

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, MD 20771



Reply to Attn of: 210.H

February 2, 2016

Digital Management Inc.
Attn: Thelma Miles
6550 Rock Spring Dr, 7th Floor
Bethesda, MD 20817

Subject: Contract NNH12CF39C, HITSS Incentive Fee Period 6

Dear Ms. Miles,

NASA has completed the evaluation of your company's technical performance for the six reporting period, April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015, under NASA Headquarters Contract Number NNH12CF39C, Headquarters Information Technology Support Services (HITSS) Contract.

The result of NASA's evaluation was that your company earned a total incentive fee of (b) (4). The Contracting Officer will prepare and forward the contract modification under separate cover for payment of the earned incentive fee. This incentive fee amount is the for technical performance. Incentive fee for cost performance will be determined by the Contracting Officer and paid at the end of the contract.

This letter conveys a summary of your company's performance for the six 6-month period. The scoring scheme used for evaluating performance is detailed in Attachment K of the contract, Incentive Fee Plan and Incentive Fee Quality Assurance Plan.

TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE

PWS Metrics

The tables below provide summary level data for each metric. Specific comments are provided for each metric in Table 1. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the incentive fee calculation by metric.

Table 1 – Metrics: Technical Surveillance Results

Metric #	Content of Metric	Percent of Metric Met	NASA Surveillance Manager	NASA Surveillance Manager Comments	DRDs Mapped to Metric and/or PWS Area	Performance Level for Incentive Fee	Percent of the Incentive Fee %
1	Content of Selected Plan Updates	100%	Dennis/McCoy, Shouse, Hong			96%-100% of the required elements are included.	7%
1	Content of Selected Plan Updates - Application Service Roadmap and Implementation Plan, Legacy Applications Disposition Plan	100%	Liteshia Dennis/Chris McCoy	DRD31 - The Application Service Roadmap Deliverable was received on time and discussed in detail between HITSS App Dev and ITCD App dev. This deliverable was accepted for this performance period. Further changes will be required to accommodate changes in existing processes and service domain definitions. DRD32 - The Legacy Application Disposition Plan was received on time and discussed in detail between HITSS	DRDs 31 & 32		

Metric #		Percent of Metric Met	NASA Surveillance Manager	NASA Surveillance Manager Comments	DRDs Mapped to Metric and/or PWS Area	Performance Level for Incentive Fee	Percent of the Incentive Fee %
				<i>App Dev and ITCD App Dev. This deliverable was accepted for this performance period. Further changes will be required during the next performance period to accommodate changes in approach for retiring and replatforming legacy applications..</i>			
1	<i>Content of Selected Plan Updates - Training Program and Outreach Plan</i>	100%	<i>Mary Shouse/Elaine Bowman</i>		DRD 22A		
1	<i>Content of Selected Plan Updates - Data Center Modernization Plan</i>	100%	<i>Linda Hong</i>	<i>Received updated Modernization plan and baselined.</i>	DRD 57		
1	Accomplishment of Plan Objectives	72%	Dennis/McCoy, Shouse, Hong			Less than 81% of the objectives are completed.	8%
2	Accomplishment of Plan Objectives - Application Service Roadmap and Implementation Plan, Legacy Applications Disposition Plan	15%	Liteshia Dennis/Chris McCoy	The accomplishment of the objectives of these plans have not yet fully come to fruition. Although a number of legacy applications have been re-	DRDs 31 & 32		

Metric #		Percent of Metric Met	NASA Surveillance Manager	NASA Surveillance Manager Comments	DRDs Mapped to Metric and/or PWS Area	Performance Level for Incentive Fee	Percent of the Incentive Fee %
				platformed and or archived the majority of legacy applications remains on aging technology with no clear transition timeline and approach. To date, 4 legacy applications have been replatformed to the Drupal Platform.			
2	Accomplishment of Plan Objectives- Training Program and Outreach Plan	100%	Mary Shouse /Elaine Bowman		DRD 22A		
2	Accomplishment of Plan Objectives- Data Center Modernization Plan	100%	Linda Hong	Execution of plan objectives for server reductions - decommissioned 12 servers, including 3 Solaris servers. Tested proposed solution for moving eDelivery to VM cluster and began SR work. Enhanced HQ VM cluster to accommodate applications that were in process for WestPrime. Moved one application NVDB from WestPrime to the VM cluster.	DRD 57		

