



DHS Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report

Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2016

October 25, 2016

Fiscal Year 2016 Report to Congress



**Homeland
Security**

Under Secretary for Management

Message from the Deputy Under Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer

October 25, 2016

I am pleased to present the “DHS Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report” (CASR) for the third quarter of Fiscal Year (FY) 2016, which was prepared by the Office of Program Accountability and Risk Management (PARM).



The report was compiled pursuant to language in the *FY 2016 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act* (P.L. 114-113) and accompanying House Report 114-215 and Senate Report 114-68. This report covers the third quarter of FY 2016 and provides the status of programs that are 1) listed and defined in the departmental memorandum titled, “Master Acquisition Oversight List,” dated January 15, 2015, and 2) had reported a new acquisition program baseline, a new acquisition decision memorandum (ADM), or a significant deviation with respect to acquisition cost, quantity, or schedule subsequent to the prior report.

Pursuant to congressional requirements, this report is being provided to the following Members of Congress:

The Honorable John R. Carter
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Lucille Roybal-Allard
Ranking Member, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable John Hoeven
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen
Ranking Member, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

Inquiries relating to this report may be directed to me at (202) 447-5751.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chip Fulghum", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Chip Fulghum
Deputy Under Secretary for Management and
Chief Financial Officer

Executive Summary

P.L. 114-113 directs the DHS Under Secretary for Management to produce a CASR to be included with the submission of the President's Budget, and quarterly updates to such report to be submitted not later than 45 days after the completion of each quarter.

PARM prepared this quarterly CASR to fulfill the reporting mandate. The report data were derived from the Investment Evaluation, Submission, and Tracking System. DHS acquisition program governance records (e.g., ADM) supplemented the CASR. These records were coordinated with DHS Components and programs. Anticipated budgets for various DHS acquisitions are shown and yet do not represent an Administration commitment to these levels for current or future fiscal years. Subsequent events will determine decisions for acquisition program and project funding. Potential program risks and any associated deficiencies also are identified. DHS Components are taking action to mitigate risks and to resolve deficiencies.



DHS Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2016

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| I. | Legislative Language | 1 |
| II. | Introduction | 5 |
| | A. Background..... | 5 |
| | B. Governance..... | 5 |
| | C. Description of Terminology Used in the Program Information Sections | 6 |
| III. | Program Information..... | 7 |
| | U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)..... | 12 |
| | CBP – TECS Modernization | 13 |
| | Headquarters Components | 18 |
| | DHS – DMO-OCIO – OneNet | 19 |
| | National Protection and Programs Directorate (NPPD) | 23 |
| | NPPD – Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM)..... | 24 |
| | NPPD – Homeland Advanced Recognition Technology (HART)..... | 29 |
| | Transportation Security Administration (TSA) | 34 |
| | TSA – Technology Infrastructure Modernization (TIM) Program | 35 |
| | United States Coast Guard (USCG)..... | 41 |
| | USCG – Medium Range Surveillance (MRS) Aircraft Program..... | 42 |
| | USCG – National Security Cutter (NSC)..... | 47 |
| | United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)..... | 52 |
| | USCIS – Verification Modernization (VER) | 53 |
| | United States Secret Service (USSS)..... | 58 |
| | USSS – Information Integration & Technology Transformation (IITT) Enabling Capabilities (EC)..... | 59 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| IV. Appendices | 64 |
| Appendix A. Abbreviations | 64 |
| Appendix B. Programs Evaluated | 66 |

I. Legislative Language

This report was compiled pursuant to language in the *Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act* (P.L. 114-113) and accompanying House Report 114-215 and Senate Report 114-68.

P.L. 114-113 states in part:

Provided further, That the Under Secretary for Management shall include in the President’s budget proposal for fiscal year 2017, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, which shall include the information required under the heading “Office of the Under Secretary for Management” under title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74), and shall submit quarterly updates to such report not later than 45 days after the completion of each quarter.

P.L. 114-113 further states:

SEC. 561. (a) Each major acquisition program of the Department of Homeland Security, as defined in Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 102–2, shall meet established acquisition documentation requirements for its acquisition program baseline established in the Department of Homeland Security Instruction Manual 102–01–001 and the Department of Homeland Security Acquisition Instruction/Guidebook 102–01–001, Appendix K. (b) The Department shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report and its quarterly updates, required under the heading “Office of the Under Secretary for Management” of this Act, on any major acquisition program that does not meet such documentation requirements and the schedule by which the program will come into compliance with these requirements.

House Report 114-215 states:

As noted by GAO and in prior appropriations reports, proper oversight of DHS’s investment portfolio is essential to ensure that components are accountable for cost, schedule, and performance, and that Congress and DHS decision makers receive useful, accurate, up-to-date information. For that reason, the Committee retains statutory language requiring DHS to submit the Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report (CASR) with the

budget request, provide quarterly updates to Congress, and post an unclassified version of the CASR on the DHS public-facing website. All programs shall be displayed by appropriation and PPA.

Senate Report 114-68 states:

The bill continues the requirement for submission of a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report in the President's fiscal year 2017 budget with quarterly updates to be submitted 45 days after the completion of each quarter. The requirements for the reports are described in House Report 112-331.

P.L. 112-74 states in part:

Provided further, That the Under Secretary for Management shall, pursuant to the requirements contained in the joint statement of managers accompanying this Act, provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report with the President's budget for fiscal year 2013 as submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and quarterly updates to such report not later than 30 days after the completion of each quarter.

The Explanatory Statement (House Report 112-331) accompanying P.L. 112-74 includes the following provision:

Comprehensive and Quarterly Acquisition Status Reports

In order to obtain the information necessary for in-depth congressional oversight, statutory language is included in this Act under "Office of the Under Secretary for Management" that requires a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report to be included as part of the submission of the President's fiscal year 2013 budget, with quarterly updates to be submitted 30 days after the completion of each quarter. The requirements for both reports are addressed below.

The Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report shall include programs identified for Major Acquisition Oversight as defined in the Department memorandum titled "Department of Homeland Security Master Acquisition Oversight List" dated January 25, 2011, and programs that have been classified for major acquisition oversight subsequent to the referenced memorandum.

The Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report shall include for each major acquisition:

1. A narrative description to include current gaps and shortfalls, the capabilities to be fielded, and the number of planned increments and/or units;
2. Acquisition Review Board (or other board designated to review the acquisition) status of each acquisition, including the current acquisition phase, the date of the last review and a listing of the required documents that have been reviewed with the dates reviewed and/or approved;
3. The most current approved Acquisition Program Baseline (to include project schedules and events);
4. A comparison of the original Acquisition Program Baseline, the current Acquisition Program Baseline, and the current estimate;
5. Whether or not an Independent Verification and Validation has been implemented, with an explanation for the decision and a summary of any findings;
6. A rating of cost risk, schedule risk, and technical risk associated with the program (including narrative descriptions and mitigation actions);
7. Contract status (to include earned value management data as applicable);
8. A life-cycle cost of the acquisition, and time basis for the estimate;
9. A planned procurement schedule, including the best estimate of the annual cost and increments/units to be procured annually until procurement is complete;
10. A table delineated by appropriation that provides (for prior years; past year; current year; budget year; budget year plus one; budget year plus two; budget year plus three; budget year plus four and beyond; and total cost) the actual or estimated appropriations, obligations, unobligated authority, and planned expenditures;
11. The reason for any significant changes (from the previous comprehensive report) in acquisition quantity, cost, or schedule;
12. Key Events/Milestones from the prior fiscal year; and
13. Key Events/Milestones for the current fiscal year.

Quarterly reports shall include:

1. An updated status report on any major acquisition for which there has been an approved or a new acquisition program baseline, a new acquisition decision memorandum, or where there has been significant deviation from the prior report with respect to acquisition cost, quantity, or schedule (a significant change is any deviation in cost or quantity that exceeds eight percent or any change in schedule that exceeds six months).

2. A table depicting the title of the program, quantity and cost based on the original acquisition program baseline, quantity and cost based on the most current acquisition program baseline, the quantity and cost of the most current estimate, and the explanation for any change in quantity and cost from prior reports.
3. If applicable, a copy of the acquisition decision memorandum, together with a copy of the Letter of Assessment signed by the Director of Testing and Evaluation.

The requirements described under this heading shall replace those included in Senate Reports 111-31 and 112-74.

II. Introduction

A. Background

Successful acquisition program management requires having the right people, policies, processes, and technologies in place to ensure effective use of taxpayer resources. This includes maturing the acquisition workforce, enhancing policy, managing the governance framework, providing ongoing program support when needed, conducting investment analysis, and promoting best practices. On October 1, 2011, DHS established the Office of Program Accountability and Risk Management (PARM) as the Management Directorate's executive office for acquisition program management. PARM works with DHS leaders and program managers to build acquisition program management capabilities across the Department.

B. Governance

DHS has developed a comprehensive approach to acquisition program management and oversight. Management Directive (MD) 102-01, *Acquisition Management*, approved in January 2010 and revised in July 2015, established departmental acquisition policies, processes, and formal Acquisition Review Boards (ARB) to provide governance for major departmental programs.

The Under Secretary for Management issued the FY 2016 Master Acquisition Oversight List (MAOL), which provides a listing of programs and establishes oversight requirements for each program. Acquisition program thresholds for capital assets are based on estimated program lifecycle costs. DHS Instructional Guidebook MD 102-01-001 defines capital assets program threshold levels as follows:¹

- Level 1 (Major) – Lifecycle Cost at or above \$1 billion
- Level 2 (Major) – Lifecycle Cost \$300 million or more, but less than \$1 billion
- Level 3 (non-Major) – Lifecycle Cost is less than \$300 million

DHS Acquisition Management Instruction Guidebook MD 102-01-001 also applies to the acquisition of enterprise services.² Acquisition program thresholds for enterprise services are based on annual expenditures. Enterprise services program threshold levels are as follows:

¹ Per DHS Instruction MD 102-01-001, capital assets are typically recognizable things that the government takes possession of, such as systems, vehicles, or structures.

² Per DHS Instruction MD 102-01-001, enterprise services provide mission capability and support.

- Level 1 (Major) – Annual expenditures at or above \$1 billion
- Level 2 (Major) – Annual expenditures \$100 million or more, but less than \$1 billion
- Level 3 (non-Major) – Annual expenditures are less than \$100 million

Additionally, an acquisition may be raised to a higher level by the chief acquisition officer if: (a) its importance to DHS’s strategic and performance plans is disproportionate to its size; (b) it has high executive visibility; (c) it affects more than one DHS Component; (d) it has significant program or policy implications; (e) it has been designated as special interest; or (f) the Acquisition Decision Authority recommends an increase to a higher acquisition level.

C. Description of Terminology Used in the Program Information Sections

In “Section III: Program Information,” there are instances where data are not required or available. For example, if the program is in the need phase of the MD 102-01 process, an Acquisition Program Baseline (APB) is not yet required. Table 2 for the program would show “Not Applicable” for the “Original APB” date because the program does not have an APB to update. The “Current APB” date also would not be applicable. In Table 8, because an APB has not been approved, the “Approved By” and “Approval Date” columns would be labeled “Not Applicable.”

III. Program Information

This section shows the status of major DHS acquisition programs as of June 30, 2016. The programs are listed in alphabetical order by Component and are in accordance with the requirements established in the January 15, 2016, MAOL. Section 4a, of each program table below, aligns with the FY 2016 President's Budget. Although the CASR shows anticipated future budgets for various DHS acquisitions, such funding levels do not represent a commitment by the Administration to request funds in any given fiscal year or at all. Future events will affect decisions about when, whether, and at what level to request future funding for acquisition projects.

