# DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL COMMITTEE STRATEGIC PLAN

Chair: MG Clifton Tooley
Co-Chair: Brad Swearingen

October 2021
Indiana Executive Council on Cybersecurity

# Defense Industrial Committee Plan

# Table of Contents

# Committee Members

## Committee Members

| Last Name | First Name | Organization | Organizational Title | Member Type (Chair/Co-chair/Full-time, As needed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ehringer | David | Rolls Royce | Business Manager for IT Security | Full Time |
| Hormann | Douglas | Raytheon | Platform Systems / Cyber Lead | As Needed |
| Langley | Bryan | Indiana Economic Development Corporation | Senior Vice President of Defense | Chair Proxy |
| Reynolds | M. Brent | Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) | Chief Scientist for Cybersecurity | As Needed |
| Silbaugh | Chris | Rolls Royce | Senior Security Strategy Officer | As Needed |
| Swearingen | Brad | Rolls Royce | Director of Cybersecurity, Defense Products | Co-Chair |
| Tooley | Cliff (GEN) | Indiana Economic Development Corporation | Director | Chair |
| Vespa | Tony | Vespa Group, LLC | Owner | Full Time |
| Werner | Kyle | Crane | Strategic Director | Full Time |
| Banta | Rich | Lifeline Datacenters | Principal & Chief Information Security Officer | Full Time |
| Chrislip | Chris | EICORP | Senior Cybersecurity Architect | As Needed |
| Jeffers | Chris | Indiana Economic Development Corporation | PTAC Director | Full Time |
| Ortiz | Jason | Pondurance | Senior Product Engineer | Full Time |
| Owen | Dan | Global Cyber Alliance | Domain Trust Product Owner | As Needed |

# Introduction

# Introduction

The world of cybersecurity is highly complex and cluttered with information, misinformation, and disinformation. As a consequence, it is important to approach it strategically and create simplicity.

With the signing of Executive Order 17-11 by Governor Eric J. Holcomb, the Indiana Executive Council on Cybersecurity (IECC) continues its mission to move efforts and statewide cybersecurity initiatives to the "Next Level." With the ever-growing threat of cyberattacks, protecting Indiana's critical infrastructure is the focus of the IECC. Cybersecurity cannot be solved by one entity alone. The IECC works with private, public, academic, and military partners from all over the state to develop and maintain a strategic framework that establishes goals, plans, and best practices for cybersecurity.

The IECC is comprised of fifteen committees and working groups who have worked together to implement the statewide strategy of 2018 while developing an updated comprehensive strategic plan.

The following implementation plan is one of the fifteen specific plans that encompass the complete *2021 Indiana Cybersecurity Strategic Plan*.

For more information, visit www.in.gov/cybersecurity.

# Executive Summary

# Executive Summary

- **Research Conducted**
  - The Defense Industry Committee leveraged a recently completed study of Indiana's defense market, with insights provided by small and large cybersecurity business leaders; a review of the State's current cybersecurity-related web presence, and defense cybersecurity-related academic programs to establish a baseline for how the defense industry might contribute to the effort to enhance the cybersecurity posture of the State of Indiana and its critical assets.
    - Defense Reports (current standing in Defense programs)
    - Other states' Cybersecurity Defense Industry
    - Other states' Current Programs supporting Defense Industry
    - Current Asset Inventories of programs, partnerships and current contract proposals
    - Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) Inventory
    - Current cybersecurity industry numbers

- **Research Findings**
  - Our analysis of the defense cybersecurity industry landscape in Indiana led to three conclusions:
    - The defense cybersecurity industry ecosystem within the state provides the Governor with a potentially potent weapon in his kitbag to promote the State as a leader in cybersecurity locally, regionally and nationally.
    - Indiana's defense industry has a strong desire to support the Governor's effort to enhance the cybersecurity posture of the State and its critical assets.
    - As it is at the national level, the foundation of Indiana's cybersecurity is a strong state economy supported by 21st Century public policy that provides the environment, resources and impetus to reposition Indiana as a thought and action leader in the cybersecurity space nationally and internationally.
  - These conclusions led the committee to establish preliminary declarations of its group ethos and mission that reads as follows:
    - The foundation of Indiana's security is a strong economy. In the 21st Century, that economy is defined by a digital world wherein cyber threats pose a clear and present danger. The first protection principle for Indiana's security is the existence of a robust defense cybersecurity industry whose presence and participation serves as a natural inoculation against threats emerging from the cyber vector.
    - Therefore, the mission of the Defense Committee is to seek, encourage and promote programs and projects that lead to the growth of a vibrant cybersecurity defense industry-related economy within the State of Indiana.