Metric #		Percent of Metric Met	NASA Surveillance Manager	NASA Surveillance Manager Comments	DRDs Mapped to Metric and/or PWS Area	Performance Level for Incentive Fee	Percent of the Incentive Fee %
3	Adherence to Service Request Schedules	27%	T. Dodson		DRDs 5 & 6	Less than 94% meet the criteria.	5%
4	Problem Ticket Response Time	95%	T. Dodson		DRDs 10 & 26	93% - 96% meet the criteria.	5%
5	Prime Time Password Resets	100%	T. Dodson		DRD 26	Meet metrics 96%-100% of the time.	4%
6	Restore Prime time Service Outages for Applications and Servers	100%	L. Hong	No outages for the reporting period. Reviewed all server ops tickets (847) for the period and none were related to application or server outages.		Meet response and mitigation metrics 96% - 100% of the time.	6%
7	Resolve Prime Time Application and Server Hardware and Software Problems	100%	L. Hong	No outages for the reporting period. Reviewed all server ops tickets (847) for the period and none were related to application or server outages.		Meet response and mitigation metrics 96% - 100% of the time.	5%
8	Customer Satisfaction Surveys	100%	S. Artis		DRDs 20 & 21	98%-100% meet the criteria	15%

Metric #		Percent of Metric Met	NASA Surveillance Manager	NASA Surveillance Manager Comments	DRDs Mapped to Metric and/or PWS Area	Performance Level for Incentive Fee	Percent of the Incentive Fee %
9	Post-Release Bug Fixes	95%	C. McCoy	This metric is the result of having two application deployment failures for the reporting period. There were a total of 43 planned deployments of which 41 were successful. The metric for Post-Release Bug Fixes per the PWS is calculated as the number of successful deployments divided by the number of total deployments multiplied by 100. In this case the result is ~95%. For detailed stats, please see the Metric 9 - Post-Release Bug Fixes Calculation (ppt).		93% - 100% are error free	13%
10	Data Center Availability	100%	L. Hong	Deliverables received monthly on time.	DRDS 47 & 48	99.99% - 100% average availability per month	8%
11	Compliance with Patch Management Plan	100%	L. Hong	Deliverables received monthly on time.	DRD 52	99% - 100% meet the criteria	7%
12	Delivery of Annual Tactical Plan and Updates on Demand	100%	S. Artis	waived per ITCD Technical Monitor due to ITCD priority changes		waived	2%

Metric #		Percent of Metric Met	NASA Surveillance Manager	NASA Surveillance Manager Comments	DRDs Mapped to Metric and/or PWS Area	Performance Level for Incentive Fee	Percent of the Incentive Fee %
13	Vulnerability Mitigation	100%	M. Meissner			98%-100% meet the criteria	10%
14	Incident Response	100%	M. Meissner			Meet the criteria 96% - 100% of the time.	5%