Program Information Sections correspond to all P.L. 112-74 Explanatory Statement requirements as follows:

- Section 1: "General Information" – Fulfills Joint Explanatory Statement requirements #1, 2, and 8.
- Section 2: "APB Comparison" – Requirements #3 and 4
- Section 3: "Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V) Status" – Requirement #5
- Section 4a: "Budget and Funding Status" – Requirement #10
- Section 4b: "Procurement Quantity by Year" – Requirement #9
- Section 5a: "Top Cost Risks" – Requirement #6
- Section 5b: "Top Schedule Risks" – Requirement #6
- Section 5c: "Top Technical Risks" – Requirement #6
- Section 6a: "Contract Status" – Requirement #7
- Section 6b: "Planned Procurement Schedule" – Requirement #9
- Section 7a: "Key Events/Milestones for Previous 12 Months" – Requirement #12
- Section 7b: "Key Events/Milestones for Next 12 Months" – Requirement #13
- Section 7c: "APB Milestones" – Requirement #13
- Section 8: "Key Project Documents" – Requirement #2
- Section 9: "Reason for Any Significant Change from Previous Report" – Requirement #11

Additional details regarding Program Information Sections 1, 3, 4, 8, and 9 are provided below.

In an effort to standardize terminology across the Federal Government and industry, DHS has changed the nomenclature for the various levels of project and program management certifications to align with the Federal Acquisition Certification for Program and Project Managers. In section 1: General Information, the DHS Program Management (PM)

Certification Levels previously were designated as either Level I, II, or III. The new designations are Entry Level, which is equivalent to Level I; Mid-Level, which is equivalent to Level II; and Senior Level, which is equivalent to Level III.

The ARB date in the Last ARB block of Section 1 for each program comes from the following sources, in order of preference from high to low:

- Most recent DHS ARB or Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM)
- Most recent DHS Portfolio Review
- Most recent Component ARB

Programs that are Post Acquisition Decision Event (ADE) 3 no longer are reviewed by the ARB. For Post ADE 3 programs, the most recent DHS Portfolio Review or Component ARB date will be used.

The Life Cycle Cost Estimate (LCCE) in the LCCE block of Section 1 for each program comes from one of the following sources, in order of preference from high to low:

- Signed DHS LCCE at the approved 50-percent confidence level³
- Signed DHS APB LCCE-approved threshold level⁴
- LCCE Point Estimate
- Independent Government Cost Estimate (for enterprise services programs only)
- Analysis of Alternatives

The LCCE in Section 9 is derived strictly from the latest DHS-approved APB and may not match the LCCE in Section 1.

The IV&V statuses provided in Table 3 identify levels of performance risk, characterized as a Composite Risk Score, for each program included in the CASR except for those programs identified as “Service” or “Sustainment.” These programs are denoted with “Not Applicable” in the Composite Risk Score section and “None” in the Summary of Results.

The Composite Score is calculated on the basis of four primary measures: Cost Variance, Schedule Variance, Risk Register Update, and Policy and Governance Compliance.

- **Cost Variance:** This measure compares actual costs to baseline costs at points within program execution. The Cost Variance calculation is consistent with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance.

³ Using whichever document is most current

⁴ Using whichever document is most current

- **Schedule Variance:** This measure compares actual schedule performance to the schedule baseline at points within program execution. The Schedule Variance calculation is consistent with OMB guidance.
- **Risk Register Update:** This measure considers the frequency within which a program examines its risks for continued relevancy or adds new risks. Risk Register Update is consistent with evaluation factors for the Federal Information Technology (IT) Dashboard.
- **Policy and Governance Compliance:** This measure assesses a program's compliance with DHS MD 102-01.

A scoring model is applied to the program data collected from the enterprise systems, and numeric scores are assigned. These scores are averaged to calculate the Composite Risk Score for that program. Programs with higher Composite Risk Scores are assessed to have higher potential risk.

The Budget and Funding Status (Section 4a) contains updated definitions for the 2016 Annual CASR. The table below contains these updated definitions. Project Funding now is determined by the year of enactment in order to report by appropriation and by program, project, and activity.

| Budget and Funding Status (Section 4a) Definitions | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | Past Years | FY 2015 (Revised Enacted) | FY 2016 (Enacted) | Outyears |
| Project Funding | Funds that were enacted prior to FY 2015 | Funds that were enacted in FY 2015 including rescissions, reprogrammings, and transfers | Funds that were enacted in FY 2016 as of March 31, 2016 | Project Request for anticipated future-year funding |
| Obligations | Obligations from funds enacted prior to FY 2015 | Obligations as of March 31, 2016 | Obligations as of March 31, 2016 | N/A |
| Unobligated Balance | Unobligated balances from funds enacted prior to FY 2015 | Unobligated balances as of March 31, 2016 | Unobligated balances as of March 31, 2016 | N/A |
| Expenditures | Expenditures from funds enacted prior to FY 2015 | Expenditures as of March 31, 2016 | Expenditures as of March 31, 2016 | N/A |

*In cases where there is multi-year or no-year funding, obligations and expenditures in each column reflect those made against funds from that source fiscal year, not necessarily in the year in which obligations or expenditures occurred.

The “Key Project Documents” in Section 8 include information for DHS acquisition programs that pre-date MD 102-01. These programs are considered to be in compliance by DHS, provided the program had the appropriate documentation approvals under the previous policy. On May 9, 2013, the Under Secretary for Management waived acquisition documentation requirements for 42 programs that were in sustainment when MD 102-01 was approved. For those programs, waived key documents are identified by “DHS – Waived by ADM.”

QUARTERLY PROGRAM UPDATES

| COMPONENT & PROGRAM | ORIGINAL APB | | MOST CURRENT APB | | Reason for Inclusion | DATE | EXPLANATION OF CHANGES/UPDATES/GUIDANCE |
|--|--------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|
| | QTY | COST (\$M) | QTY | COST (\$M) | | | |
| <i>U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) – TECS Modernization</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$685.38</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$692.55</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>Jun 7, 2016</i> | <i>Rebaseline remediation plan</i> |
| <i>Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) – OneNet</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$4,585.62</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$4,585.62</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>Apr 16, 2016</i> | <i>Approval of OneNet final operating capability (FOC). The OneNet Program will be changed to post-FOC program on the MAOL.</i> |
| <i>National Protection and Programs Directorate (NPPD) – Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM)</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$3,249.00</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$2,670.00</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>Jun 16, 2016</i> | <i>Program review</i> |
| <i>NPPD – Homeland Advanced Recognition Technology (HART)</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$0</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$0</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>May 26, 2016</i> | <i>Approval of ADE-2A</i> |
| <i>Transportation Security Administration (TSA) – Technology Infrastructure Modernization (TIM)</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$398,109.20</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$398,109.20</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>Apr, 26, 2016</i> | <i>Rebaseline of the TIM Program</i> |
| <i>United States Coast Guard (USCG) – Medium Range Surveillance (MRS) Aircraft</i> | <i>36</i> | <i>\$1,706</i> | <i>36</i> | <i>28,737.71</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>Jun 7, 2016</i> | <i>Approval of ADE-3 and ADE 2A/2B</i> |
| <i>USCG – National Security Cutter (NSC)</i> | <i>8</i> | <i>\$3,450</i> | <i>8</i> | <i>\$21,969</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>Apr 20, 2016</i> | <i>ARB completed. To address the unresolved cybersecurity critical operational issue.</i> |
| <i>United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) – Verification Modernization (VER)</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$3,663.23</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$3663.23</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>Apr 20, 2016</i> | <i>Program review</i> |
| <i>United States Secret Service (USSS) – Information Integration and Technology Transformation (IIT)</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$712.75</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>\$594.84</i> | <i>ADM</i> | <i>Apr 6, 2016</i> | <i>ARB review. The purpose of the ARB was to conduct a program review.</i> |

U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)

CBP – TECS Modernization

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|---|--------------|--|--|------------|--------------|------------------|
| Investment | CBP – TECS Modernization | | | Last ARB | Level | Phase | LCCE (\$M) | LCCE Date | Reporting Period |
| DHS PM Certification | Senior | | | Oct 15, 2016 | Level 2 | Mixed: Obtain, Produce/ Deploy & Support | \$669.259 | Apr 18, 2016 | Q3FY2016 |
| Investment Description | <p>The focus of CBP TECS Modernization is to improve the technological and data-sharing functions at and between the ports of entry (POE) and to improve primary and secondary inspection processes at border POEs. CBP TECS Modernization also will modernize the core TECS subject record and support services for all TECS users. This modernization effort includes new applications and host system components that are specific to the CBP mission. TECS Modernization addresses performance gaps that exist in the legacy TECS. CBP will accomplish this investment through incremental modernization and enhancement of five major system applications processes.</p> <p>The TECS Modernization program addresses a capability gap by improving the technological and data-sharing functions at and between the POEs and improving primary and secondary inspection processes at border POEs. TECS Modernization incrementally will develop and deploy this modernization effort.</p> | | | | | | | | |
| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | | | | | | | |
| Original APB | Nov 19, 2010 | Current APB | Mar 14, 2014 | Comparison | These figures were updated to reflect cost numbers from version 3.0 of the APB signed March 14, 2014. The total cost for the latest revision threshold and objective are respectively as follows: \$692.551 and \$677.112. | | | | |
| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | | | | | | | |
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | 1.25 | Summary of Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program reports meeting cost and schedule targets. - Program updated its risk register within 30 days. - One document not approved at the appropriate level as outlined in the MD-102-01. | | | | | | |

4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10)

| | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 | Current Year FY16 | Budget Year FY17 | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|------------|
| Project Funding | \$ 304,462 | \$ 50,001 | \$ 48,003 | \$ 42,001 | \$ 50,500 | \$ 51,004 | \$ 51,514 | \$ 202,031 | \$ 799,516 |
| PC&I - Securing and Expediting Trade and Travel | | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| O&S - Securing and Expediting Trade and Travel | | | | \$ 42,001 | \$ 50,500 | \$ 51,004 | \$ 51,514 | \$ 202,031 | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | | Automation Modernization | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | | Critical Operations Protection | | | | | | |
| Obligations | \$ 304,462 | \$ 50,001 | \$ 48,001 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | \$ 304,462 | \$ 50,001 | \$ 33,549 | | | | | | |

4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9)

| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
|---|-------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|------|------|------|-----------------|-------|
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Comment(s) | | | | | | | | | |

5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| Risk Description | Type | Cost | Probability | Impact |
|----------------------------|------|------|-------------|--------|
| No Cost Risks to report | | | | |
| Mitigation Strategy | | | | |

| 5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If the functionality contained in the existing Pleasure Boat Reporting System is not modernized completely (or partially modernized with waivers provided by the Office of Field Operations) by September 2016, then users will remain dependent on the mainframe until the modernized functionality can be activated and the TECS Modernization Program will not meet the milestones outlined in the APB. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Finalize requirements, prioritize, and enhance existing CBP (non-mainframe) system to include any requirements that currently are not addressed. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If the downstream systems that access TECS data through direct access to legacy databases or through LXX feeds are not transitioned off the mainframe before 9/30/2016, then they no longer will receive TECS data and their systems will be displaying less than current data or TECS Modernization will be increased to include a backward interface to legacy TECS to support these downstream systems, which delays mainframe retirement. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | The Targeting and Analysis Systems Program Directorate and Passenger Systems Program Directorate are working to identify an appropriate modernized solution for the services, direct database connections, and the LXX feeds used to support the Targeting and Analysis Systems Program Directorate system to complete within the timeline. (Solution complete, schedule planned for 88 percent of tasks. Plan to leverage interfaces developed for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).) | | | | | | |

| 5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If users of legacy TECS are allowed to execute legacy functionality on the mainframe after equivalent modernized functionality is provided, then it will be impossible to achieve mainframe independence as desired. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Control Risk. CBP offices issue directives for users to cease use of legacy TECS and begin using the modernized TECS system. Passenger Systems Program Directorate issues notification to CBP, DHS partners, and PGA user groups when legacy TECS transactions no longer will be available. | | | | | | |