- **Additional Findings**
  - The committee's initial research established the following as preliminary facts related to the State's cybersecurity defense industry:
    - The state's private sector cybersecurity defense industry is limited when compared to other states claiming leadership nationally with only thirteen companies identified as being current players in this market segment. However, those companies are extremely motivated to play a larger role at the state, regional and national levels, but require the support of the state in doing so.

- The state’s federal sector cybersecurity footprint represents great potential for leveraging via public-private partnerships in advancing Indiana’s interests with the inventory including Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane, the Indiana National Guard’s Muscatatuck training and testing facility, the Indiana National Guard’s Stout Field Special Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) and cybersecurity support team, and Grissom Air Reserve Base’s cyber team.
- Under the leadership of the Lieutenant Governor, the state has taken the initial first steps towards repositioning Indiana in the defense cybersecurity market through the commissioning of a statewide defense industry study directed towards framing a way ahead for the state in establishing itself as a thought and action leader in this market and has initiated the implementation of that study’s principle recommendations that include:
    - The establishment of a statewide defense market development and capture system.
    - The establishment of a statewide strategy for repositioning Indiana as a defense market thought and action leader.
    - The establishment and operation of a public-private partnership digital and physical defense industry ecosystem with the cybersecurity market being its first major vector.

- **Committee Deliverables**
    - Cyber Market System
    - Cyber Digital Platform
    - Cyber Statewide Testbed
    - CMMC Training/Certification

- **Additional Notes:**
    - The Defense Industrial Committee has identified the following two tasks as being those that frame the way ahead:
        - Working closely with the Lieutenant Governor in integrating its efforts with those directed towards the larger state-level defense market development and capture system.
        - Identifying and advocating public-private partnership opportunities to advance the development and growth of the defense cybersecurity market within the State.

- **References**

  - Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition & Sustainment Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification - https://www.acq.osd.mil/cmmc/ (Dec. 2020)
  - U.S. Department of Defense – DoD to Require Cybersecurity Certification in Some Contract Bids https://www.defense.gov/News/News-Stories/Article/Article/2071434/dod-to-require-cybersecurity-certification-in-some-contract-bids/
  - Accenture, *Integrated Digital Platforms: Flexible Technology to Meet the Consumer* Challenge, (Accenture Interactive: 2012)
  - AcqNotes, *Acquisition Process,* http://acqnotes.com/acqnote/acquisitions/acquisitionprocess-overview
  - AcqNotes, *Acquisition Category (ACAT),* http://acqnotes.com/acqnote/acquisitions/acquisition-category
  - Aerospace Industries Association, *The Strength to Lift America: The State of the U.S. Aerospace and Defense Industry,* (AIA: 2016)
  - American Legislative Exchange Council, *Rich States, Poor States – ALEC-Laffer State Economic Competitiveness Index*, (ALEC: 2017)
  - APMP Center for Business Development Excellence, *Capability Maturity Model for Business Development, Version 2.0* (APMP: 2014)
  - Arellano, Robert, *Analysis of Rapid Acquisition Processes to Fulfill Future Urgent Needs*, (Naval Postgraduate School: 2015)
  - BD-CMM Development Team and Steering Committee, *Capability Maturity Model for Business Development, Version 1.0*, (Business Development Institute: 2007)
  - Center for Strategic and International Studies, *Defense Acquisition Trends, 2016 – The End of the Contracting Drawdown*, (CSIS: 2017)
  - Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Contracting Process,* https://www.cdc.gov/contracts/process/index.html
  - Congressional Research Service, *Defense Primer: The National Defense Budget Function (050),* (CRS: 2017)
  - CNBC, *America's Top States for Business 2017,* https://www.cnbc.com/2017/07/11/americas-top-states-for-business-2017-overallranking.html
  - DB4 Consulting, *Capture Management: Art, Science or Sorcery?* (Loudon County Chamber of Commerce GovCon Initiative Training Session: 2015)
  - Defense Acquisition University, *Defense Acquisition Guidebook*, https://www.dau.mil/tools/dag
  - Defense Science Board, *Fulfillment of Urgent Operational Needs*, (USD AT&L: 2009) Defense Systems Management College, *DoD Funds Management Platinum Card*, (Defense Acquisition University, Fort Belvoir, VA: 2016).
  - Deloitte, *2017 Global Aerospace and Defense Sector Outlook – Growth Prospects Remain Upbeat*, (Deloitte: 2017)
  - Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Emerging Capability and Prototyping (EC&P), *Prototyping and Experimentation: Accelerating the Adoption of Transformative Capabilities*, (DASD EC&P: 2016)
  - DeVol, Ross, Joe Lee and Minoli Ratnatunga, *2016 State Technology and Science Index*, (Milken Institute: 2016) 37