Table 2 – Incentive Fee: Technical Performance

Metric #	Metric Description	Score	Performance Level	Pool Earned Adjective	Available Fee pool for 6 months	Incentive Fee	Earned Fee
1	Content of Selected Plan Updates	100%	96%-100% of the required elements are included.	Maximum	(b) (4)	7%	(b) (4)
2	Accomplishment of Plan Objectives	75%	Less than 81% of the objectives are completed.	Minimum		8%	
3	Adherence to Service Request Schedules	27%	Less than 94% meet the criteria.	Minimum		5%	
4	Problem Ticket Response Time	95%	93% - 96% meet the criteria.	Target		5%	
5	Prime Time Password Resets	100%	Meet metrics 96%-100% of the time.	Maximum		4%	
6	Restore Prime time Service Outages for Applications and Servers	100%	Meet response and mitigation metrics 96% - 100% of the time.	Maximum		6%	
7	Resolve Prime Time Application and Server Hardware and Software Problems	100%	Meet response and mitigation metrics 96% - 100% of the time.	Maximum		5%	
8	Customer Satisfaction Surveys	100%	98%-100% meet the criteria.	Maximum		15%	
9	Post-Release Bug Fixes	95%	93% - 100% are error free.	Maximum		13%	
10	Data Center Availability	100%	99.99% - 100% average	Maximum		8%	
11	Compliance with Patch Management Plan	100%	99% - 100% meet the criteria.	Maximum		7%	
12	Delivery of Annual Tactical Plan and Updates on Demand	100%	100% submitted on time.	Maximum		2%	
13	Vulnerability Mitigation	100%	98% - 100% meet the criteria.	Maximum		10%	

14	Incident Response	100%	Meet the criteria 96% - 100% of the time	Maximum	(b) (4)	5%	(b) (4)
							(b) (4)

Compliance to the DRD requirements and delivery schedules were reviewed as part of the technical surveillance. During this period, 51 DRDs were eligible for review. Of the 51 DRDs, 0 DRDs failed to meet requirements and/or the delivery schedule. (For specific comments, reference the DRD rating provided in Addendum A of the Incentive Fee Letter.)

General Technical Performance

The following were identified as either continuing or new concerns by NASA with regards to technical performance:

- Continuing Concerns
 - Delivery of the On Demand System –Although DMI has assigned a different technical team and project management team to the effort, progress towards a final redesign and deployment of technical solution that meets NASA’s needs continues to be slow.
 - Agile Implementation – Although the agile pilot is complete and NASA is beginning to see the transformation in how software development is executed, there continues to be much concern with the estimation, planning, and execution of work. Many of the concerns regarding estimation appear to be related to DMI’s ability to estimate the various types of technical activities/work. Other concerns such as planning and execution appear to be related to a learning curve with regards to agile/scrum methodology. Although, the agile coach has done a good job with the pilot, NASA requests that DMI continues to provide training to the DMI staff to ensure that they are more equipped and knowledgeable to execute software development work based on an agile process. Furthermore, NASA requests that DMI not only commits to continuous training of employees for agile, but also commits to continuous development and assessment of how well agile is executed across staff and roles to ensure improvement and maturity of agile processes.
 - Deficiency of Technical Skill Sets Required – There continues to be concerns regarding the skills and experience of the technical staff and the PM staff executing and managing the technical work. NASA has communicated the technical areas where skill sets are deficient, and has requested that DMI address this and that DMI provide a detailed plan for how this deficiency in technical expertise will be resolved. This impacts estimation, workflow, service request completion, technical capabilities, ITCD’s strategic plan, etc. This should have been addressed by the end of period 4 performance. However, little progress was made with regards to technical staff and skill sets. NASA continues to request a mitigation plan and strategy accompanied with an actual

implementation schedule for addressing this deficiency. NASA still awaits resolution and a thoughtful, realistic, executable plan from DMI.

- Management and Allocation of Staff Across the Contract – NASA requested a resource allocation and management plan (that provided details on what resources/staff currently support HITSS, how those resources/staff members would be assigned work, how work would be managed, etc.) from DMI during period 4. DMI's response to this request was insufficient. ITCD technical monitors and ITCD leadership continue to express frustration and concern regarding (but not limited to) the following:
 - Work performed is often single threaded or performed serially.
 - DMI can rarely provide an explanation of resource assignments.
 - DMI cannot provide a percentage allocation for each resource/staff member across the contract and across task orders.
 - DMI still not appear to have a strong understanding of the skills and expertise of its HITSS staff.
 - DMI continues to express that its concern regarding sufficient staffing, however, when asked to produce a staffing plan, it cannot.
 - DMI projects potential overruns for labor, but the amount of service requests does not support the projected cost overrun on labor.
 - Some DMI HITSS managers (at the COE level) do not demonstrate a good grasp on cross training, cross utilization, matricing, and managing resources and work to ensure timeliness of deliverables.
 - Some HITSS staff do not appear to have a sense of schedule or of urgency with regards to product delivery and completion of work. It takes HITSS too long to complete service requests and this impacts stakeholder operations.