6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------|---------|---|---------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|
| HSBP1014C00049 | Awarded | System Development and Operations and Maintenance | Cost Plus Fixed Fee | Sep 18, 2014 | Sep 17, 2019 | Yes | \$175.000 |
| HSBP1016J00050 | Awarded | Project Support and Security | Firm Fixed Price | Jan 22, 2016 | Jan 24, 2021 | No | \$8.918 |
| HSBP1015F00067 | Awarded | Provides user training management support to the Passenger System Program Directorate for in-field training of customs inspectors using passenger screening systems at U.S. POEs. | Fixed Price | Apr 1, 2015 | Mar 31, 2018 | No | \$5.00 |
| HSBP1014J00666 | Awarded | Provide independent testing support | Time and Materials | Sep 30, 2014 | Sept 29, 2017 | No | \$4.409 |
| HSBP1015F00409 | Awarded | This contract provides program management and operational test and evaluation support to the TECS Modernization Program. Contract ensures IT regulatory compliance. | Firm Fixed Price | Sep 16, 2015 | Sep 25, 2017 | No | \$3.775 |

6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|------|------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|
| No planned procurements reported. | | | | | | | |

7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Jul 01, 2015 to Jun 30, 2016)

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------------|--------------|
| Description | Travel Documents and Encounter Data | Completion Date | Jul 10, 2015 |
| Description | Lookout Record Data and Screening Services | Completion Date | Mar 10, 2015 |
| Description | Primary Inspection Processes | Completion Date | Sep 22, 2015 |
| Description | Travel Documents and Encounter Data | Completion Date | Mar 31, 2016 |
| Description | High Performance Primary Query and Manifest Processing | Completion Date | Apr 15, 2016 |

7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Jul 01, 2016 to Jun 30, 2017)

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------------|--------------|
| Description | Lookout Record Data and Screening Services | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2016 |
| Description | Primary Inspection Process | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2016 |
| Description | Operational Testing of modernized TECS at a Land POE | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2016 |
| Description | Operational Testing of modernized TECS at an Air and Sea POE | Completion Date | Oct 31, 2016 |
| Description | Operational Testing of Data Center Switchover/Failover | Completion Date | Jan 30, 2017 |

7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2014 Through Final Operational Capability Delivery)

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|--------------|
| Description | Modernized TECS Operational at the National Data Center | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2016 |
| Description | Modernized TECS Operational at the Second Data Center | Completion Date | Mar 31, 2017 |
| Description | ADE-3 | Completion Date | Mar 31, 2017 |

8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2)

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Approved Mission Needs Statement (MNS) | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Mar 24, 2011 |
| Approved Operational Requirements Document (ORD) | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Mar 14, 2014 |
| Approved Acquisition Plan (AP) | Yes | Approved By | Component Approved | Approval Date | Apr 23, 2012 |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Mar 14, 2014 |
| Approved Testing and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | May 16, 2016 |
| Approved Integrated Logistics Support Plan (ILSP) | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Mar 24, 2011 |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Apr 18, 2016 |

9 REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11)

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
| Quantity | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | No change from previous report. |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | \$692.551 | \$692.551 | No change from previous report. |
| Schedule (FOC) | FY 2016 | FY 2016 | No change from previous report. |

Headquarters Components

DHS – DMO-OCIO – OneNet

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--|------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| Investment | DHS – DMO-OCIO – OneNet | Last ARB | | Level | | Phase | | LCCE (\$M) | | LCCE Date | | Reporting Period | |
| DHS PM Certification | Senior Level | Aug 12, 2011 | Level 1 | Support | \$2,366.599 (Component) | Sep 30, 2014 | Q3FY2016 | | | | | | |
| Investment Description | <p>OneNet is a group of interrelated initiatives designed to improve the Department’s IT infrastructure by unifying disparate Component IT networks, platforms, and services to provide a common IT infrastructure across DHS. OneNet supports the Secretary of Homeland Security’s goal to “Strengthen and Unify DHS Operations and Management,” supporting all of the Department’s strategic goals and business objectives: awareness, prevention, protection, response, recovery, service, and organizational excellence. DHS OneNet investments provide a critical infrastructure foundation that supports systems that disseminate information across all DHS Components (including external customers and intelligence partners). The DHS OCIO’s vision to fortify this foundation is embodied in OneNet. It is through the execution of OneNet initiatives that barriers to collaboration and information sharing within and across DHS Components are reduced and operational efficiencies are achieved. OneNet represents a transition to enterprise services through developing, implementing, and managing cross-organizational efforts. OneNet initiatives have addressed vulnerabilities in critical infrastructure, cyber security, and disaster recovery gaps noted in FYs 2005–2007 Government Accountability Office and DHS Inspector General reports. The uniform network services, consolidated computing asset footprint, standardized email platform, and wireless strategic initiatives provided by OneNet also will continue to provide more efficient system maintenance, management, and administration costs. Key customers of OneNet include state, local, and tribal governments, CBP, Intelligence & Analysis, and ICE, as well as other federal civilian agencies. The stakeholders of OneNet include DHS, its Components, state, local, and tribal governments, as well as the DHS OCIO/Information Technology Service Office, Federal Protective Service, and other various government, law enforcement, and intelligence agencies that communicate classified data.</p> <p>OneNet directly addresses vulnerabilities in critical infrastructure, cyber security, and disaster recovery gaps noted in FYs 2005–2007 Government Accountability Office and DHS Inspector General reports. The uniform network services, consolidated computing asset footprint, standardized email platform, and wireless strategic initiatives provided by OneNet also will continue to provide more efficient system maintenance, management, and administration costs. The OneNet program provides the following: a secure, survivable enterprise network with centralized operations, security, and governance; e-mail – establishes a common, reliable, and standardized email communication system to facilitate information sharing across the Department; provides a single enterprise global address list; and Data Center – consolidates 43 primary Component Data Centers into 2 physically secure, geographically diverse Enterprise Data Centers. Enterprise Data Centers offer services for computing, applications, data storage management, and disaster recovery.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Original APB | Jan 07, 2016 | Current APB | Jan 07, 2016 | Comparison | Not Applicable |

| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | |
|--|----------------|---------------------------|---|
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | Not Applicable | Summary of Results | None – Program is in sustainment. Accordingly, no IV&V scores are reported. |

4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10)

| | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 | Current Year FY16 | Budget Year FY17 | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|--------------|
| Project Funding | \$ 419,497 | \$ 75,307 | \$ 64,539 | \$ 72,427 | \$ 73,151 | \$ 73,883 | \$ 74,622 | \$ 1,149,340 | \$ 2,002,766 |
| WCF - Office of Chief Information Officer | | | | \$ 72,427 | \$ 73,151 | \$ 73,883 | \$ 74,622 | \$ 1,149,340 | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | Working Capital Fund | | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | Office of Chief Information | | | | | | | |
| Obligations | \$ 418,703 | \$ 68,236 | \$ 44,809 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | \$ 794 | \$ 3,008 | \$ 19,730 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | \$ 406,477 | \$ 58,509 | \$ 11,529 | | | | | | |

*Project funds for all fiscal years reflect this activity for the Working Capital Fund

4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9)

| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
|---|-------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|------|------|------|-----------------|-------|
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Comment(s) | | | | | | | | | |

5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If return on investment is uncertain, then the LCCEs may be underestimated. | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | OCIO and Program Analysis and Evaluation will work with Components in portfolio review process to increase transparency of legacy Data Center costs. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | | Type | Cost | Probability | High | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | | | | | | | |

| 5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|------|
| Risk Description | If Enterprise Operations Center Migration is delayed, then Federal Information Security Management Act compliance will be breached. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Utilize competitive award acquisition strategy and emphasize DHS OCIO and Component involvement and coordination to comply with enterprise operations policy. | | | | | | |

| 5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--|---------------|--|
| Risk Description | No current technical risks meet the reporting criteria. | Type | Technical | Probability | | Impact | |
| Mitigation Strategy | | | | | | | |

| 6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
| HSHQDC08J00169 | Awarded | ADP & Telecommunications Services | Combination (two or more) | Jul 11, 2008 | Dec 30, 2021 | Yes | \$967.000 |
| HSHQDC-13-J-00382 | Awarded | Network engineering support for OneNet | Firm Fixed Price | Sep 16, 2013 | May 28, 2017 | No | \$14.682 |
| HSHQDC-14-F-00050 | Awarded | Security Operations Center support for the OneNet Network | Time and Materials | May 21, 2014 | Aug 20, 2016 | No | \$13.102 |
| HSHQDC-14-J-00193 | Awarded | Project management support for the OneNet management | Firm Fixed Price | May 31, 2014 | Feb 28, 2017 | No | \$6.233 |

| 6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-----------------------------------|------|------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|
| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
| No planned procurements reported. | | | | | | | |

| 7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Jul 01, 2015 to Jun 30, 2016) | | |
|---|--|-----------------|
| Description | | Completion Date |
| No key events/milestones reported. | | |

7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Jul 01, 2016 to Jun 30, 2017)

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| Description | No planned key events/milestones reported. | Completion Date | |
|--------------------|--|------------------------|--|

7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2014 Through Final Operational Capability Delivery)

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Description | No APB milestones reported. | Completion Date | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|

8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2)

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Approved MNS | Yes | Approved By | Component Approved | Approval Date | Sep 01, 2005 |
| Approved ORD | Yes | Approved By | Component Approved | Approval Date | Sep 01, 2005 |
| Approved AP | Yes | Approved By | Component Approved | Approval Date | Sep 01, 2005 |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jan 7, 2016 |
| Approved TEMP | Yes | Approved By | Component Approved | Approval Date | Sep 01, 2005 |
| Approved ILSP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Dec 21, 2015 |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | Component Approved | Approval Date | Sep 30, 2014 |

9 REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11)

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
| Quantity | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | No change from previous report. |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | No change from previous report. |
| Schedule (FOC) | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | No change from previous report. |

National Protection and Programs Directorate (NPPD)

NPPD – Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM)

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|--|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Investment | NPPD – Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM) | Last ARB | Level | Phase | LCCE (\$M) | LCCE Date | Reporting Period |
| DHS PM Certification | Senior Level | May 27, 2016 | Level 1 | Mixed; Analyze/ Select & Obtain | \$2,357.360 | Jan 05, 2016 | Q3FY2016 |
| Investment Description | <p>The CDM Program furthers the ability to execute the responsibilities delegated to DHS in OMB Memorandum M-10-28. The continuous monitoring trends, when cross-correlated with the U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team and EINSTEIN, will allow DHS to provide a Federal civilian Government-wide view on security measures needing priority attention. Additionally, the cyber diagnostic strategy will provide timely, targeted, and prioritized visibility into security issues, allowing agencies to address the worst problems first. The program provides tested continuous monitoring, diagnosis, and mitigation activities. DHS centrally will oversee the procurement, operations, and maintenance of diagnostic sensors (tools) and dashboards deployed to each agency. In addition, DHS will maintain a dashboard to provide situational awareness on a federal level. This initiative is in direct support of the Administrations Cross-Agency Priority goal for implementing continuous monitoring across the federal networks.</p> <p>The CDM Program provides tested continuous monitoring, diagnosis, and mitigation activities designed to strengthen the security posture of the Federal Government's networks (124 civilian agencies). Under this program, DHS centrally will oversee the procurement and operations of diagnostic sensors (tools) and dashboards deployed to each participating agency.</p> | | | | | | |

| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Original APB | Current APB | Comparison | | | |
| Jun 04, 2013 | Aug 28, 2015 | Program Cost and Schedule Re-baseline | | | |

| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | Summary of Results | | |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program reports meeting cost and schedule targets. - Program updated its risk register within 30 days. - All required MD 102-01 documents are submitted and approved. | | |