- Douglas, Brad, *Welcome to the New Normal: Winning Business in Today's Market Place*, (Deltek Insight 2015: 2015)
- Etherton, Jon, *Acquisition Policy: Current Acquisition Environment*, (NDIA: 2017)
- Evans, Peter, Annabelle Gawer, *The Rise of the Platform Enterprise: A Global Survey*, (The Center for Global Enterprise: 2016)
- Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation, *Top 100 Contractors Report Fiscal Year 2016*, (GSA, https://www.fpds.gov/fpdsng_cms/index.php/en/reports/62-top-100-contractors-report)
- Gates, Doug, Tom Mayor, Erich Gampenrieder, *Global Aerospace and Defense Outlook: The Dawn of a New Day*, (KPMG: 2016)
- Goodly, Bernard, *Managing the Army's Research and Development Investments in a Time of Declining Resources*, (Defense Acquisition University: 2016)
- Governing for States and Localities, *Military Active-Duty Personnel, Civilians by State*, http://www.governing.com/gov-data/military-civilian-active-duty-employee-workforcenumbers-by-state.html
- Government Accountability Office, *Contracting Data Analysis – Assessment of Government-wide Trends*, (GAO: 2017)
- Government Accountability Office, *Defense Science and Technology- Adopting Best Practices Can Improve Innovation Investments and Management*, (GAO: 2017)
- Government Accountability Office, *DoD Rapid Innovation Program – Some Technologies Have Transitioned to Military Users, but Steps Can Be Taken to Improve Program Metrics and Outcomes*, (GAO: 2016)
- GovernmentContractsWon.com, *Indiana Defense Contractor Lists by City*, https://www.governmentcontractswon.com/department/defense/indiana_cities.asp
- GovWin, *Top 20 Unrestricted Federal Business Opportunities for FY2018*, (Deltek Federal Information Solutions: 2017)
- Hahn, Heather, Maeve Gearing, Michael Katz, Ria Amin, *Observations of Leaders Driving Changes in State Government*, (Urban Institute: 2015)
- Indiana University *I-Light Network Map*, http://ilight.net/map
- Industrial Research Institute, *2017 Global R&D Funding Forecast*, (R&D Magazine: 2017)
- LeHong, Hung, Chris Howard, Dennis Gaughan, Debra Logan, *Building a Digital Business Technology Platform*, (Gartner: 2016)
- Levinson, Robert, Sopen Shah, Paige Connor, *Impact of Defense Spending: A State-by-State Analysis*, (Bloomberg Government: 2011)
- Linsscott, Warren, *2015 Deltek Clarity GovCon Industry Study Results*, (Deltek: 2015)
- Martin, Greg, *Lunch & Learn: Congressional Enactment*, (DAU: 2017)
- Milken Institute, *2016 State Technology and Science Index – Sustaining America's Innovation Economy*, (Milken Institute: 2016)
- Morgan, Steve.  Cybersecurity Market Report, Q1 2017. http://cybersecurityventures.com/cybersecurity-market-report/
- Newman, Larry, *Shipley Proposal Guide for Business Development and Sales Professionals*, (Shipley Associates: 2009)
- Office of the Secretary of Defense Test Resource Management Center, Test & Evaluation/Science & Technology Opportunities, June 8, 2015, http://slideplayer.com/slide/6052297/

- Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, *Program Acquisition Cost by Weapon System United States Department of Defense*, (DoD: 2017)
- PricewaterhouseCoopers, *Aerospace and Defense 2016 in Review and 2017 Forecast*, (PwC: 2017)
- PricewaterhouseCoopers, *Aerospace Manufacturing Attractiveness Rankings*, (PwC: 2017)
- Project Management Institute, *PMBOK Guide, 6th Edition*, (Project Management Institute: 2017)
- Purdy, Ellen and Ted Bujewski, *Rapid Innovation Fund (RIF) 101*, (OSD Research and Engineering: 2017)
- Ross, Alec, "Want Job Security? Try online security". Wired, April 25, 2016
- Salesforce, *Federal Government Contractor Study 2016*, (Market Connections: 2016)
- Salesforce, *Government Contractor Best Practices*, (Market Connections, 2016).
- Sego, Patricia, *Capture Management*, (Glendale Technical Sales Consulting, Inc.: 2012)
- Shipley and Associates, *Business Development Lifecycle*, http://sbdl.shipleywins.com
- U.S. Department of Defense, *Department of Defense Directive 5000.01 Operation of the Defense Acquisition System*, (DoD: 2017)
- U.S. Department of Defense, *Department of Defense Instruction 5000.74, Defense Acquisition of Services*, (DoD: 2017)
- U.S. Department of Defense, *Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS)*, (DoD: 2015)
- U.S. Department of Defense, *Performance of the Defense Acquisition System – 2016 Annual Report*, (DoD: 2016)
- U.S. Department of Defense, *Rapid Innovation Fund (RIF) Program: Use of Technology Transition Best Practices*, (DoD: 2016)
- U.S. Department of Defense, *Report to Congress- Restructuring the Department of Defense Acquisition, Technology and Logistics Organization and Chief Management Officer Organization*, (DoD: 2017)
- U.S. Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment, *Defense Spending by State Fiscal Year 2014*, (DoD OEA: 2016)
- U.S. Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment, *Defense Spending by State Fiscal Year 2015*, (DoD OEA: 2017)
- U.S. Department of Defense Office of Small Business Programs, *2017 Small Business Training Week – Rapid Innovation Fund*, (DoD OSBP: 2017)
- U.S. Department of Defense Rapid Reaction Technology Office, *Rapid Reaction Technology Office Overview*, (DoD RRTO: 2016)
- U.S. Department of Defense, *2016 Report to Congress: Sustainable Ranges*, (USD P&R: 2016)
- USASpending.gov, *Indiana Spending Map*, https://www.usaspending.gov/transparency/Pages/SpendingMap.aspx?statecode=IN
- Warley, David, *The Project Manager's Survival Guide to Bids, Tenders and Proposals*, (Association for Project Management: 2016)
- Whaley, Eileen and Dana Stewart, *Path from Urgent Operational Need to Program of Record*, (Defense Acquisition University Alumni Association: 2014)
- Wyatt, Earl, *Rapid Fielding: A Path for Emerging Concept and Capability Prototyping*, (DASD RF: 2013)

# Research

# Research

1. **What has your area done in the last five years to educate, train, and prepare for cybersecurity?**
    a. Continued Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation (DFARS) training / software
    b. User training / programs to catch vulnerabilities

2. **What (or who) are the most significant cyber vulnerabilities in your area?**
    a. The everyday user
    b. Information Sharing Channels

3. **What is your area's greatest cybersecurity need and/or gap?**
    a. Studies have indicated that more than 60% of small business fail within 6 months of a significant cyber incident such as a breach or ransomware. There is need for affordable solutions to comply with current regulations and solution sets for the above statistics.
    b. Technology Expertise
    c. Education and Training

4. **What federal, state, or local cyber regulations is your area beholden to currently?**
    a. DFARS compliance
    b. European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)
    c. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)

5. **What case studies and or programs are out there that this Council can learn from as we proceed with the Planning Phase?**
    a. Kentucky completed a full evaluation of Cyber in the State through Defense Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) grant
    b. Cyber document – Indiana Economic Development Corporation (IEDC) 2017
    c. State of Illinois Cybersecurity Strategy

6. **What research is out there to validate your group's preliminary deliverables? This could be surveys, whitepapers, articles, books, etc. Please collect and document.**
    a. Defense Industry State Document – Sagamore Institute Produced
    b. Other State Research

7. **What are other people in your sector in other states doing to educate, train, prepare, etc. in cybersecurity?**
    a. Private, Public, Partnership Investment in cybersecurity
    b. Innovation / Entrepreneur programs (California model)
    c. Defining the lane, they want to dominate (Marketing plan and strategic plan attached)
    d. MiC3: Serving Michigan. The Michigan Cyber Civilian Corps (MiC3) is a group of trained cybersecurity experts who volunteer to provide expert assistance to enhance the State's ability to rapidly resolve cyber incidents when activated under a Governor declared State of Emergency. The group includes volunteers from government, education, and business sectors.