Due to the above concerns, NASA requested escalation to DMI executive management. NASA expected resolution by end of period 5; however, NASA still waits for resolution.

- Agency and HQ Forms - NASA/ITCD still has concerns regarding the staffing required to support Agency and HQ forms as well as the stability of the team with regards to turn-over. It is critical for DMI to show stability and consistency with regards to communication and execution of work for Agency forms as well as HQ forms to ensure consistency in the deliverables and management of budget.
- Mitigation of Vacancies Across the HITSS Task Orders – There appears to be difficulty in addressing backfills for new and vacant positions across the contract. Several task orders have had vacant positions for months. While NASA appreciates DMI's commitment to finding qualified candidates, NASA is concerned that DMI does not appear to have sufficient resources (internal/DMI or external (via partners and other staffing resources)) to address these vacancies in a timely manner. Timeliness in addressing new and vacant positions on this contract is critical to continuity and quality of services.
- On several occasions during period 6, application code was deployed into the production environment with incorrect operational configurations. In some cases parts of the production application were pointing to resources which reside in the staging environment. On one occasion an application was deployed on the wrong network and was not accessible to the customer.

- Strengths This Performance Period
 - Overall, the performance of the HITSS security team has been outstanding during this performance period. Some key accomplishments include:
 - For metric 13: Periodic reviews of Agency patch management reporting in ITSEC-EDW have always shown the HITSS-managed systems to be fully compliant with vulnerability management requirements. For metric 14: There were approximately 15 non-Prime time incident call-downs – the HITSS team met the performance requirement in all cases.
 - The HITSS security team has done an excellent job in FY15, especially in light of being somewhat short-staffed. I know that resource issues are being addressed and look forward to another year of outstanding support in FY16.
 - The services and support in the area of Scientific & Technical Information (STI) support continues to be outstanding. The DMI staff supporting this area continues to demonstrate great professionalism, preparedness, competencies, and customer service.

COST PERFORMANCE

Cost performance remained a key concern during period 5 due to budget and funding impacts. Costs on the Core task order 10.01 were managed well by the DMI HITSS Program Manager. Based on the funding reports (533s, Monthly Program Reviews, and other financial reporting mechanisms), the maximum incentive fee, (b) (4) for this period. However, due to increasing impacts to the ITCD budget, the following factors and concerns will require continued attention to ensure that costs and budget are carefully managed:

- allocation of work across SRs
- management of work and staff labor hours related to complexity and type of service requests and related support
- allocation of staff across all HITSS task orders. (Based on review of the task orders, 533s, and invoices, it appears that Core continues to be used as a charge line for staff when needed. Resources not planned on the Core task order (10.01) were performing work on the Core task order instead of performing work on the other task orders to which these resources were originally proposed and planned. ITCD has requested that a review of the non-Core task order work be analyzed to determine sufficient resource planning and staffing needs. ITCD continues to work with non-Core task owners to communicate the burn-rate, funding, and other concerns that may affect DMI's resource planning and staffing needs. Some progress was made during period 5, NASA will continue to scrutinize CORE staffing and hours.)
- weaknesses in specific skill sets on the Core task order contribute to challenges with estimation and execution of work
- additional resources/staffing required to mitigate risks and non-delivery for Agency and HQ forms
- additional resources/staffing required to execute the agile transformation process and pilot
- additional resources/staffing required to address ITCD's requirements for Rational

As a result of the aforementioned factors, NASA has requested that DMI consider providing additional guidance to HITSS staff developing estimates, ROMs, and pricing plans to ensure that an appropriate model and technique is utilized on Core as well as all other HITSS task orders. While this request is actively worked by the HITSS Program Manager to address with HITSS staff contributing to estimates, ROMs, and pricing plans, much progress needs to be made in order to prevent gross over/under estimation, staff assignments, and allocation of WYEs across task orders.