4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10)

| | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 | Current Year FY16 | Budget Year FY17 | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Project Funding | \$ 356,303 | \$ 204,071 | \$ 102,659 | \$ 274,801 | \$ 140,191 | \$ 158,012 | \$ 157,117 | \$ 1,098,361 | \$ 2,491,515 |
| PC&I - Protect Infrastructure | | | | \$ 266,971 | \$ 128,588 | \$ 146,618 | \$ 147,867 | \$ 995,118 | |
| O&S - Protect Infrastructure | | | | \$ 7,830 | \$ 11,603 | \$ 11,394 | \$ 9,250 | \$ 103,243 | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | | Infrastructure Protection & | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | | Federal Network Security | | | | | | |
| Obligations | \$ 356,303 | \$ 204,071 | \$ 37,590 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 65,069 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | \$ 143,938 | \$ 42,690 | \$ 8,338 | | | | | | |

4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9)

| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|------|------|------|-----------------|-------|
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Comment(s) | | | | | | | | | |

5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------|------|--------------------|------|---------------|------|
| Risk Description | If the costs grow beyond what is affordable to the program, then tradeoffs to the program will have to be made. | Type | Cost | Probability | High | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Update the LCCE frequently as program executes work. If costs begin to escalate, then tradeoffs will be made and either schedule will slip or some agencies will not be able to have all three increments' capabilities. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If accurate and comprehensive agency network specifications are not defined clearly prior to contract award, then the initial task orders may fail to satisfy customer needs and/or large gaps may be identified through solution validation. | Type | Cost | Probability | High | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Continue to work with early engagement group to gain a clear understanding of current tools, size of gap, and any other complexities that need to be identified in the task orders and to provide a checklist of network information required. Establishing earned value metrics to measure agency progress in satisfying task order information requirements to provide a visible and easily understood way to measure progress. | | | | | | |

| 5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|----------|--------------------|------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If the program accelerates as quickly as OMB and events appear to dictate, then agencies may not have sufficient resources to operationalize. | Type | Schedule | Probability | High | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Coordinate with agencies to identify requirements and potential professional installation services required. Work with the Federal Systems Integration and Management Center to ensure availability of professional installations services are available under the blanket purchase agreement. Establish personnel qualifications standards that must be part of the required staffing plan. | | | | | | |

| 5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------|-----------|--------------------|------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If resource levels are not sufficient to execute the amount of work for this program, then the schedule and operational performance of the planned systems may be affected. | Type | Technical | Probability | High | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Added 15 federally funded research and development center contract positions to support the federal program management office's organization. Working with Human Capital to expedite filling existing vacancies and planning to fill FY 2016 approved positions. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If there is insufficient agency infrastructure or storage to support the CDM solution, then alternatives for hosting the Continuous Monitoring as a Service (CMaaS) solution will need to be considered and/or CDM implementation/deployment will be delayed. | Type | Technical | Probability | High | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Work with agencies and leadership to determine what we can support and fund. | | | | | | |

| 6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|--|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
| HSSA01-12-X-0178 | Awarded | Assisted Acquisition Support | Combination | Sep 06, 2012 | Aug 31, 2018 | No | \$471.632 |
| HSSA01-14-X-2202 | Awarded | Systems Engineering and Cybersecurity Advice | Time and Materials | May 28, 2014 | Aug 31, 2015 | No | \$53.544 |
| GSQ0015AJ0052 | Awarded | Cybersecurity and Communications | Time and Materials | Apr 14, 2015 | Apr 13, 2020 | No | \$23.565 |
| GSQ0015AJ0041 | Awarded | Systems Engineering and Cybersecurity Advice | Time and Materials | Feb 24, 2015 | Jun 16, 2018 | No | \$16.309 |
| GSQ0014AJ0058 | Awarded | Development of CDM Dashboard | Time and Materials | Mar 2, 2014 | Mar 2, 2018 | No | \$15.633 |

6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|------|------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|
| No planned procurements reported. | | | | | | | |

7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Jul 01, 2015 to Jun 30, 2016)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Description | 2.7 CMaaS | | | | Completion Date | Sept 21, 2015 |
| Description | 2.8 CMaaS | | | | Completion Date | Sept 11, 2015 |
| Description | 2.9 CMaaS | | | | Completion Date | Sept 11, 2015 |
| Description | As-Is Discovery | | | | Completion Date | Mar 10, 2016 |
| Description | Provisioning of CMaaS Tools and Dashboard | | | | Completion Date | Apr 26, 2016 |
| Description | TO2A Provisioning of CMaaS Tools and Dashboard activity | | | | Completion Date | Jun 16, 2016 |

7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Jul 01, 2016 to Jun 30, 2017)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | Provisioning of CMaaS Tools and Dashboard | | | | Completion Date | Sep 10, 2016 |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------|--------------|

7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2014 Through Final Operational Capability Delivery)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|--|--|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | ADE 3 | | | | Completion Date | Aug 31, 2016 |
| Description | FOC | | | | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2018 |

8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2)

| | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Approved MNS | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Aug 16, 2012 |
| Approved ORD | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jun 24, 2015 |
| Approved AP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sept 5, 2014 |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Aug 28, 2015 |
| Approved TEMP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Apr 03, 2014 |
| Approved ILSP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Dec 19, 2014 |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Aug 31, 2015 |

9**REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11)**

| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Quantity | Not Reported | Not Reported | Not Applicable |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | \$2,653.00 | \$2,653.00 | No change from previous report. |
| Schedule (FOC) | FY 2018 | FY 2018 | No change from previous report. |

NPPD – Homeland Advanced Recognition Technology (HART)

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Investment | NPPD – Homeland Advanced Recognition Technology (HART) | Last ARB | Level | Phase | LCCE (\$M) | LCCE Date | Reporting Period |
| DHS PM Certification | Level III | Apr 25, 2016 | 1 | Obtain/ Analyze | \$5,835.40 | April 14, 2016 | QFY2016 |
| Investment Description | <p>The Office of Biometric Identity Management (OBIM) is the lead entity within DHS responsible for biometric identity management services. OBIM is in the acquisition and development stage for the HART as a replacement for the Automated Biometric Identification System (IDENT). HART will provide identity services expertise, as a service provider for customers across the Department, at other federal agencies, state and local law enforcement, and overseas. HART will be used for biometric identity verification and determination.</p> <p>HART will address new and emergent capability gaps to meet baseline and new customer mission needs. These gaps include the inability to meet capacity and customer mission requirements; increased accuracy of biometric matching results; increased IT security and privacy protections; greater interoperability; and improved performance and availability. Not fully funding HART will hamper immigration, credentialing, and law enforcement missions significantly.</p> | | | | | | |

| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--|
| Original APB | Current APB | Comparison | |
| April 22, 2016 | | | |

| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | Summary of Results | | |
| Not Applicable | Not Applicable | | |

4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10)

| | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 | Current Year FY16 | Budget Year FY17 | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
|---|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| Project Funding | \$ 19,000 | \$ 43,923 | \$ 65,800 | \$ 268,886 | \$ 275,860 | \$ 313,419 | \$ 284,041 | \$ 3,660,581 | \$ 4,931,510 |
| PC&I - Securing and Expediting Trade and Travel | | | | \$ 52,800 | \$ 40,000 | \$ 46,700 | \$ - | \$ - | |
| O&S - Securing and Expediting Trade and Travel | | | | \$ 216,086 | \$ 235,860 | \$ 266,719 | \$ 284,041 | \$ 3,660,581 | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | Office of Biometric Identity Management | | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | Office of Biometric Identity Management | | | | | | | |
| Obligations | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | \$ 19,000 | \$ 43,923 | \$ 65,800 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | | | | | |

*Past and prior years amounts are recoveries planned for HART.

4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9)

| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------|----------------|------|------|------|--------------------|-------|
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Comment(s) | | | | | | | | | |

5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| Risk Description | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
|---|---|------|-------------|--------|--------|------|
| If a vendor delivers a HART system that causes Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs to balloon unexpectedly, then OBIM may not have sufficient funds for the sustainment phase of the HART lifecycle. It is possible for a vendor to deliver a solution that is extremely inexpensive when first delivered. This can be because the contractor made maximum reuse of existing IDENT equipment, or got deeply discounted pricing from a vendor trying to get a foot in the door with OBIM. When it comes time to replace the hardware or renew licensing (software and hardware), or to buy more hardware to provide more capacity, there may be extremely high prices involved. | | | | | | |
| Mitigation Strategy | Avoid the risk by requiring vendors to deliver a 5-year lifecycle cost for their proposed solution as part of their proposals, and use it in our selection criteria. Additionally, make vendors, as part of their offer, submit a per-year cost for license renewal and a unit cost for hardware/software required when needing to increase capacity. Use this as part of the evaluation criteria for the contract award. | | | | | |

5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------|----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|------|
| Risk Description | OBIM is planning to have four separate increments for the development of HART. The increments of the HART are planned to overlap. If there is insufficient staff to work on multiple increments, THEN the schedule for HART may not be met. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1) Obtain detailees from other Components or agencies. 2) Hire additional staff. 3) Extend the schedule. | | | | | | |

5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If the integrity and quality of the source data are not identified and corrected before the migration, then the transactional use of the data in our daily business and future analytical use to improve operations may be affected negatively, data conversion effort may not be able to meet the planned schedule, and/or the data inaccurately may be transformed and migrated. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1) Analyze legacy data before finalizing the data conversion scope and identify and secure subject matter experts with knowledge of and experience with the legacy data. 2) Understand and document IDENT data quality issues before migrating data into a new system. 3) Ensure that data governance is established and dedicated to address data issues related to the data conversion effort. 4) Prepare a detailed inventory of what data and systems' architecture exist, and identify any data issues relevant to the conversion during the data store design phases of the project. 5) Ensure all resource dependencies, such as access to and availability of environments (legacy IDENT, HART staging, and HART Production), tools, software licenses, or personnel, are thoroughly identified. | | | | | | |

6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-------------------|--------|--|--------------------|------------|---|------------------|-------------------|
| HSHQDC-15-J-00177 | Active | Provide requirements definition support services in support of the replacement biometric system, HART | Firm Fixed Price | 6/8/2015 | Current Option: 6/7/2017; Last Option: 6/7/2020 | No | \$3,223,984.34 |
| HSHQDC-15-J-00351 | Active | Provide acquisition and management support services in support of the replacement biometric system, HART. | Firm Fixed Price | 8/31/2015 | Current Option: 6/30/2017; Last Option: 6/30/2018 | No | \$1,143,918.15 |
| HSHQDC-15-X-00114 | Active | Interagency Agreement: Provide operational test agent support services in support of the planning phase of the replacement biometric system, HART. | Time and Materials | 9/9/2015 | 9/30/2016 | No | \$257,000 |

6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|
| TBD | Pre-Solicitation | HART Strategic Communications Support Services | TBD | TBD | TBD | No | TBD |
| TBD | Pre-Solicitation | Develop, test, and deploy the replacement biometric system, HART | Hybrid (Firm Fixed Price/Fixed Price Award Fee/ Time & Materials) | TBD | TBD | Yes | TBD |
| TBD | Pending Interagency Agreement Award | Interagency Agreement: Establish an interagency agreement with the Department of Defense's Defense Information Systems Agency Joint Interoperability Test Command for Operational Test Agent support services for the HART. | Time & Materials | 10/1/2016 | 10/28/2018 | No | TBD |

7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Jul 01, 2015 to Jun 30, 2016)

| Description | Completion Date |
|-------------|-----------------|
| ADE-2A | Apr 25, 2016 |

7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Jul 01, 2016 to Jun 30, 2017)

| Description | Completion Date |
|-------------|-----------------|
| ADE-2B | Sep 30, 2016 |

7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2014 Through Final Operational Capability Delivery)

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | Initial Operating Capability (IOC) | Completion Date | Dec 31, 2018 |
| Description | ADE-3 | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2021 |
| Description | FOC | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2021 |

| 8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2) | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------|--|
| Approved MNS | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | 7/27/2015 | |
| Approved ORD | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | 3/6/2016 | |
| Approved AP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | 4/21/2016 | |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | 4/22/2016 | |
| Approved TEMP | No | Approved By | None | Approval Date | None | |
| Approved ILSP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | 3/22/2016 | |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | 4/14/2016 | |

| 9 REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11) | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
| Quantity | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | No change from previous report. |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | No change from previous report. |
| Schedule (FOC) | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | No change from previous report. |

