristen</td>
<td>Werkheiser, Kristen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Escobedo, Robert</td>
<td>Lennon, David</td>
<td>Weyer, Xiomara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>Monti</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Fabian, Juanita</td>
<td>Lepak, Tammy</td>
<td>Whipp, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Industry-Boeing</td>
<td>Fenger, Joel</td>
<td>Levy, Isabelle</td>
<td>White, Lori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrero</td>
<td>Rosie</td>
<td>Industry-ENSCO</td>
<td>Finklea, Anthony</td>
<td>Lightcap, Amy</td>
<td>Whitmer, Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokenik</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>General Dynamics Mission</td>
<td>Fisher, Mike</td>
<td>Little, Heather</td>
<td>Williams, Enita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Systems &amp; NCMS National Board</td>
<td>Luisa, Victoria</td>
<td>Lord, Virginia</td>
<td>Winton, Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>NCMS</td>
<td>Ly, Daniel</td>
<td>Luedke, Jennifer</td>
<td>Wolf, Mindy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>Maes, Jody</td>
<td>Nutzman, Sherrie</td>
<td>Wolf, Joanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deabler</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Industry-Colorado</td>
<td>Maguire, Frank</td>
<td>O’Brien, Michael</td>
<td>Wolpoff, Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahy</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Industry-Raytheon</td>
<td>Malafsky, Deborah</td>
<td>Odonnell, Patrick</td>
<td>Womer, Deborah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>Darci</td>
<td>Industry-Raytheon</td>
<td>Matthews, Tatiana</td>
<td>Ogle, Rodney</td>
<td>Yearta, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Envisioneering Inc.</td>
<td>McKearney, Dennis</td>
<td>Oliver, Cassandra</td>
<td>Yuhas, Rae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>CISCO</td>
<td>McKinney, Christy</td>
<td>Ornelas, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>KBRwyle Technology Solutions, LLC</td>
<td>McManus, Daniel</td>
<td>Ososkie, Charles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackey</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>BAE</td>
<td>Melendez, Geniah</td>
<td>Parker, Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Vectrus</td>
<td>Miller, Kevin</td>
<td>Parr, Doris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>NCMS</td>
<td>Nims, Nicholas</td>
<td>Parr, Justin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc</td>
<td>Mitchell, Bruce</td>
<td>Perrone, Philomena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirtle</td>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>Atmospheric Science Technology, LLC</td>
<td>Monroe, Lori</td>
<td>Perryman, Susan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargent</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Boeing</td>
<td>Montoya, Sandra</td>
<td>Peterson, Tracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>McCallie Associates</td>
<td>Nally, Diana</td>
<td>Peters, Pia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Agency or Group</td>
<td>NCMS (via WEBEX- Last, First Name)</td>
<td>Last, First Name</td>
<td>Last, First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>NCMS (via WEBEX)</td>
<td>Nelson, Donald</td>
<td>Piotrowski, Elaine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolaus</td>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nikolaus, Suzanne</td>
<td>Porter, Lizet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolette</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nolette, Tammy</td>
<td>Powell, Derrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolette</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pylat, Valerie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolette</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rector, Patricia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workload & Timeliness Performance Metrics

DoD-Industry

JUNE 2019
INDUSTRY’S TIMELINESS DISTRIBUTION
BY CASE TYPE

*Note:
Over the past 10 months, NBIB has received a smaller proportion of less fieldwork intensive T3R cases from Industry when compared to the historical average. While the Industry T3R inventory is now at the lowest point in over 2 years, the timeliness of the most recent Industry T3R closings is primarily a result of a higher proportion of T3R cases which required fieldwork.
**Quarterly Timeliness Performance Metrics for Submission, Investigation & Adjudication**