NASA considers cost performance as a key focus on this contract due to the remediation of technical debt and mitigation of deficiencies in technical talent required for NASA to execute on many of its key initiatives. The DMI HITSS Program Manager has done a great job managing costs for this period. Close management of costs should continue to ensure timely preparation for potential budget impacts.

SUMMARY

In summary, NASA was concerned with your company's technical performance during this period. Overall, NASA is not satisfied with the technical performance during this period. Although there is great appreciation for the support and services provided in the area of Information Security, deficiencies in other technical areas continue to plague this contract, specifically on the Core task order, and the requirements requested of DMI to fulfill during this and previous performance periods. Due to slow resolution of deficiencies in technical performance, NASA, specifically ITCD, continues to incur risks to delivery of services, to experience delays with improvement of technologies and related resources that are critical to the NASA HQ offices and organization.

NASA continues to request that a thoughtful management of cost and technical performance (based on DMI management engagement with staff, DMI corporate's assistance to the HITSS Program Manager with addressing technical deficiencies and needed skill sets on the HITSS contract, and a true, fact based analysis of the technical deficiencies with staff and of the deficiencies with regards to the execution of work on this contract) is imperative to ensure that the IT services and support required by ITCD and HQ organizations are sustained and enriched. NASA/HQ ITCD expects that the areas of concern for technical performance will be fully addressed in preparation for the HITSS option year 3 (fiscal year 2016) in order to realize stability in process, execution, and delivery in the various HITSS contract services. This stabilization is essential as Mission Directorates, offices, and organizations begin to consider potential collaboration across their teams for technical capabilities and begin to assess budgets against technical services and support rendered across the various IT contracts. With more integration across the NASA HQ offices, organizations, and Mission Directorates, it is imperative that HITSS, specifically, DMI have a better handle on resource planning, technical skills/capabilities, and work estimation to ensure that execution of work across the HITSS task orders is timely and supportable.

Thank you for your support during period 6 performance and we look forward to making much progress in the areas of concern during period 7 performance.



Terence Haynes
Contracting Officer

Cc: HQ/ITCD/Victor Thompson
HQ/ITCD/Liteshia Dennis

Addendum A – Data Requirements Delivery Schedule Compliance and Surveillance Results

Score Card Key: N/A – The delivery of the DRD is not applicable for this contract reporting period. The DRD was provided per the schedule outlined and all requirements were completed in period 1.
 M – The DRD requirements and delivery schedule were met satisfactorily.
 F – The DRD requirements and/or delivery scheduled were not met.

DRD #	DRD Name/Description	Requirements & Delivery Schedule	Score Card	NASA Review Results
DRD #1	Documentation environment of metrics, analytics and deliverables implementation plan and migration schedule	Updated and available weekly during the first two months of contract start; enhancements and additional content added monthly thereafter until established baseline schedule is met	N/A	N/A – DRD is related to the contract transition.
DRD #2	Transition plan and integrated schedule	Available at contract start with significant weekly updates for the transition period up to Operational Readiness Review and acceptance.	N/A	N/A – DRD is related to the contract transition.
DRD #3	Contract Status Meeting	Monthly – no later than last week of the month	M	
DRD #4	Daily Tag Up Review	Daily	M	
DRD #5	Integrated Master Schedule with ability to drill down to supporting data, including resource loading	Updated every 2 weeks from month 2 of contract start date.	M	* IMS configuration is under review by both ITCD and DMI to improve content and usability. For reporting period 5, both ITCD and DMI have agreed to re-assess for period 6 and to implement configuration changes for option year 3.