Transportation Security Administration (TSA)

TSA – Technology Infrastructure Modernization (TIM) Program

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---------------|---------|--|------------|--------------|------------------|
| Investment | TSA – Technology Infrastructure Modernization (TIM) Program | Last ARB | Level | Phase | LCCE (\$M) | LCCE Date | Reporting Period |
| DHS PM Certification | Senior Level | June 23, 2016 | Level 2 | Mixed: Obtain, Produce/ Deploy & Support | \$1,344M | Sep 15, 2015 | Q3FY2016 |
| Investment Description | <p>The TIM Program reduces the probability of a terrorist attack on the transportation sector by replacing legacy vetting systems with a person-centric system. This approach eliminates exploitable gaps, improves enrollment and threat assessment methodologies, and enables TSA to vet and provide credentials to more transportation populations. The TIM system provides an integrated, end-to-end solution to manage identities, credentials, and assessment results for millions of transportation workers, providing more accurate and timely identification of terrorist threats. TIM provides a service-oriented architecture framework, mission services, and service capabilities. The IOC was achieved in May 2014.</p> <p>The TIM Program addresses a capability gap by replacing legacy vetting systems with a person-centric system. This approach will eliminate exploitable gaps, improve enrollment and threat assessment methodologies, and enable TSA to vet and provide credentials to more transportation populations. The program is being developed in four main increments that are service-oriented architecture infrastructure, service-oriented architecture foundation, and mission services in support of Maritime, Surface, and Aviation programs and populations.</p> | | | | | | |

| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Original APB | Current APB | Comparison | Original APB still current | Comparison | Not Applicable |
| Nov 04, 2011 | | | | | |

| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | |
|---|---|------|--|
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | Summary of Results | 2.25 | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program reports meeting cost targets but shows significant deviation from its schedule baseline. - Program updated its risk register within 30 days. - All required MD 102-01 documents are submitted and approved. | | |

4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10)

| | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 | Current Year FY16 | Budget Year FY17 | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Project Funding | \$ 232,710 | \$ 42,713 | \$ 41,938 | \$ 41,714 | \$ 44,694 | \$ 42,683 | \$ 43,243 | \$ 112,322 | \$ 602,017 |
| PC&I - Transportation Screening Operations | | | | \$ 6,300 | \$ 6,363 | \$ 6,427 | \$ 6,491 | \$ 6,556 | |
| O&S - Transportation Screening Operations | | | | \$ 35,414 | \$ 38,331 | \$ 36,256 | \$ 36,752 | \$ 105,766 | |
| Funding Status | Total | | | | | | | | |
| Obligations | \$ 229,011 | \$ 40,539 | \$ 13,925 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | \$ 3,699 | \$ 2,174 | \$ 28,013 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | \$ 205,608 | \$ 15,030 | \$ 5,164 | | | | | | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | Intelligence and Vetting | | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | Other Vetting Programs | | | | | | | |
| Project Funding | | \$ 38,324 | \$ 36,796 | | | | | | |
| Obligations | | \$ 38,324 | \$ 13,925 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | | \$ - | \$ 22,871 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | | \$ 29,095 | \$ 5,164 | | | | | | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | Intelligence and Vetting | | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | TWIC - Fee | | | | | | | |
| Project Funding | | \$ 4,389 | \$ 5,142 | | | | | | |
| Obligations | | \$ 4,389 | \$ - | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | | \$ - | \$ 5,142 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | | \$ 4,381 | \$ - | | | | | | |

TSA's FY15 and FY16 obligations and expenditures reflect those against the current year enacted funds only. Obligations and expenditures against TSA's two-year and no-year account balances (i.e. 'carryover') are not reflected in the table.

4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9)

| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------|----------------|------|------|------|--------------------|-------|
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Comment(s) | | | | | | | | | |

| 5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|------|--------------------|--------|---------------|------|
| Risk Description | If the TIM Program is unable to gain DHS approval of the 2016 LCCE reflecting the rebaseline and mitigation strategy, then the program will continue to be in a breach position from its original LCCE. | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Work with TSA Acquisitions to ensure that proposals from the development contractors provide best value to the program. This will be done through proper setting of requirements and negotiations on associated hours to complete work packages required by the Federal Government. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If new functionality or populations are required by the customer before TIM reaches full operational capability, then the work may have to be done in the legacy systems and then built again in TIM at a later date at additional cost. | Type | Cost | Probability | High | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Work with legacy system developers to develop solutions for new functionality that can maximize reuse between legacy systems and TIM (if possible). | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If the proposed costs for the development contractor to complete the TIM development to FOC are larger than estimated in the TIM LCCE, then the program will incur schedule delays through readjustment of scope and accelerated acquisitions to bring on additional contractors. | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Work with TSA Acquisitions to ensure that proposals from the development contractors provide best value to the program. This will be done through proper setting of requirements and negotiations on associated hours to complete work packages required by the Federal Government. | | | | | | |

| 5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|------|
| Risk Description | If the TIM Program is unable to rebaseline its schedule to meet the demands of additional scope and functionality requirements to the TIM system, then the TIM Program will remain in breach of its previously approved schedule baseline. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Work with TSA and DHS Acquisitions groups to rebaseline the TIM program and be underway with a new schedule baseline by the end of the fourth quarter of 2016. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If new requirements or new populations to the TIM system require significant cost, schedule, or other business analysis, then the TIM Program may not be able to respond in a timely fashion because of the cuts to program management office support though the LCCE mitigation strategy. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Require additional funding and schedule for analysis of new populations or business analysis of the TIM Program. | | | | | | |

| 5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If the program is unable to implement agile development practices and use open source software, then the program will not be able to meet the DHS Agile Pilot designation for the program. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Work with the results of the TIM Study Plan and Tech Assist to devise an affordable approach to using agile practices in the development of the system. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If the TIM system is unable to leverage the capabilities of other systems within DHS for biometric and person-centric matching (like IDENT) for its mission, then the program may incur unnecessary costs to achieve its mission. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Work with DHS systems and stakeholders to ensure that systems that provide matching services have the ability to meet the TIM mission and have the proper technology to meet TIM requirements. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If the TIM program is unable to provide functionality enhancements of the TIM system to the TSA Adjudication Center, then the ability for the TSA Adjudication Center to optimize its ability to adjudicate transportation workers will be limited. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Continue to work with the TSA Adjudication Center and TSA Office of International Affairs Program Management Division to ensure that priorities and requirements for functionality enhancements to TIM are known and prioritized accordingly. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If the enrollment data for the TSA Pre✓® population are “dirtier” than expected, then data migration of that population will take longer at an additional cost than expected. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Begin data migration and data analysis for TSA Pre✓® populations early, and recognize any potential issues with data cleanliness so that they can be mitigated before schedule is affected. | | | | | | |

| 6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
| HSTS0213JOIA324 | Awarded | System Development and O&M Services | Cost Plus Award Fee | Aug 01, 2012 | Feb 28, 2017 | Yes | \$16.450 |
| HSTS0216JOIA119 | Awarded | Independent Systems Engineering | Cost Plus Fixed Fee | Jun 6, 2016 | Jun 07, 2017 | No | \$3.655 |
| HSTS0216JOIAO53 | Awarded | Data Center Services | Firm Fixed Price | Jan 01, 2016 | Jun 30, 2017 | No | \$9.894 |
| HSTS0215XOIA048 | Awarded | Independent Systems Engineering | Firm Fixed Price | Mar 19, 2015 | Jun 6, 2016 | No | \$3.648 |
| HSTS02-15-J-OIA079 | Awarded | IV&V for TIM Program | Firm Fixed Price | Sept 25, 2015 | Sep 24, 2020 | No | \$6.472 |

6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|
| HSTS0215DOIA049 | Proposal for task order under review | O&M Services – Tier 1 and Tier 2 | Firm Fixed Price | TBD | TBD | No | TBD |

7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Jul 01, 2015 to Jun 30, 2016)

| | | | |
|-------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | The DHS Under Secretary for Management (USM) provided ADM approving new technical approach. | Completion Date | Apr 26, 2016 |
| Description | USM provided ADM authorizing program to continue resolving problems identified during Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E), and assigned OCIO to form a Tech Assist Integrated Project Team (IPT) to develop a new technical approach. | Completion Date | Nov 30, 2016 |
| Description | Proposed new technical approach by the Tech Assist IPT approved by ARB as basis for rebaseline of TIM program | Completion Date | Mar 29, 2016 |

7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Jul 01, 2016 to Jun 30, 2017)

| | | | |
|-------------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| Description | ARB for ADE 2A decision with respect to the rebaseline | Completion Date | NLT Sep 30, 2016 |
|-------------|--|-----------------|------------------|

7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2015 Through Full Operational Capability Delivery)

| | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Description | ADE 2A Decision | Completion Date | NLT Sep 30, 2016 |
| Description | FOC | Completion Date | FY 2021 |

8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2)

| | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Approved MNS | Yes | Approved By | Component Approved | Approval Date | Apr 28, 2009 |
| Approved ORD | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Apr 09, 2012 |
| Approved AP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jan 02, 2013 |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Nov 04, 2011 |
| Approved TEMP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Nov 27, 2013 |
| Approved ILSP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Nov 04, 2011 |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sep 11, 2015 |

9**REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11)**

| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Quantity | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | \$398,109 | \$398,109 | No change from previous report. |
| Schedule (FOC) | FY2016 | FY2021 | Change due to ARB direction of 3/29/2016 to rebaseline the program |

United States Coast Guard (USCG)*

*The USCG Programs do not include O&M budget under the Project Request line in Table 4: Budget and Funding Status. This is due to the uniqueness of the Coast Guard accounting system.

USCG – Medium Range Surveillance (MRS) Aircraft Program

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| Investment | USCG – Medium Range Surveillance (MRS) Aircraft | Last ARB | Level | Phase | LCCE (\$M) | LCCE Date | Reporting Period |
| DHS PM Certification | Senior Level | April 22, 2016 | Level 1 | Mixed: Produce/ Deploy & Support | \$21,317.660 | Sep 18, 2012 | Q3FY2016 |
| Investment Description | <p>The MRS Program involves two Maritime Patrol Aircraft (MPA) platforms, the HC-144 and C-27. The MRS MPA replaces the legacy HU-25 Guardian. Both aircraft are state-of-the-market, twin-engine, turboprop airplanes with a cockpit designed for superior situational awareness, reducing workload and increasing safety allowing the aircrew to better concentrate on mission requirements. The HC-144 offers a mission system suite that enables the aircrew to compile data from the aircraft’s multiple and integrated sensors and transmit information to surface vessels, other aircraft, and shore facilities. The C-27 MPA Conversion/Sustainment Project introduces, missionizes, and establishes the C-27 support structure. The C-27 originally was acquired by the Department of Defense, and as a result of the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, 14 C-27s were transferred to the Coast Guard. The aircraft will be missionized using the same mission system architecture installed on HC-144 and HC-130J fleet.</p> | | | | | | |

| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| Original APB | Current APB | Comparison | | | |
| May 15, 2007 | Oct 23, 2012 | <p>Original APB is Deepwater Joint Program baseline. Version 2.0 included greater fidelity with respect to spare and repair cost efforts, and reflects the additional 5 years of acquisition and follow-on support. Schedule updated to reflect decision to revert to ADE-2B from ADE-3 and incorporate initial OT&E. Cost updated to reflect lifecycle cost estimate. The revised Key Performance Parameters (KPP) align with those of the updated ORD.</p> | | | |

| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | Summary of Results | | |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program reports meeting cost and schedule targets. - Program updated its risk register within 30 days. - All required MD 102-01 documents are submitted and approved. | | |