**Average Days of Fastest 90% of Reported Clearance Decisions Made**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Initial (T3/T5)</th>
<th>Top Secret (T5)</th>
<th>Secret (T3)</th>
<th>TS Reinvest (T5R)</th>
<th>Secret Reinvest (T3R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY18-Q3</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-Q4</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19-Q1</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19-Q2</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The adjudication timeliness includes collateral adjudication by DoD CAF and SCI adjudication by other DoD adjudication facilities*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Initial</th>
<th>Top Secret</th>
<th>Secret/Confidential</th>
<th>Top Secret Reinvestigations</th>
<th>Secret Reinvestigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY18-Q3</td>
<td>21,170</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>8,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-Q4</td>
<td>16,094</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td>11,362</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>7,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19-Q1</td>
<td>14,399</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>10,523</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>2,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19-Q2</td>
<td>29,983</td>
<td>7,001</td>
<td>22,982</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>2,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8/20/2019
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>Month</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Adjudication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2018</td>
<td>44 days</td>
<td>388 days</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2018</td>
<td>44 days</td>
<td>396 days</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2018</td>
<td>44 days</td>
<td>414 days</td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2018</td>
<td>43 days</td>
<td>405 days</td>
<td>16 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>45 days</td>
<td>404 days</td>
<td>11 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
<td>45 days</td>
<td>404 days</td>
<td>27 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td>47 days</td>
<td>435 days</td>
<td>16 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>43 days</td>
<td>395 days</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>38 days</td>
<td>359 days</td>
<td>18 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2019</td>
<td>40 days</td>
<td>350 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2019</td>
<td>41 days</td>
<td>291 days</td>
<td>48 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>43 days</td>
<td>319 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Adjudications Reported:
- Jun 2018: 1,817
- Jul 2018: 1,510
- Aug 2018: 1,496
- Sep 2018: 1,726
- Oct 2018: 1,714
- Nov 2018: 1,732
- Dec 2018: 432
- Jan 2019: 2,315
- Feb 2019: 3,220
- Mar 2019: 1,469
- Apr 2019: 1,932
- May 2019: 1,189

End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%):
- Jun 2018: 442 days
- Jul 2018: 446 days
- Aug 2018: 467 days
- Sep 2018: 462 days
- Oct 2018: 465 days
- Nov 2018: 460 days
- Dec 2018: 509 days
- Jan 2019: 454 days
- Feb 2019: 406 days
- Mar 2019: 408 days
- Apr 2019: 362 days
- May 2019: 410 days
INDUSTRY’S AVERAGE TIMELINESS TRENDS FOR 90% SECRET/CONFIDENTIAL SECURITY CLEARANCE DECISIONS

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>4,343</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>3,996</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>9,054</td>
<td>8,817</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>12,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>222 days</td>
<td>221 days</td>
<td>231 days</td>
<td>229 days</td>
<td>261 days</td>
<td>224 days</td>
<td>215 days</td>
<td>246 days</td>
<td>253 days</td>
<td>209 days</td>
<td>162 days</td>
<td>183 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

<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>1,514</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>1,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>657 days</td>
<td>670 days</td>
<td>683 days</td>
<td>748 days</td>
<td>647 days</td>
<td>611 days</td>
<td>593 days</td>
<td>579 days</td>
<td>619 days</td>
<td>573 days</td>
<td>438 days</td>
<td>414 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry’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>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Adjudications Reported: 3,235
End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)
- Jun 2018: 166 days
- Jul 2018: 183 days
- Aug 2018: 280 days
- Sep 2018: 272 days
- Oct 2018: 278 days
- Nov 2018: 278 days
- Dec 2018: 343 days
- Jan 2019: 386 days
- Feb 2019: 476 days
- Mar 2019: 544 days
- Apr 2019: 420 days
- May 2019: 305 days

End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%):
- Total: 4,237 days
Defense Vetting Directorate
Patricia Stokes
Agenda

- Vetting Risk Operations Center - Ms. Mardaga
- National Background Investigations Bureau - Mr. Pekrul
- DoD Consolidated Adjudications Facility - Ms. Martineau
- Enterprise Business Support Office - Dr. Barber
- National Background Investigations Service - Mr. Carpenter
Vetting Risk Operations Center (VROC)

Industry e-QIP & Interim Determination Metrics

- FY 19 e-QIP Submissions: 101,529
- Current e-QIP Inventory: 17,086
- FY 19 Interims Processed: 36,586
- Interim Timeliness: 72,539 Average 15 days

DISS Provisioning Status

DoD Continuous Vetting

- CE Population Jun 2019: 1,346,890
- Population By Department:
  - Air Force: 21%
  - Army: 34%
  - Industry: 27%
  - Navy: 12%
  - Marine Corps: 4%
  - 4th Estate: 2%

CE Alerts Received

- FY17: 26,843
- FY18: 47,453
- FY19: 81,260

Early Detection

- Secret: 6yr 7mo
- TS: 2yr 5mo

Early Detection and Risk Mitigation, before next PR due to begin

CE FY19 Alerts by Guideline

- Drug Involvement: 14,426, 26%
- Financial Considerations: 30,858, 55%
- Allegiance to US: 183, 0%
- Criminal Conduct: 1,426, 26%
- Alcohol Consumption: 5,149, 9%
- Personal Conduct: 9, 0%
- Sexual Behavior: 813, 2%
Industry’s Monthly workload & inventory