DRD #6	Project Schedule Adherence Report	Monthly – no later than second week of the month	N/A	See notes above.
DRD #7	Logistics Management Plan	Three months after contract start date.	N/A	
DRD #8	HQ Enterprise Architecture Plan Updates	8 months after contract start date	N/A	Per ITCD request, the EA Plan updates were deferred until reporting period 6.
DRD #9	Operational Level Agreements	Initial set due 4 months after contract start; subsequent due in accordance with Government schedules	N/A	* No OLA updates were requested during reporting period 5.
DRD #10	Report on response times, ticket aging, and customer satisfaction, delivered	1 month after start date and monthly after that.	M	
DRD #11	Root Cause Analysis and Corrective Action Plan	as requested by ITCD	M	
DRD #12	Configuration Management Plan	Update as required by ITCD	N/A	No updates were requested during reporting period 5.
DRD #13	CCB Meeting Minutes	Weekly – 2 days after meeting	M	
DRD #14	Spare Parts Inventory Report	3 months after contract start, quarterly thereafter	M	
DRD #15A	Summary of updates to ROSA showing what was created	One time deliverable due with Data Migration Plan for RAM	N/A	ROSA is no longer referenced for updates due to use of RAM.
DRD #15B	Summary of updates to RAM showing what was created and modified over previous 3 months	Available quarterly after RAM Implementation	N/A	No updates were requested.
DRD #16	Diagrams of Application logic, connectivity, interdependence and data flow	90 days after contract start and update continuously	M	

DRD #17	Diagrams of Server dependencies (sinks/sources), physical placement and relationship	Draft three months after contract start; final six months and update continuously	N/A	No updates were requested during this performance period. However, updates will be requested during period 5.
DRD #18	Health & Safety Plan	Submit with proposal	N/A	N/A
DRD #19	Occupational Injuries and Illnesses Report	One month from contract start and monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #20	Customer Service Metrics Proposal	Deliver final three months after contract start	N/A	N/A
DRD #21	Customer Satisfaction Survey Report	Deliver at contract start with the customer satisfaction survey, monthly summary analytics and trending	M	
DRD #22A	Training Program & Outreach Plan, detailing materials, methods and approach and to include communications, and facilitating relationship building activity. Two plans submitted each year with each plan covering the period of performance April 1 thru September 30 and October 1 thru March 31.	Initial Draft 45 days from contract start; Final two months from contract start. Subsequent draft plan due each August 1 with final due Oct 1; and Feb 1 with final due April 1.	M	
DRD #22B	ITCD Communications Plan	Draft 45 days from contract start; final six months from contract start. Updates as required by ITCD.	M	
DRD #23	Customer Advisory and Service Review, meeting notes, action items, results, and schedule.	As required within 2 business days of meetings.	N/A	Requirements to meet this DRD were relieved as a result of non-government activity.
DRD #23A	On-Boarding and Off-Boarding Statistics Report	Deliver weekly beginning 3 months from contract start.	M	

DRD #24	Customer Requirements Adherence Metrics Proposal	Deliver within 75 days of contract start; final due 3 months after contract start	N/A	Deliverable was required for contract year 1.
DRD #25	Requirements Adherence Report	Deliver 3 months after contract start date, monthly thereafter	N/A	Report was not delivered.
DRD #26	Summary and Trend Ticket Reporting including number of tickets opened, completed and pending (e.g. under a week, under two or over three) number escalated, rating, closed, times to first respond, customer satisfaction. Summary and reporting of phone support, email support, and drop-in support.	One month from contract start date and monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #27	Service Request Processing Plan describing overall management and execution of the SR system and customer satisfaction report	Within two weeks of contract start date	N/A	N/A
DRD #28			N/A	N/A (This DRD was removed from the DRD requirement list.)
DRD #29	Catalog Orders Report/Checkbook includes number of orders by category, requisition number and funding source (if known), number complete, funds used versus available, funds in process, summary total of monthly catalog invoice and break out of ITCD funded monthly total.	Two weeks from contract start date, monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #30	Application Service Framework	Two months from contract start date, modifications reflecting approved changes as required	M	Deliverable was received on time and discussed between HITSS App Dev and ITCD App Dev. Changes to accommodate new agile App Dev processes and to allow for clarification of existing services were proposed and will be factored into the next release. The results of Knowledge Management and Portfolio management will also be factored into a subsequent release.