4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10)

| | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 | Current Year FY16 | Budget Year FY17 | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| Project Funding | \$ 1,067,128 | \$ 35,000 | \$ 105,000 | \$ 155,500 | \$ 70,000 | \$ 97,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 1,533,542 | \$ 3,163,170 |
| Acquisition, Planning, and Expenses - Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements | | | | \$ 155,500 | \$ 70,000 | \$ 97,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 1,533,542 | |
| Maintenance and Salaries - Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements | | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements | | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | HC-27J Conversion/Sustainment | | | | | | | |
| Obligations | \$ 1,063,912 | \$ 32,542 | \$ 34,006 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | \$ 3,215 | \$ 2,458 | \$ 70,994 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | \$ 1,053,537 | \$ 20,176 | \$ 5,859 | | | | | | |

1. This table reflects AC&I funding only.

4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9)

| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
|---|---|-----------|-----------------|----------------|------|------|------|--------------------|-------|
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | 18 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Comment(s) | The original MRS program of record is 36 HC-144 aircraft. In accordance with DHS ADM dated 16FEB15, upon completion of C-27J Conversion, Sustainment Phase 2 Discrete Segment (DS)-2, the MRS program of record will be 18 HC-144 and 14 C-27J, which currently is planned for FY 2024. Currently, 18 HC-144 and 7 C-27J are in service. HC-144 initial spares acquisition, prototype flight management system and mission system technical refreshments continued in FY 2016. Thirteen C-27J aircraft that were in long-term storage were transferred from the U.S. Air Force to the Coast Guard. Seven of 13 have been regenerated from long-term storage. Transfer of 14 th C-27J from the U.S. Air Force to USCG currently is scheduled for FY 2017. Achieved Phase 2 DS-1 IOC at Air Station Sacramento for C-27J in July 2016. DHS ARB (ADE-3 for Phase 2 DS-1 - Baseline Aircraft, ADE-2C for Phase 2 DS 2 - Missionization) is scheduled for the first quarter of FY 2017. | | | | | | | | |

| 5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If sufficient spares are not available for C-27J aircraft, then C-27J units may not be able to meet the MRS ORD KPP threshold requirement availability of 71-percent Availability Index. | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Conduct sparing analyses – Complete. 2. Purchase spares with FY 2014, FY 2015, and FY 2016 funds – In Progress. 3. Update sparing analysis using original equipment manufacturers’ (OEM) Opus 10 sparing model and updated data once aircraft begin operations – In Progress. 4. Continually collect data for updates to sparing models – In Progress. 5. Purchase existing inventory at OEM warehouse in United States for immediate sparing – In Progress. 6. Develop contracting options to procure initial and replenishment spares from aircraft OEM and major suppliers – In Progress. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | Until maintenance training devices are procured, on-aircraft/hands-on maintenance training can be provided only by performing inspections and repairs on operational aircraft, increasing risk of damage, and increasing the field unit resources required to provide and supervise training/maintenance evolutions. | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Award OEM airframe/electrical/engine/propeller training contract for APO - Complete. 2. Establish initial training program - Complete. 3. Establish contractor logistics support to help maintain operational HC-130Hs during C-27J transitions, allowing Coast Guard technicians to attend OEM and local C-27J training and build organic knowledge base - Complete. 4. Establish formal C-27J training at ATTC - In Progress. 5. Develop Coast Guard-specific training requirements with FORCECOM, ATTC, and CG41 - In Progress. 5. Explore alternate solutions for hands-on technical training - In Progress. | | | | | | |

| 5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|------|
| Risk Description | If HC-144B Prototype and Validation/Verification conversions with upgraded flight management system are not completed on schedule, then retrofits of Minotaur mission system upgrades may be delayed. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Establish separate fielding scenarios for flight management system upgrade and Minotaur retrofits – In Progress. 2. Develop HC-144B simulator configuration, flight manuals, and other logistics that can be implemented independently from Minotaur – In Progress. 3. Leverage recently procured Heavy Maintenance Facility at Aviation Logistics Center to perform Minotaur retrofits in-house – In Progress. | | | | | | |

| 5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If sufficient data rights are not available from the OEM, then the government may incur significant cost increases and schedule delays in missionizing C-27J configuration and maintenance procedures. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Renew contract for OEM field service representative and initiate actions for technical reach-back that provides access to OEM tech data – In Progress. 2. Award contract for OEM tech data access for engines – Complete. 3. With U.S. Navy Naval Air Systems Command, visit U.S. Air Force site in Germany and OEM facilities in Italy to examine similar aircraft and identify specific OEM technical data required for missionization – Complete. Release end user certificates – Complete. | | | | | | |

5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If significant obsolescence occurs in the C-27J aircraft, then timely engineering services and logistics support may be unavailable to support operations. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Establish a working group to address obsolescence – Complete. 2. Ensure OEM has an initial plan in place to address major obsolescence issues – Complete. 3. Ensure plan is vetted by Spartan Users Group (Coast Guard is a participant) – In Progress. 4. Implement C-27J with a federated mission system (Minotaur) to prevent incompatibility with C-27J cockpit architecture or flight management system obsolescence efforts. – In Progress. | | | | | | |

6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|--------------------|---------|--|------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|
| HSCG23-10-R-2DA020 | Awarded | Production and delivery of up to nine HC-144A aircraft | Firm Fixed Price | Jul 29, 2010 | Oct 30, 2015 | No | \$234.819 |
| HSCG-23-14R-2DA005 | Awarded | Spare parts contract for the HC-144A MPA | Other | Jul 15, 2014 | Jul 14, 2017 | No | \$58.403 |
| HSCG23-12-C-2DA019 | Awarded | Diminishing Manufacturing Source non-recurring engineering | Firm Fixed Price | Sep 28, 2012 | Sep 27, 2015 | No | \$19.657 |

6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|------|------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|
| No planned procurements reported. | | | | | | | |

7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Jul 01, 2015 to Jun 30, 2016)

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| Description | No key events/milestones for the previous 12 months reported. | Completion Date | |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|--|

7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Jul 01, 2016 to Jun 30, 2017)

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| Description | No key events/milestones for the next 12 months reported. | Completion Date | |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|--|

7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2014 Through Final Operational Capability Delivery)

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Description | Final Asset Delivery/FOC | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2025 |
|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------|

| 8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2) | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--|
| Approved MNS | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jan 21, 2005 | |
| Approved ORD | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Aug 09, 2011 | |
| Approved AP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Oct 09, 2015 | |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Oct 23, 2012 | |
| Approved TEMP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jun 08, 2011 | |
| Approved ILSP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Feb 29, 2016 | |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sep 18, 2012 | |

| 9 REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11) | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
| Quantity | 36 | 36 | No change from previous report. |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | \$1,706.00 | \$3,169.39 | Original APB is Deepwater Joint Program baseline. Version 2.0 included greater fidelity with respect to spare and repair cost efforts, and reflects the additional 5 years of acquisition and follow-on support. Cost updated to reflect LCCE. The revised KPPs align with those of the updated ORD. |
| Schedule (FOC) | FY2025 | FY2025 | No change from previous report. Schedule updated to reflect decision to revert to ADE-2B from ADE-3 and incorporate initial OT&E. |

USCG – National Security Cutter (NSC)

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Investment | USCG – National Security Cutter (NSC) | Last ARB | Level | Phase | LCCE (\$M) | LCCE Date | Reporting Period |
| DHS PM Certification | Senior Level | Apr 15, 2016 | Level 1 | Produce, Deploy and Support | \$19,894.525 | Sep 24, 2014 | Q3FY2016 |
| Investment Description | The NSC replaces the legacy 378-ft high endurance cutters. NSCs will have a range of 12,000 nautical miles and an underway endurance of 60 days. NSCs will be programmed to deploy 230 days annually, while maintaining the current personnel tempo of 185 days from homeport. | | | | | | |

| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Original APB | | Current APB | | Comparison | |
| May 15, 2007 | | Jan 24, 2014 | | Original APB is the Deepwater Joint Program baseline. LCCE decreased from \$22,277.000M to \$21,901.000M. IOC accomplished in FY 2008. FOC schedule slipped from FY 2016 to FY 2020. | |

| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | | Summary of Results | |
| 1 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program reports meeting cost and schedule targets but shows a slight deviation from its targets. - Program updated its risk register within 30 days. - All required MD 102-01 documents are submitted and approved. | |

| 4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------|
| | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 | Current Year FY16 | Budget Year FY17 | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
| Project Funding | \$ 4,433,789 | \$632,847 | \$743,400 | \$127,000 | \$ 95,000 | \$ 65,000 | \$ 65,000 | \$ 21,000 | \$ 6,183,036 |
| Acquisition, Planning, and Expenses - Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements | | | | \$127,000 | \$ 95,000 | \$ 65,000 | \$ 65,000 | \$ 21,000 | |
| Maintenance and Salaries - Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements | | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements | | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | National Security Cutter (NSC) | | | | | | | |
| Obligations | \$ 4,243,489 | \$573,981 | \$ 39,230 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | \$ 103,293 | \$ 58,866 | \$704,170 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | \$ 3,712,587 | \$113,099 | \$ 1,396 | | | | | | |

1. This table reflects AC&I funding only.

| 4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|-----------------|----------------|------|------|------|--------------------|-------|
| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | 9 |
| Comment(s) | Funding for NSC-9 long-lead time materials and production, although not included in the original program of record, were appropriated by Congress in FY 2016. | | | | | | | | |

| 5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | NSC-7 and NSC-8 will be home-ported in Hawaii. Conducting NSCs 7 and 8 Post Shakedown Availabilities (PSA) in Hawaii is estimated to cost \$2M–\$6M more than previous NSCs conducted in the continental United States. Location of the PSAs is determined by many factors relevant to the West Coast NSCs and operational fleets. If PSAs for NSCs 7 and 8 are conducted in Hawaii, then there will be an increase in the cost of completing these PSAs. | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Investigate Hawaii access requirements - Complete. 2. Refine estimates for Hawaii-based PSA - Complete. 3. Identify requirements/costs from vendors with continental U.S. PSA work - Complete. 4. Pursue requirements definition with EC IPTs - Complete. 5. Engage sponsor & cutter schedulers for earliest opportunity to affect PSAs in the continental United States - Complete. 6. Develop plan capturing funding, contracting, and crew and cutter schedule management for PSAs both within and outside the continental United States - Complete. 7. Conduct industry day with local Hawaii industry and shipyard to capture tech/cost risks for PSA execution accurately - Complete. 8. Evaluate continental U.S. options – In Progress. | | | | | | |

| 5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) testing during initial OT&E was deferred, although margins for space, weight, and power were evaluated successfully. For final OT&E, however, full SCIF testing is planned to assess integration and performance. If a set of testable operational SCIF requirements are not promulgated, the NSC Program will not meet the final OT&E requirements to validate the operational effectiveness and suitability of the SCIF in its use on the NSC in an operationally relevant environment. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. CG-771/751/2 establish requirement IPT - Complete. 2. Develop requirements set - In Progress. 3. Work with Command, Operational Test and Evaluation Force, IPT and DHS to ensure testability - In Progress. 4. Trace requirements to NSC ORD - In Progress. 5. Command, Operational Test and Evaluation Force develops Integrated Evaluation Framework - In Progress. 6. Intel requirements IPT met in July 2015. Generated updates to 2003 Interim Requirements Document to support final OT&E - In Progress. 7. CG-257 also updating Intel concept of operations - In Progress. | | | | | | |