Top Secret (T5)

- Scheduled/Closed
- Inventory

Secret (T3)

- Scheduled/Closed
- Inventory

Top Secret Reinvest (T5R)

- Scheduled/Closed
- Inventory

Secret Reinvest (T3R)

- Scheduled/Closed
- Inventory
*Note:
Over the past 10 months, NBIB has received a smaller proportion of less fieldwork intensive T3R cases from Industry when compared to the historical average. While the Industry T3R inventory is now at the lowest point in over 2 years, the timeliness of the most recent Industry T3R closings is primarily a result of a higher proportion of T3R cases which required fieldwork.
Average Days of Fastest 90% of Reported Clearance Decisions Made

FY18-Q3 FY18-Q4 FY19-Q1 FY19-Q2
All Initial (T3/T5) 276 291 294 275
Top Secret (T5) 455 459 468 422
Secret (T3) 215 226 234 234
TS Reinvest (T5R) 689 694 618 582
Secret Reinvest (T3R) 197 227 289 148

Initiate Investigate Adjudicate

Adjudication actions reported – 3rd Q FY18 21,170 5,610 15,560 4,155 8,543
Adjudication actions reported – 4th Q FY18 16,094 4,732 11,362 3,745 7,676
Adjudication actions reported – 1st Q FY19 14,399 3,876 10,523 5,503 2,254
Adjudication actions reported – 2nd Q FY19 29,983 7,001 22,982 4,996 2,543

*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>Month</th>
<th>Total Adjudications Reported</th>
<th>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2018</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>442 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2018</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>446 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2018</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>467 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2018</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>462 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>465 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>460 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>509 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>454 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>406 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2019</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>408 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2019</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>362 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>410 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry’s Average Timeliness Trends for 90% Secret/Confidential Security Clearance Decisions

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

Total Adjudications Reported

<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>4,343</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>3,996</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>9,054</td>
<td>8,817</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>12,472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)

<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>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>222 days</td>
<td>221 days</td>
<td>231 days</td>
<td>229 days</td>
<td>261 days</td>
<td>224 days</td>
<td>215 days</td>
<td>246 days</td>
<td>253 days</td>
<td>209 days</td>
<td>162 days</td>
<td>183 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Background Investigations Bureau

Industry’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>1,514</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>1,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>657 days</td>
<td>670 days</td>
<td>683 days</td>
<td>748 days</td>
<td>647 days</td>
<td>611 days</td>
<td>593 days</td>
<td>579 days</td>
<td>619 days</td>
<td>573 days</td>
<td>438 days</td>
<td>414 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry’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>3,235</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>4,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-to-End Timeliness (Fastest 90%)</td>
<td>166 days</td>
<td>183 days</td>
<td>280 days</td>
<td>272 days</td>
<td>278 days</td>
<td>343 days</td>
<td>386 days</td>
<td>476 days</td>
<td>544 days</td>
<td>420 days</td>
<td>305 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Initiation**
- **Investigation**
- **Adjudication**
DoD CAF Operational Update – Industry Division

**Risk Management Portfolio**
- T1/T3/T5 Initials (22 days)
- Expedites
- Interim SCI
- Key Management Personnel (KMP)
- Recertify/Reconsideration/Upgrade

**Strategic Priorities**
1. Aging inventory reduction
2. Inventory size reduction
3. Improve quality and consistency of decision making & business processes

**Readiness Portfolio**
- T3R/T5R Medium/High Risk
- CE Alerts
- Incident Reports
- REO/RSI
- Supplemental Information

**Efficiency Initiatives**
- Lean Six Sigma
- Reorganization
- “All Hands on Deck”
- Targeted inventory reductions
- Deferred PR adjudications
- Increased workforce flexibility
- Robust use of OT
- Reciprocity

**Weekly Outgoing Case Production**
- AVG FY2018
- Dec-18
- Mar-19
- Jun-19

**Industry Work-in-Progress**
- 36,533
- Readiness: 29%
- Risk: 30%
- Deferred: 41%

**Deferred PR Adjudications Portfolio**
- T3R/T5R Low to No Risk
**EBSO Key Events and Milestones**

**May 2019**
- Design efforts to further refine NBIS Agency
- Industry participation in NBIS Agency Usability Testing
- CE enrollment data visible in DISS