8. **What does success look like for your area in one year, three years, and five years?**
    a. Cyber Defense Capture Market system
    b. Working Digital platform
    c. Industry Lead Cyber Conference
    d. Defense Industry Legislative Recommendations
    e. 2% Market Share gain

9. **What is the education, public awareness, and training needed to increase the State's and your area's cybersecurity?**
    a. A proactive, ongoing public awareness campaign consisting of key messages, delivered via social media and resources, tips and best practices is essential for educating and engaging people of all ages; a necessary element for providing the requisite protections needed for safeguarding our personal and financial information in all aspects of our everyday life.

10. **What is the total workforce in your area in Indiana? How much of that workforce is cybersecurity related? How much of that cybersecurity-related workforce is not met?**
    a. Cybersecurity workforce – Needs to be defined and studied at a higher level.

11. **What do we need to do to attract cyber companies to Indiana?**
    a. Develop a market capture system that can truly identify opportunity in this sector
    b. Land a large program of record / Department of Defense (DOD) Contract with cyber component (US Govt 19B in 2017)
    c. Define focus in cyber
    d. Invest money into the current assets (Georgia, Michigan, Rhode Island model)
    e. Full inventory of all current assets (Kentucky model with OEA grant)
    f. Consider models of Maryland's Cybersecurity Investment Incentive Tax Credit
    g. Host conference or workshop on cyber insurance, funding risk assessments for critical infrastructure assets, piloting new technologies for critical infrastructure protection; and investing in processes to help critical infrastructure operators mitigate cyber risk. (Already been offered by STLogics company in Indiana to host)

12. **What are your communication protocols in a cyber emergency?**
    a. Internal Company protocols – Individually defined by each company

13. **What best practices should be used across the sectors in Indiana? Please collect and document.**
    a. Partner with Industry: State governments can leverage partnerships with the private sector by utilizing industry expertise through the acquisition of products and services with high levels of security and reasonable terms and conditions.
    b. Adopt Industry-Recognized Security Standards: State governments should adopt international standards recognized by industry to better align security across all agencies and departments.
    c. Standardize Cloud Security: If state governments plan on standardizing their approach to cloud security, they should leverage existing federal certification programs at the state level.

d. Establish an Outcome Focused Governance Structure: A state’s governance structure should cover all aspects of the enterprise and encourage cross-organizational collaboration and transparency.
e. Actively Share Information: There are a wide variety of different models for the sharing of cyber threat information, and integration centers have emerged in recent years to provide a vital link between all levels of government, the private sector, and academia.
f. Create a Culture of Awareness: State governments should invest in training and education for their workforces to enhance overall cybersecurity awareness.

# Deliverable: Cyber Market System

# Deliverable: Cyber Market System – Review

## *General Information*

1. **What is the deliverable?**
    a. Review of the Indiana defense industry cybersecurity market pursuit collaboration plan and system.
    b. Define programs that are worthy of a collective Statewide program and complete asset mapping for what capabilities we have in the State.

2. **What is the status of this deliverable?**
☒ Completed ☐ In-progress 25% ☐ In-progress 50% ☐ In-progress 75% ☐ Not Started

3. **Which of the following IECC goals does this deliverable meet?**
☐ Establish an effective governing structure and strategic direction.
☒ Formalize strategic cybersecurity partnerships across the public and private sectors.
☐ Strengthen best practices to protect information technology infrastructure.
☐ Build and maintain robust statewide cyber-incident response capabilities.
☐ Establish processes, technology, and facilities to improve cybersecurity statewide.
☐ Leverage business and economic opportunities related to information, critical infrastructure, and network security.
☐ Ensure a robust workforce and talent pipeline in fields involving cybersecurity.

4. **Which of the following categories most closely aligns with this deliverable?**
☐ Research – Surveys, Datasets, Whitepapers, etc.
☐ Informational Product – Definitions, Glossary, Guidelines, Inventory, Best Practices, etc.
☒ Operational Product – Programs, Processes, etc. (generally can be produced within the group or with current resources)
☐ Operational Proposal – Programs, Processes, etc. (generally requires additional resources)
☐ Templates/Toolkits – Actionable Resource Kits, Turnkey Templates
☐ Policy Recommendation – Recommended Changes to Law

## Objective Breakout of the Deliverable

5. **What is the resulting action or modified behavior of this deliverable?**
    a. Reposition Indiana as a thought and action leader nationally and internationally in the defense cybersecurity market space. This platform will enable us to pull statewide and regional resources to compete in the national cyber market.