5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If the Consolidated Afloat Networks Enterprise Services (CANES) cryptologic system solution is not developed, tested, and accredited fully to support the installation timeline for NSC5 post delivery period, then NSC5 may deploy without a complete SCIF and full intelligence capability. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Validate system specifications - Complete. 2. Develop a detailed plan of actions and milestone outlining the system engineering process - Complete. 3. Conduct quarterly TIMs to ensure system design, development, and integration remain on schedule - In Progress. 4. Capture CANES in overarching SCIF engineering change proposal, which authorizes equipment installation onboard the cutter - In Progress. 5. Perform SSEE-F integration testing - Complete. 6. Conduct monthly tech and accreditation meetings with CANES & CG-2 office to track software updates and lab testing, parallel to the hardware install on NSC5 – In Progress. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If the Link requirement changes to something other than Link 11, then there could be significant cost and schedule impacts across both acquisition and sustainment. The Coast Guard has decided on the Common Data Link Management System (v) 7 for its Navy tactical link for the NSC. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Establish a working group with stakeholders to outline/resolve issues - Complete. 2. Coordinate with the Chief of Naval Operations to determine the long-term link requirements for the NSC - In Progress. 3. Establish Link issue as agenda item on next permanent joint working group meeting. 4. Coordinate with the U.S. Navy Program Executive Office C4I Link (PMW-150) to understand the U.S. Navy POR way ahead for the Common Data Link Management System - Complete. 5. Closely monitor Navy Type/Naval Owned determination for the Offshore Patrol Cutter program, identify opportunity to align NSC with the Offshore Patrol Cutter solution - In Progress. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If the repair facility (Offeror) cannot maintain structural alignment and integrity during SEDA, the operational performance of the cutter could be degraded. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | 1. Award SEDA contract to maintain structural integrity and alignment - Complete. 2. Mature approach to reduce risk further - In Progress. 3. Establish RIO to ensure approved approach is followed by the repair facility. Provides onsite quality assurance of structural fit-up, welding, shaft, and reduction gear alignment in work specification - In Progress. 4. Reduction gear tooth contact checks - Planned. 5. Propulsion shaft strain gauge readings - Planned. 6. Three-dimensional hull scan - Planned. 7. Propulsion shafting optical alignment checks - Planned. | | | | | | |

6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|--------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|
| HSCG23-13-C-ADB014 | Awarded | Production NSC 8 | Fixed Price | Mar 30, 2015 | Feb 21, 2020 | Yes | \$533.553 |
| HSCG23-13-C-ADB014 | Awarded | Production NSC 7 | Fixed Price | Mar 30, 2014 | Feb 15, 2019 | Yes | \$532.311 |
| HSCG23-11-C-2DB043 | Awarded | Production NSC 5 | Fixed Price | Sep 09, 2011 | Jun 04, 2016 | Yes | \$531.647 |
| HSCG23-13-C-ADB014 | Awarded | Production NSC 6 | Fixed Price | Apr 30, 2013 | Dec 15, 2017 | Yes | \$521.737 |
| HSCG23-11-C-ADB043 | Awarded | Production NSC 4 | Fixed Price | Nov 29, 2010 | Sep 14, 2015 | Yes | \$511.741 |

6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|------|------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|
| No planned procurements reported. | | | | | | | |

7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Oct 01, 2014 to Sep 30, 2015)

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Description | NSC 4 Production and Development | Completion Date | Sept 14, 2015 |
| Description | NSC 5 Long Lead Time Material | Completion Date | Jun 05, 2015 |

7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Oct 01, 2015 to Sep 30, 2016)

| | | | |
|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | NSC 5 LLTM | Completion Date | Jun 04, 2016 |
|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|

7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2014 Through Final Operational Capability Delivery)

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | Final Asset Delivered/FOC | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2020 |
|-------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------|

8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2)

| | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Approved MNS | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jan 21, 2005 |
| Approved ORD | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sep 28, 2012 |
| Approved AP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Mar 04, 2014 |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jan 24, 2014 |
| Approved TEMP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Dec 18, 2013 |
| Approved ILSP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Aug 29, 2013 |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sep 24, 2014 |

9 REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11)

| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|
| Quantity | 8 | 8 | No change from previous report. |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | \$3,450 | \$5,682 | Original APB is the Deepwater Joint Program baseline. LCCE decreased from \$22,277.000M to \$21,901.000M. |
| Schedule (FOC) | FY 2020 | FY 2020 | No change from previous report. IOC accomplished in FY 2008. FOC schedule slipped from FY 2016 to FY 2020. |

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)

USCIS – Verification Modernization (VER)

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------|---------|--|------------|--------------|------------------|
| Investment | USCIS – Verification Modernization (VER) | Last ARB | Level | Phase | LCCE (\$M) | LCCE Date | Reporting Period |
| DHS PM Certification | Senior Level | Mar 21, 2016 | Level 2 | Mixed – Obtain, Produce/Deploy & Support | \$2,741.00 | Feb 29, 2016 | Q3FY2016 |
| Investment Description | <p>The USCIS VER investment aims to strengthen and improve E-Verify and Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) to support continued workload growth by modernizing the Verification Information System (VIS) and associated applications. The E-Verify Program allows participating employers to verify the employment eligibility of newly hired employees, while the SAVE Program allows federal, state, and local government agencies to verify the immigration status of benefit applicants.</p> <p>In the face of growing demand, the legacy systems are unable to meet VER capability needs in six key areas. The DHS USM approved the Verification Program Modernization MNS outlining the following six capability gaps in 2012: Account Management, Business Process and Workflow, Data Analytics and Reporting, Identity Management, Program Data, and System Architecture. Modernization will streamline and automate business processes, strengthen the technical infrastructure of VIS, and increase the capacity of both E-Verify and SAVE, while reducing the risk of identity fraud, data inaccuracies, and system misuse.</p> | | | | | | |

| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Original APB | Current APB | Comparison | Original APB still Current | Comparison | Not Applicable |
| Sep 11, 2015 | | | | | |

| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | Summary of Results | | |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program reports meeting cost and schedule targets. - Program has updated its risk register beyond 3 months. - All required MD-102 documents are submitted and approved. | | |

4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10)

| | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 | Current Year* FY16 | Budget Year* FY17 | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Project Funding | \$ 359,818 | \$ 63,947 | \$ 155,225 | \$ 156,210 | \$ 158,194 | \$ 148,658 | \$ 150,698 | \$ 1,464,477 | \$ 2,657,227 |
| O&S - Immigration Status Verification | | | \$ 104,560 | \$ 103,912 | \$ 103,849 | \$ 107,641 | \$ 114,930 | | |
| PC&I - Immigration Status Verification | | | \$ 15,111 | \$ 15,227 | \$ 17,471 | \$ 1,722 | \$ 516 | | |
| IEFA - O&S - Immigration Status Verification | | | \$ 35,554 | \$ 37,071 | \$ 36,874 | \$ 39,295 | \$ 35,252 | | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | | Salaries and Expenses / IEFA | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | | E-Verify / SAVE | | | | | | |
| Obligations | \$ 328,115 | \$ 61,453 | \$ 86,507 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance | \$ 31,703 | \$ 2,494 | \$ 68,718 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | \$ 227,897 | \$ 36,485 | \$ 63,811 | | | | | | |

* FY16-Beyond reflect the most recent OMB business case, which includes all discretionary E-Verify funding and SAVE fee funding for the Verification Modernization investment.

4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9)

| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
|---|---|-----------|--------------|-------------|------|------|------|-----------------|-------|
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Comment(s) | The objective FOC date is Q4 FY 2019. The threshold FOC date is Q3 FY 2020. | | | | | | | | |

5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|------|--------------------|--------|---------------|------|
| Risk Description | If SAVE Program customer and query volumes surge above projected levels prior to VER reaching FOC and implementing all identified business process improvements, then there will be strategic impacts to include policy, external communications, staffing, cost, and schedule | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Develop contingency plan that identifies, anticipates, and recommends staff increases and other measures to mitigate surges in SAVE Program customers and query volume. | | | | | | |
| Risk Description | If mandatory E-Verify is enacted prior to VER reaching FOC and implementing all identified business process improvements, then there will be strategic impacts to include policy, external communications, staffing, cost, and schedule.. | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Develop contingency plan that that identifies, anticipates, and recommends staff increases and other measures to mitigate surges in E-Verify Program customers and query volume. | | | | | | |

5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------|----------|--------------------|------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If project managers do not fully comprehend the technical complexities and planning dependencies ongoing across the organization, then they cannot plan effectively and there is a potential for rework and delays. | Type | Schedule | Probability | High | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Cross-program coordination and collaboration for PM currently happens at the Program IPT. Initial risk management approach will be to streamline and improve interproject collaboration within the IPT by forming a working group to identify areas for improvement and align with program reporting. | | | | | | |

5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|------|
| Risk Description | If the technical complexity associated with architectural enhancements is greater than anticipated or deemed infeasible, then the program may experience cost and schedule overruns and fail to meet the end goals for modernization. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | High |
| Mitigation Strategy | Stand up VIS in Advanced Wireless Systems to assess the architecture in the to-be environment. Examine the riskiest part of the current architecture (business logic in stored procedures) during FY 2016 release cycles. | | | | | | |

6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------|---------|---|------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|
| HSSCCG15J00025 | Awarded | VIS O&M Support. (VariQ) | Firm Fixed Price | Sep 26, 2015 | Sep 25, 2019 | No | \$47.518 |
| HSSCCG11X00012 | Awarded | Enhanced Telephony for Customer Relationship Management tool. (General Services Administration Verizon) | Firm Fixed Price | Oct 01, 2010 | Sep 30, 2016 | No | \$15.445 |
| HSSCCG14C00019 | Awarded | Data Analytics Fraud Framework Tool. (Executive Information Systems LLC) | Firm Fixed Price | Sep 30, 2014 | Sep 29, 2018 | No | \$10.277 |
| CISIRWA15079 | Awarded | Modernization Pilot (Excella Consulting) | Firm Fixed Price | Sep 09, 2015 | Sep 04, 2016 | No | \$7.192 |

6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level

| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|------|------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|
| No planned procurements reported. | | | | | | | |

7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Jul 1, 2015 to Jun 30, 2016)

| | | | |
|-------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | ADE 2A/2B formally approved by the DHS USM | Completion Date | Oct 06, 2015 |
| Description | State of Wisconsin joined Records and Information from DMVs for E-Verify (RIDE) | Completion Date | Nov 15, 2015 |
| Description | VIS O&M Release 21.1 will include SVS Web Services and E-Verify Responsive Web Design | Completion Date | Mar 13, 2016 |
| Description | VIS O&M Release 21.2 | Completion Date | Apr 10, 2016 |
| Description | Mobile E-Verify application pilot completion | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2016 |

7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Jul 01, 2016 to Jun 30, 2017)

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | VIS Modernization Pilot completion | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2016 |
| Description | Additional state to join RIDE | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2016 |

7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2014 Through Final Operational Capability Delivery)

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Description | ADE 2A/2B | Completion Date | Oct 06, 2015 |
| Description | IOC - SVS | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2017 |
| Description | ADE 2C | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2017 |
| Description | ADE 3 | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2020 |
| Description | FOC - Program | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2020 |

8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2)

| | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Approved MNS | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Apr 20, 2012 |
| Approved ORD | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sep 09, 2015 |
| Approved AP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sep 16, 2015 |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sep 11, 2015 |
| Approved TEMP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Aug 31, 2015 |
| Approved ILSP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Sep 09, 2015 |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | March 18, 2016 |

9**REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11)**

| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Quantity | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | \$3,663.228 | \$3,663.228 | No change from previous report. |
| Schedule (FOC) | FY 2019 | FY 2019 | No change from previous report. |

United States Secret Service (USSS)