DRD #31	Application Service Roadmap and Implementation Plan	Six months after contract start and every six months thereafter, modifications reflecting approved changes as required. (Due last business day of each Incentive Fee Period)	M	Deliverable was received on time and discussed in detail between HITSS App Dev and ITCD App dev. Further changes will be required to accommodate changes in existing processes and service domain definitions.
DRD #32	Legacy application disposition plan	Six months from contract start date, modifications reflecting status and approved changes every 60 days. (Initial plan due last business day of Incentive Fee Period (3/29/2013); 60 day status due the first business day of July, September, November, January and March)	M	Deliverable was received on time and discussed between HITSS App Dev and ITCD App Dev. Changes to accommodate an AWS Hosting Environment will be factored into the next release.
DRD #33	Legacy application portfolio report	Six months from contract start date, modifications reflecting status and approved changes every 60 days. (Initial plan due last business day of Incentive Fee Period (3/29/2013); 60 day status due the first business day of July, September, November, January and March)	N/A	Did not request this artifact for this performance period. Will be delivered within the current performance period.
DRD #34A	Framework for Development Program	Due at contract start, modifications reflecting approved changes as required	N/A	Did not request this artifact for this performance period.
DRD #34B	Framework for Web Site Development Program	Due nine months after contract start	N/A	Did not request this artifact for this performance period.

DRD #35	Interface Control Documents	One month from contract start date and as needed thereafter	M	These were delivered as requested on a per app basis when an application underwent changes as a result of the SR process.
DRD #36	Software Management Guide	Interim due three months after contract start date; updated SDLC due six months after contract start; modifications reflecting approved modifications quarterly thereafter	N/A	Submitted last performance period. No changes were requested during this performance period. Agile Pilot is on going with a goal of testing out the SMG and the associated SOPs. Changes will be required once
DRD #37	Standard requirements template that documents the service or design need from the perspective of effected discipline areas (e.g. applications development, IT security, customer training, operations) and by level of need (e.g. mandatory, optional, preferred).	Within two months from contract start date	M	Modified template delivered to accommodate capturing requirements as user stories. Additional changes may be needed to accommodate any changes from the Agile pilot.
DRD #38	System Design Specification	Two months from contract start date, modifications reflecting approved modifications as needed thereafter	M	These were delivered as requested on a per app basis when an application underwent changes as a result of the SR process.
DRD #39	Application Status Review materials	Three months from contract start, monthly thereafter	M	Deliverable was received biweekly in the form of SR Review Material.
DRD #40	Portfolio Management Views of Application Services and Inventories	Six months from contract start date, continuously thereafter	N/A	Did not request this artifact for this performance period. Requested for current performance period.
DRD #41	As built detailed functional and physical description of development environment, its interfaces and processes	Two months from contract start date, provided within 2 days of changes to structural or ITS environment including patches	N/A	Did not request this artifact for this performance period. Requested for current performance period.

DRD #42A	Application Delivery Implementation Plan (Formerly Version Description Document but renamed to Release Implementation Plan Template)	Initial draft five months from contract start; final six months from contract start date	M	Delivered in form of VDD and CR Implementation plan.
DRD #42B	Website Delivery Implementation Plan (Formerly Version Description Document but a secondary plan created specifically for Website Implementations)	Initial draft eight months from contract start; final nine months from contract start date	M	Delivered in form of VDD and CR Implementation plan.
DRD #42C	Release Notes Document Template	Initial draft five months from contract start; final six months from contract start date	M	Delivered in form of VDD and CR Implementation plan.
DRD 43A	Release Implementation Plan (for each Application and Website)	Scheduled in accordance with CCB	M	Delivered in form of VDD and CR Implementation plan.
DRD #43B	Release Notes Document (for each Application and website)	Scheduled in accordance with CCB	M	Delivered in form of VDD and CR Implementation plan.
DRD #44A	Biennial Review of Forms Final Report	First report due 10/1/2014 and biennially per NPD 1420.1	M	Although the deliverables were submitted to ITCD, there were several process issues, resource issues, and concerns with regards to the content of the report. ITCD and DMI continue to work to mitigate these issues and concerns.
DRD #44B	Quarterly Data to Produce Forms Bulletin (one for Agency and 1 for HQ)	Quarterly (Dec, March, June & Sept)	M	Although the deliverables were submitted to ITCD, there were several process issues, resource issues, and concerns with regards to the content of the report. ITCD and DMI continue to work to mitigate these issues and concerns.