6. **What metric or measurement will be used to define success?**
    a. Two percent, about $300 million of DOD cybersecurity market share, around $15 billion plus, by Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 as identified in contracts and grants awarded captured in usaspending.gov

7. **What year will the deliverable be completed?**
   ☒ 2021 ☐ 2022 ☐ 2023 ☐ 2024 ☐ 2025+

8. **Who or what entities will benefit from the deliverable?**
   a. Indiana entrepreneurs, businesses, colleges, universities and agencies involved in the defense cybersecurity market space

9. **Which state or federal resources or programs overlap with this deliverable?**
   a. State and federal defense cybersecurity-related programs.

## Additional Questions

10. **What other committees and/or working groups will your team be working with to complete or plan this deliverable?**
    a. Economic Development

11. **Which state agencies, federal agencies, associations, private organizations, non-profit organizations, etc. will need to be involved to complete or plan this deliverable?**
    a. Indiana Economic Development Corporation, Crane, Indiana National Guard, National Center for Complex Operations, Inc., Sagamore Institute, Prime / Mid / Small Cybersecurity Industry, Indiana Office of Technology & Other State Resources.

12. **Who should be main lead of this deliverable?**
    a. IEDC Defense Development

13. **What are the expected challenges to completing this deliverable?**
    a. None at this time

# *Implementation Plan*

14. **Is this a one-time deliverable or one that will require sustainability?**
    ☐ One-time deliverable
    ☒ Ongoing/sustained effort

## Tactic Timeline

| Tactic | Owner | % Complete | Deadline | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Build Cyber Defense Team | IEDC | 100% | January 1, 2018 | Defense Industry Cyber Group will be Cyber lead for State Defense Effort with IEDC |
| Asset Mapping | IEDC | 100% | January 1, 2019 | Digital Platform will help us complete this process |
| Research National Cyber Opportunities | Defense Industry Committee / IEDC | 100% | Ongoing | Working on group proposals for current opportunities |
| National & International Cybersecurity Market Development & Capture Support | IEDC/ NCCO | 100% | Ongoing | Viable pursuit of opportunities requires sustained development & capture support. |

## Resources and Budget (Please add rows as needed)

**15. Will staff be required to complete this deliverable?**

☒No ☐ Yes

a. The Defense Committee will use current staff of IOT, IEDC, and other entities to complete this process.

**16. What other resources are required to complete this deliverable? (Examples include software, hardware, supplies, materials, equipment, services, facilities, etc.)**

| Resource | Justification/Need for Resource | Estimated Initial Cost | Estimated Continued Cost, if Applicable | Primary Source of Funding | Alternate Source of Funding | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Digital Platform - Pilot | Establishes Base Line Cybersecurity Market Development & Capture Capability | $800K | N/A | OEA Grant | N/A | |
| Digital Platform – Phase 2 | Digital Platform Marketing Capability | $10K | $10K / month | State | N/A | |
| Defense Cybersecurity Market Development & Capture Support | Viable market development & capture system requires persistent research & market analysis | $35K | $35K / month | State | N/A | |

## Benefits and Risks

**17. What is the greatest benefit of this deliverable?**

a. Provides state with capability to develop and capture national and international cybersecurity market share.

**18. How will this deliverable reduce the cybersecurity risk or impact? What is the estimated costs associated with that risk reduction?**

a. Indiana collectively has the resources to lead the national security dialogue in the cybersecurity space. There is no estimated cost at this time.

**19. What is the risk or cost of not completing this deliverable?**

a. Indiana currently has lost 60% of the market share in the DOD contracting space and the risk is to continue this losing trend when we have all the resources / companies to do business in the cybersecurity and DOD space.

**20. What defines success and/or what metrics will be used to measure success? What is the baseline for your metrics?**

a. Two percent increase in the Defense Market by 2022 / National recognition of Cyber capabilities in Indiana.

**21. Are there comparable jurisdictions (e.g., other states) that have similar projects that we can compare this project to using the same metrics?**

☐No ☒ Yes

a. State of Georgia - $40M to new cybersecurity building / assets - leaning in on future cyber solutions.