**July 2019**
- Trusted Information Provider (TIP) pilot kick off (Industry)
- Expand eApp and NBIS Agency testing (select Industry/DoD users)

**August 2019**
- Migration of Research, Recertify & Upgrade (RRU) Functionality from JPAS to DISS
- Continuous DISS upgrades to support prioritization of Customer Service Requests
- Other improvements to support DoD CAF Adjudication process

**October 2019**
- Initiate transition of industry from JPAS to eApp (phased implementation)
- Finalize TIP pilot concept of operations plan

**January 2020**
- Expand industry transition to eAPP
- Operationalize TIP pilot activities
- Sunset JPAS and fully adopt DISS

---

*Defense Information System for Security (DISS) + National Background Investigation Services (NBIS)***
Migrating Cleared Industry into eApp

Benefits of migrating to eApp

- Improved user experience
- Quality Value
- Mass initiation
- Flexible hierarchy
- Automated PR deferral into CE
- Sustain VROC approve and release capabilities

To participate in eApp usability testing, please contact:
Aleesha Peebles
Aleesha.h.peebles.civ@mail.mil
301-833-3592

Note: Participation in usability study requires a DoD CAC, DoD email account and access to DoD domain.
What is NBIS?

Design, build, test, field, operate, maintain, and secure National Background Investigation Services (NBIS) - the federal-wide information technology (IT) service used to conduct suitability, security, and credentialing investigations for all federal civilians, military members, and government contractors.

Capabilities

• Collection and validation of submitted information
• Validation of previous investigation
• Maintain end to end situational awareness and command and control
• Contains information on requesting and receiving agencies
• Fingerprint and biometric processing
• Integrated case management with automated workflow
• Continuous evaluation and adjudication
• Dashboard portal-based view
• Business intelligence and advance data analytics
• Ability to export data to other investigative providers
• Automatic validation of data from multiple sources
System Modernization

LEGACY (Current)
- Vulnerable Architecture
- Aging Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current NBIB IT Ecosystem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Mgmt. Tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current NBIB IT Ecosystem

PBMS
- Front End Assignment Tool
- AKA/OCII Database
- Raffle Tracker
- Character Replacement Tool
- Transform Calculator
- G5 Organizer
- Message Formatter II

PBMS (Legacy)
- Item Level Assignment Tool
- Middle Sweep Tracker
- eQA Generator
- Corrections Struggles
- eMail Creator
- Hardcopy Log
- Outbound Manifest II

PBMS (Future)
- ProD Trading Tool
- Pre Review Daily Grid
- Case Comment Generator
- DC4/PAA Manifest
- File Release II
- Mailroom Index
- PAA Tool

PBMS (Future)
- forms Depot and Smart 360
- Pre Review Manifest
- Case Kout
- Document Organization Tool
- FP Manifesting Mail
- Custom Solutions Tools

PBMS (Future)
- Case Management Tool
- CVT Flat File Tool
- Investigator Box of Tools
- PIPS Mass Update Tool (PMUT)
- SAG Workload Tool (SWT)
- Quality Application Tools (web platform)
- Field Workload Manager (web platform)

PBMS (Future)
- CPFRA (web platform)
- Agg Tracker (web platform)
- Dashboard/ata database (used by web platform apps)
- Expedite Notice Tool (ENT)
- Integrity Recontact Tool (IRT)
- ROI Retrieval Tool (RRT)
- Manifest Reporting Tool (MRT)

PBMS (Future)
- Special Case Assignment Tool (SCAT)
- Old Dog Dashboard (OOD)
- Support Contract Rebuttal Tool (SCRT)
- Expedited Case Closing Tool
- SC File Generator (NET desktop application)
- FOI/PA Tool

PBMS (Future)
- Access genie
- Billing tools
- Check Ride Tool

+ 24 Additional Supporting Applications

NBIS (Future)
- Secured Cloud Architecture
- User-Friendly Interface

NBIS IT Ecosystem

Data Backbone
- Rules & Standards for Data Use and Dissemination

Data Brokerage as a Service (DBaaS)

Commercial
- Open Source

Government

Corporate

Machine Learning
- Security as a Service (SaaS)
- Artificial Intelligence Platform as a Service (AI PaaS)
- Attribute-Based Access Controls (ABAC)
**Capability Roadmap**

**Laid Foundational Layer**
- Organizational Build
- Purposeful User Roles
- Framework for efficient sustainment period
- Mitigates learning curve for new capability

**Initiation Capability**
- Enhanced User Interface
- Improved Data
- Improved SM visibility
- Simplifies things for the “screener”