DRD #45	Data Exchange Agreement Audit and Gap Analysis	Six months from contract start date	N/A	N/A
DRD #46	Service Level Agreement Audit	One month from contract start date and monthly thereafter	N/A	Initial was provided, PWS Description says: Six months from contract start. I think this should be changed to be either quarterly or on demand.
DRD #47	Availability of hosted and housed services	One month from contract start date and monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #48	Performance of hosted and housed services	One month from contract start date and monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #49	Diagram of server location	Three months from contract start date and every three months thereafter	N/A	No updates were requested for this performance period.
DRD #50	Diagram of servers logical connection to network	Three months from contract start date and on-demand thereafter	N/A	No updates were requested for this performance period.
DRD #51	Capacity and Performance Report	Two months from contract start date, on-demand thereafter	N/A	No updates were requested for this performance period.
DRD #52	Quarterly/Monthly Patch Release Report	One month after contract start date, monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #53	Equipment Upgrade Evaluation Report	90 days of contract start date and semiannually thereafter	M	
DRD #54	Moved to DRD#67		N/A	N/A
DRD #55	Data Center (including SEF) SOP Audit & Recommendations Report	Six months from contract start date and monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #56	Reserved	Reserved	N/A	N/A

DRD #57	Data Center Modernization Plan	Initial Plan three months from contract start date; updated plan at six months; and every six months thereafter	M	
DRD #58	Data Exchange Agreement Audit and Gap Analysis	Six months from contract start date.	N/A	No updates were requested during this performance period. However, updates will be requested during period 5.
DRD #59	Reserved	Reserved	N/A	N/A
	Reserved		N/A	N/A
DRD #60	Contractor Information Security Management Plan	Within one month from contract start date, updated annually thereafter	M	
DRD #61	Draft Policy, Requirement, Procedure, or Standard	On demand	M	
DRD #62	eDiscovery Data Search Results	On demand	M	
DRD #63	Reserved		N/A	N/A
DRD #64	Security Reviews and Assessments	On demand	M	Security reviews and assessments were delivered as requested.
DRD #65	Daily Risk Vulnerability Report	Daily	M	DRD was suspended from 4/1/15 – 9/30/15
DRD #66	Monthly Vulnerability Scan Report (encrypted)	One month after contract start date, monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #67	Intrusion Detection Summary	One month after contract start date, quarterly thereafter	M	
DRD #68	Monthly Wireless 802.11 Scanning Report (encrypted)	Two months after contract start date, monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #69	Annual Penetration Test Plan and Rules of Engagement and Schedule	On demand	M	Not requested
DRD #70	Annual HQ Penetration Testing Report	On demand	M	Not requested

DRD #71	IT C&A Security Plan Assessment using the NASA standard template	On demand	M	
DRD #72	Risk Assessment	On demand	M	
DRD #73	Security Controls Assessment Report Assessment using the NASA standard template	On demand	M	
DRD #74	Plan of Actions and Milestones Assessment using the NASA standard template	On demand	M	
DRD #75	System Certification Report	On demand	M	
DRD #76	Monthly POA&M Status Report	One month after contract start date, monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #77	Monthly ISSA Status Report	Two months after contract start date, monthly thereafter	M	
DRD #78	Incident Response Training and Test Report	annually by fiscal year's end	M	
DRD #79	Quarterly Metric Report summarizing the transaction history, incidents, and inventories/inspections for that report	Due 90 days from contract start date, and every 3 months thereafter	M	
DRD #80	HQ ITS Contingency & Continuity Plan, Training and Test Report annual update	annually by fiscal year's end	M	