USSS – Information Integration & Technology Transformation (IITT) Enabling Capabilities (EC)

| 1 GENERAL INFORMATION (#1, #2, #8) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------|---------|------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------|
| Investment | USSS – Information Integration & Technology Transformation (IITT) | Last ARB | Level | Phase | LCCE (\$M) | LCCE Date | Reporting Period |
| DHS PM Certification | Senior Level | Mar 3, 2016 | Level 2 | Mixed; Obtain, Support | \$540.766 | Nov 25, 2015 | Q3FY2016 |
| Investment Description | <p>The IITT Program is an extensive re-architecting of the current infrastructure and the careful selection and integration of interoperable capabilities supportive of USSS core functions and priorities. The IITT program will create Enabling, Communications, and Control capabilities, as well as cross-cutting Mission Support capabilities, all designed to address identified technology gaps. The USSS identified IT EC gaps associated with three key areas: network security, information sharing and situational awareness, and operational communications. EC is the DHS-approved and -funded Level 2 modernization program within IITT that addresses the capabilities and operational security requirements represented in this report. Other approved and funded Level 3 projects in the IITT program include: Cross Domain (CD) and Multi Level Security (MLS) (Control Capabilities) and the Combined Operational Logistics Database 2 (Mission Support Capability).</p> <p>The IITT program addresses a capability gap by creating Enabling, Communications, and Control capabilities, as well as cross-cutting Mission Support capabilities.</p> | | | | | | |

| 2 APB COMPARISON (#3, #4) | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------|---|
| Original APB | Feb 22, 2011 | Current APB | Nov 30, 2015 | Comparison | <p>The IITT Program (EC) experienced a schedule breach from the original APB in late 2012 when the EC Modernization contract award was protested. As required by DHS Acquisition Management Directive 102-01, the Secret Service notified DHS and submitted a remediation plan with a recommendation to rebaseline the program after the protest was resolved and the program resumed. The APB revision corrects the program schedule events resulting from the schedule breach and establishes the new EC schedule baseline. Schedule and cost baselines were updated.</p> |

| 3 IV&V STATUS (#5) | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|---|
| Composite Risk Score (1-5, lower is better) | 1 | Summary of Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program reports meeting cost and schedule targets. - Program updated its risk register within 30 days. - All required MD 102-01 documents are submitted and approved. |

4a BUDGET AND FUNDING STATUS (dollars in \$000) (#10)

| | | Prior Years | Past Year FY15 ¹ | Current Year FY16 ² | Budget Year FY17 ³ | BY+1 FY18 | BY+2 FY19 | BY+3 FY20 | BY+4 (FY21) and Beyond | Total |
|---|------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Project Funding | | \$ 173,821 | \$ 45,580 | \$ 44,794 | \$ 46,322 | \$ 47,168 | \$ 47,646 | \$ 48,128 | \$ 353,868 | \$ 807,327 |
| PC&I - Integrated Operations | | | | | \$ 35,674 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 50,391 | |
| O&S - Integrated Operations | | | | | \$ 10,648 | \$ 37,168 | \$ 37,646 | \$ 38,128 | \$ 303,477 | |
| Funding Status | Legacy Appropriation: | ACIRE and S&E | | | | | | | | |
| | Legacy PPA: | Information Integration and Technology Transformation | | | | | | | | |
| Obligations | | \$ 141,994 | \$ 42,231 | \$ 21,279 | | | | | | |
| Unobligated Balance⁴ | | \$ 1,204 | \$ 2,324 | \$ 22,458 | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | | \$ 138,647 | \$ 27,677 | \$ 5,138 | | | | | | |

1. The FY17 Congressional Justification reported \$44,556, which excluded the salaries portion of the investment.
2. The FY17 Congressional Justification reported \$43,737, which excluded the salaries portion of the investment.
3. The FY17 Congressional Justification reported \$45,237, which excluded the salaries portion of the investment.
4. Reflects unobligated balances for unexpired funds.

4b PROCUREMENT QUANTITY BY YEAR (# 9)

| | Prior Years | Past Year | Current Year | Budget Year | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 and Beyond | Total |
|---|----------------|-----------|-----------------|----------------|------|------|------|--------------------|-------|
| Quantity of End Units or System(s) | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Comment(s) | FOC – FY 2018 | | | | | | | | |

5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High]

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|------|--------------------|------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If the 9th Floor SCIF buildouts for the MLS Access Project's Increment 2 and 3 deployments are delayed, then there will be a cost increase and a delay in those deployments. | Type | Cost | Probability | High | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Continue monitoring of USSS SCIF construction project. Receive updates at the weekly Internal Weekly Coordination Meeting. Deploy MLS Access capability to current SCIF areas first, then deploy subsequently as SCIF upgrades are complete. | | | | | | |

| 5a TOP COST RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If Security Engineering staffing needs are not addressed, then Security Engineering costs will increase and reliance on contractor support may lead to inability to meet IT security requirements. | Type | Cost | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Continue efforts to fill vacant Security Engineering positions. Attempt to leverage Joint Developmental Assignment Program. Supplement staffing with contract support. Engage system administrators in playing a more active security role. | | | | | | |

| 5b TOP SCHEDULE RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If IITT civilian staffing is not sufficient to handle the program management and Security Engineering needs of the program, then IITT program execution will be affected. | Type | Schedule | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Aggressively pursue new hires. Supplement staff needs with contractor support until full-time employees hired. | | | | | | |

| 5c TOP TECHNICAL RISKS (#6) [Probability – Medium, High; Impact – Medium, High] | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| Risk Description | If USSS cannot utilize the Joint World Wide Intelligence Communications System (JWICS) Top Secret/Sensitive Compartment Information network being provided by the National Security Agency, then MLS would lose JWICS access until a replacement network can be acquired, installed, and configured. | Type | Technical | Probability | Medium | Impact | Medium |
| Mitigation Strategy | Coordinate with DHS to acquire a DHS Classified Local Area Network Point-of-Presence in HQ USSS to support Top Secret and Below Interoperability MLS access capability. | | | | | | |

| 6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
| HSSS0114F0076 | Awarded | Design, develop, and deploy a modernized IT Network Infrastructure | Cost Plus Fixed Fee | Jul 11, 2014 | Jan 10, 2019 | Yes | \$43.374 |
| HSSS0114F0102 | Awarded | Provide Information System Security Officer Support | Firm Fixed Price | Aug 27, 2014 | Sep 28, 2019 | No | \$12.917 |

| 6a CONTRACT STATUS (#7) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|------------------|--------------|--------------|----|---------|
| HSSS0116J0085 | Awarded | To procure software and services to provide support in an extensive array of activities to ensure the effective procurement, implementation, and transition to operational use of a commercial off-the-shelf Resource Management System for the USSS Uniformed Division | Firm Fixed Price | Apr 8, 2016 | Apr 7, 2019 | No | \$3.168 |
| HSSS0114F0104 | Awarded | Provide Federal Information Security Management Act support | Firm Fixed Price | Sep 10, 2014 | Sep 28, 2019 | No | \$2.397 |

| 6b PLANNED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE (#9) Top 5 Contracts by Dollar Level | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|------------------|------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Contract Number | Status | Description of Product or Service | Type | Start Date | End Date | EVM in Contract? | Total Value (\$M) |
| TBD | Pre-award | Contact professional support services for IT projects and aligned programs | Firm Fixed Price | TBD | June 30, 2023 | No | TBD |

| 7a KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR PREVIOUS 12 MONTHS (#12) (Period between Jul 01, 2015 to Jun 30, 2016) | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------------|
| Description | | | Completion Date |
| MLS ADE-3 Increment 2 | | | Apr 22, 2016 |

| 7b KEY EVENTS/ MILESTONES FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS (#13) (Period between Jul 01, 2016 to Jun 30, 2017) | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------------|
| Description | | | Completion Date |
| MLS ADE-3 Increment 3 | | | Feb 28, 2017 |
| MLS Authority to Operate/Interim Approval to Test/Authority to Connect Increment 3 | | | Nov 30, 2016 |
| COLD2 – Uniformed Division Resource Management System Development | | | Sep 3, 2016 |
| COLD2 – Uniformed Division Resource Management System Development Operations/Configuration Management | | | Sep 30, 2016 |

| 7c APB MILESTONES (#13) (Oct 01, 2014 Through Final Operational Capability Delivery) | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Description | Preliminary Design Review | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2015 |
| Description | Critical Design Review | Completion Date | May 5, 2016 |
| Description | Integration & Test Readiness Review | Completion Date | Sep 30, 2016 |
| Description | Production Readiness Review | Completion Date | Dec 31, 2016 |
| Description | ADE 3 | Completion Date | Mar 31, 2017 |
| Description | IOC | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2017 |
| Description | FOC | Completion Date | Jun 30, 2018 |

| 8 KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS (#2) | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--|
| Approved MNS | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jan 26, 2010 | |
| Approved ORD | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Feb 22, 2011 | |
| Approved AP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Jul 08, 2011 | |
| Approved APB | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Nov 30, 2015 | |
| Approved TEMP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Oct 19, 2012 | |
| Approved ILSP | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Dec 21, 2015 | |
| Approved LCCE | Yes | Approved By | DHS Approved | Approval Date | Nov 25, 2015 | |

| 9 REASON FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT (#11) | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Criteria | Previous Report | Current Report | Reason for Change |
| Quantity | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | No change from previous report. |
| APB Cost Threshold (\$M) | \$712.745 | \$594.843 | APB updated to reflect EC only |
| Schedule (FOC) | FY2018 | FY2018 | No change from previous report. |

IV. Appendices

Appendix A. Abbreviations

| Abbreviation | Definition |
|--------------|---|
| ADE | Acquisition Decision Event |
| ADM | Acquisition Decision Memorandum |
| AP | Acquisition Plan |
| APB | Acquisition Program Baseline |
| ARB | Acquisition Review Board |
| CANES | Consolidated Afloat Networks Enterprise Services |
| CASR | Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report |
| CBP | U.S. Customs and Border Protection |
| CD | Cross Domain |
| CDM | Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation |
| CMaaS | Continuous Monitoring as a Service |
| DHS | Department of Homeland Security |
| DS | Discrete Segment |
| EC | Enabling Capability |
| FOC | Full Operational Capability |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| HART | Homeland Advanced Recognition Technology |
| ICE | U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement |
| IDENT | Automated Biometric Identification System |
| IITT | Information Integration and Technology Transformation |
| ILSP | Integrated Logistics Support Plan |
| IT | Information Technology |
| IV&V | Independent Verification & Validation |
| JWICS | Joint Worldwide Intelligence Communications System |
| KPP | Key Performance Parameter |
| LCCE | Life Cycle Cost Estimate |
| MAOL | Major Acquisition Oversight List |
| MD | Management Directive |
| MLS | Multi-Level Security |
| MNS | Mission Needs Statement |
| MRS | Medium Range Surveillance |
| NPPD | National Protection and Programs Directorate |
| NSC | National Security Cutter |

| Abbreviation | Definition |
|---------------------|--|
| O&M | Operations & Maintenance |
| OBIM | Office of Biometric Identity Management |
| OCIO | Office of the Chief Information Officer |
| OMB | Office of Management Budget |
| ORD | Operational Requirements Document |
| P.L. | Public Law |
| PARM | Program Accountability and Risk Management |
| PM | Program Management |
| POE | Port of Entry |
| RIDE | Records and Information from DMVs for E-Verify |
| SAVE | Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements |
| TBD | To Be Determined |
| TEMP | Testing and Evaluation Master Plan |
| TIM | Technology Infrastructure Modernization |
| TSA | Transportation Security Administration |
| USCG | United States Coast Guard |
| USCIS | United States Citizenship and Immigration Services |
| USM | Under Secretary for Management |
| USSS | United States Secret Service |
| VER | Verification Modernization |
| VIS | Verification Information System |

Appendix B. Programs Evaluated

| Component | | PROGRAM | Level | Type |
|-----------|-------|--|-------|--------|
| 1 | CBP | TECS Modernization | 2 | IT |
| 2 | OCIO | OneNet | 1 | IT |
| 3 | NPPD | Continuous Diagnostic and Mitigation (CDM) | 1 | IT |
| 4 | NPPD | Homeland Advanced Recognition Technology (HART) | 1 | IT |
| 5 | TSA | Technology Infrastructure Modernization (TIM) | 2 | IT |
| 6 | USCG | Medium Range Surveillance (MRS) Aircraft | 1 | Non-IT |
| 7 | USCG | National Security Cutter (NSC) | 1 | Non-IT |
| 8 | USCIS | Verification Modernization (VER Mod) | 2 | IT |
| 9 | USSS | Information Integration & Technology Transformation (IITT) | 2 | IT |