**CE deferral for PRs**
- Reduces volume of PR’s
- Reduces bill for investigations
- Reduces number of investigations
- Clear & Monitor individuals more effectively

**Metrics & CE Capabilities**
- Data Broker - CV Data Sources
- eApp (Form 85) MVP
- Low Side Repository MVP
- Mirador CMS Update
- Metrics/Business Intelligence MVP
- Dynamic Forms MVP

**Foundational Elements**
- Investigation Scoping & Scheduling
- Data Capture
- Flexibility for emerging requirements
- Reduced investigation time
- IdAM - 2 Factor Authentication

**Future Releases**
- Investigative Mgt
- Scoping/Scheduling
- Assignment
- Case Delivery (via Portal)
- Automated Records Checks
- Fingerprints
- Vouchers
- Quality Review
- Internal Communications
- Data Broker - T1 Data Sources
- CV Data Sources
- Fingerprint Data Sources

**Subject Interaction**
- eApp
- PDT (cloud)
- eAgency Prototype
- ATOs
Questions?
Agenda

• Current NISPPAC/MOU Membership
• Policy Changes and Impacts
• New Business
• Systems
• Old Business
# National Industrial Security Program Policy Advisory Committee

## Industry Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quinton Wilkes</td>
<td>L3Harris</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Keith</td>
<td>L3Harris</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harney</td>
<td>Northrop Grumman</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Mackey</td>
<td>BAE Systems</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>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Borrero</td>
<td>ENSCO</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Stone</td>
<td>RAND Corp</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Association</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Kai Hanson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIS</td>
<td>Matt Hollandsworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSWG</td>
<td>Joseph Kraus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFRDC/UARC</td>
<td>Shawn Daley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSA</td>
<td>Kathy Pherson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISWG</td>
<td>Marc Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMS</td>
<td>Cathe Kaohi*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDIA</td>
<td>Rick Lawhorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Charlie Sowell*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Changes and Impacts

Industry Questions / Concerns
- New proposed Facility Pre-decisional Security Rating Score (SRS)
- Continuous Evaluation (CE) and lack of understanding concerning terminated employees
- Agencies not recognizing reciprocity of individuals in CE that are out of scope
- Deferring of closed investigations pending adjudication at the DOD CAF and what deferred means
  - Impact to reporting requirements for timeliness of adjudications
- “Deliver Uncompromised” initiative
- Future OUSDI guidance on use of marijuana, ownership of stocks involved with marijuana and use of other products derived from marijuana (marijuana/CBD oil purchased for your pet) – is this reportable?
- NSA released new Evaluated Products List (EPL) and removed equipment that had been previously approved for DVD destruction. Industry was left in limbo with no guidance from sponsoring agencies.
  - Draft ISL received for review concerning guidance from DCSA when an EPL is updated, awaiting feedback on comments
- Accounting for Top Secret material when in electronic form
  - Draft ISL received 11 July for review

Industry Proposed Solutions / Requests
- Industry and Government have encountered vast amounts of security policy and procedural changes in the past two years and do not anticipate this slowing. Implementation is difficult when Industry expertise is not leveraged early in the planning process. Collaborating with Industry will reduce some of the challenges when executing new national security policy.
**New Business: Insider Threat and NID**

**Industry Questions / Concerns**
- June 2019 received draft Industrial Security Letter (ISL) for Industry comment on evaluating Insider Threat Program Effectiveness
  - Will the CDSE site include the new Insider Threat evaluation process?
  - NISPPAC evaluating and consolidating comments on ISL
- June 2019 received draft ISLs for Crosscut Shredders and Investment Reporting
  - Comments on Destruction Using Crosscut Shredders submitted 20 June, awaiting response
  - Comments on Investment Reporting submitted 27 June, awaiting response
- NID timelines for some companies are over 170 days
  - DCSA approved BAE NID waiver for TS, COMSEC, and SAP

**Industry Proposed Solutions / Requests**
- NISPPAC requests continued involvement in Insider Threat Program evaluation criteria/processes
- Industry would like to convene the NID working group to review timelines, processes, and possible NID waiver for SCI
Ongoing Business: DCSA and CUI

Industry Questions / Concerns

• How will CUI governance be distinguished from NISP governance?

• How might this impact DSS’ ability to remain responsive on matters under NISP governance?

• Industry is currently being asked during DCSA assessments to describe DFARS compliance for CDI on unclassified networks.

• With increased Comprehensive Security Assessments under DiT, will Industry be increasingly evaluated on protection of CUI/CTI?

• How does the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification play into this?

Industry Proposed Solutions / Requests

• Industry stands ready and willing to interface and work with DCSA on suggestions for implementation on both governance and compliance

• Industry requests guidance on DFARS compliance during current DCSA assessments

  • NISPPAC gathered information from industry on current methods of assessment and provided to ISOO on 19 June for review, awaiting feedback
Industry Questions / Concerns

- Variances in implementation from one DCSA field office to the next to include inconsistency of certain DCSA activities within DiT (Meaningful Engagement) as well as the potential industry adoption of elevated Industrial Security Requirements Tailored Security Plan (TSP’s)
- Smaller companies without key technologies will not be seen or reviewed and the vulnerabilities this might introduce into the supply chain
- Coordination with the GCA’s and the concern about the impacts of introducing vulnerability information to the GCA outside the scope of a contract

Industry Proposed Solutions / Requests

- Industry commented and voiced concerns
- DCSA communicated the process is still in development

- Industry requests the opportunity for collaboration when coordinating with the GCA’s on vulnerability information
Industry Questions / Concerns

- Trusted Work Force 2.0
  - Currently there is no NISPPAC representation in the Trusted Work Force 2.0 meetings
- Industry received Trusted Workforce 2.0 briefing from DNI on 28 March 2019

Industry Proposed Solutions / Requests

- Industry requests that a NISPPAC member attend the Trusted Workforce 2.0 meetings
Systems – Industry Questions / Concerns

**National Industrial Security System (NISS):**
- Still in transition
- Latency issues
- Increase in facility clearance timelines
- Awaiting guidance on when Industry must have access

**Defense Information System for Security (DISS):**
- Concern regarding roll-out and lack of available user training
- DISS replacing JPAS as system of record
- How many users with current accounts?

**NISP Contracts Classification System (NCCS):**
- Concern regarding timely provisioning of the system
- DCSA is engaged with Industry on strategic plan for transition
- Initiating a working group to provide feedback and possible improvements

**eAPP:**
- Awaiting go live date and transition plan

**eAgency:**
- Initial look at the system in April 2019, awaiting go live date and transition plan

**eMASS:**
- System was rolled out May 6, 2019 with many obstacles for industry; difficulty getting access with a PKI cert, latency issues, system maintenance / patching, etc
- Most issues have been resolved and industry will continue working with DCSA to help facilitate the progress
Old Business: Small Business in Crisis

Industry Questions / Concerns

• What will happen when DiT, CUI, & NIST 800-171 takes hold?
• How will this affect our supply chain?
• Based on white paper submitted to DCSA by NCMS, DSS is engaging with DMDC to determine if system access to JPAS, SWFT and DISS can be accomplished without an eligibility.

Industry Proposed Solutions / Requests

• Industry needs policies for consultants/security services companies
Old Business: SEADs

Industry Questions / Concerns

• Industry is still awaiting implementation information regarding travel reporting under SEAD 3. Reporting foreign travel for all suitability, collateral, SAP and SCI individuals may adversely impact both government and Industry, especially if the reporting mechanisms vary per customer.

• Draft ISL SEAD 3 verbiage has been reviewed by Industry and suggestions have been submitted.

Industry Proposed Solutions / Requests

• NISPPAC requests to see draft ISL for SEAD 3 before final release to industry

• Industry is aware SEAD 8 draft is under coordination.
Old Business: Legislation Watch

Creation of Committees

Industry Questions / Concerns

• 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
  • Awaiting clarification on committee members and information sharing

Industry Proposed Solutions / Requests

• NISPPAC recommends ISOO be one of the members of the committee since this agency represents Industry
- Agency Implementation
- New CUI Coversheet and Media Labels
  - SF 901, 902, and 903
- Federal Acquisition Regulation
- Update to Stakeholders
  - July 17 (1-3 EDT)
- CUI Industry day
U.S. NRC Classified Contractor Information Systems Authorizations
NRC maintains two separate Industrial Security Programs or Offices under the NISP
  - One program for NRC cleared contractor companies
  - One program for NRC Licensee and Licensee contractor companies

NRC has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Department of Energy (DOE) for the performance Certification and Accreditation (C&A) reviews of NRC Licensee/Licensee contractor classified networks
  - MOUs have been updated when DOE and NRC re-establish Inter-Agency Agreements
  - Same accreditation and review process for NRC as for DOE
  - NRC has only a small number classified Licensee networks accredited by DOE

No NRC cleared contractor companies require classified IT systems at their facility.