**22. Are there comparable jurisdictions (e.g., other states) that does not have a comparable project that we can use as a control to show what happens if Indiana does not complete the deliverable?**

☐No ☒ Yes

## Other Implementation Factors

**23. List factors that may negatively impact the resources, timeline, or budget of this deliverable?**

a. None

**24. Does this deliverable require a change from a regulatory/policy standpoint?**

☒No ☐ Yes

**25. What will it take to support this deliverable if it requires ongoing sustainability?**

a. See chart under question number 16.

**26. Who has the committee/working group contacted regarding implementing this deliverable?**

a. Private and military partners.

**27. Can this deliverable be used by other sectors?**

☐No ☒ Yes

a. Cybersecurity marketing can be leveraged for adjacent markets and opportunities.

## Communications

**28. Once completed, which stakeholders need to be informed about the deliverable?**

a. IEDC Defense Development

**29. Would it be appropriate for this deliverable to be made available on Indiana's cybersecurity website (www.in.gov/cybersecurity)?**

☐No ☒ Yes

**30. What are other public relations and/or marketing considerations to be noted?**

a. None

# *Evaluation Methodology*

**Objective 1:** IEDC Defense Development and partners will review the current cybersecurity market pursuit plan and system in 2021.

*Type:* ☒ Output ☐ Outcome

*Evaluative Method:*

☒ Completion<br>
☐ Award/Recognition<br>
☐ Survey - Convenient<br>
☐ Survey – Scientific<br>
☐ Assessment Comparison<br>
☐ Scorecard Comparison<br>
☐ Focus Group<br>
☐ Peer Evaluation/Review<br>
☐ Testing/Quizzing<br>
☐ Benchmark Comparison<br>
☐ Qualitative Analysis<br>
☐ Quantifiable Measurement<br>
☐ Other

# Deliverable: Cyber Digital Platform

# Deliverable: Cyber Digital Platform

## *General Information*

1. **What is the deliverable?**
    a. Indiana defense cybersecurity market development and capture plan and system (Digital Platform)

2. **What is the status of this deliverable?**
☐ Completed ☐ In-progress 25% ☒ In-progress 50% ☐ In-progress 75% ☐ Not Started

3. **Which of the following IECC goals does this deliverable meet?**
☐ Establish an effective governing structure and strategic direction.
☐ Formalize strategic cybersecurity partnerships across the public and private sectors.
☐ Strengthen best practices to protect information technology infrastructure.
☐ Build and maintain robust statewide cyber-incident response capabilities.
☐ Establish processes, technology, and facilities to improve cybersecurity statewide.
☒ Leverage business and economic opportunities related to information, critical infrastructure, and network security.
☐ Ensure a robust workforce and talent pipeline in fields involving cybersecurity.

4. **Which of the following categories most closely aligns with this deliverable?**
☐ Research – Surveys, Datasets, Whitepapers, etc.
☐ Informational Product – Definitions, Glossary, Guidelines, Inventory, Best Practices, etc.
☒ Operational Product – Programs, Processes, etc. (generally can be produced within the group or with current resources)
☐ Operational Proposal – Programs, Processes, etc. (generally requires additional resources)
☐ Templates/Toolkits – Actionable Resource Kits, Turnkey Templates
☐ Policy Recommendation – Recommended Changes to Law

## Objective Breakout of the Deliverable

5. **What is the resulting action or modified behavior of this deliverable?**
    a. Reposition Indiana as a thought and action leader nationally and internationally in the defense cybersecurity market space.  This platform will enable us to pull statewide and regional resources to compete in the national cyber market.
        i. This platform will allow Indiana business and academia to qualify and register as defense contractors. Once qualified and registered, the software platform will facilitate a streamlined and automated proposal and contract process, matching Government acquisition opportunities (e.g., Request for Information (RFI), Request for Proposal (RFP), Small Business Innovative Research and

Small Business Technology Transfer (SBIR/STTR), and grants) to Indiana defense contractors.

ii. This platform will also allow Government and business users to perform Market Research, collect defense contract-related metrics, serve as a historical document, and "lessons-learned" repository and to allow post-contract award debriefs.

6. **What metric or measurement will be used to define success?**
   a. Two percent, about $300 million of DOD cybersecurity market share, around $15 billion plus, by Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 as identified in contracts and grants awarded captured in usaspending.gov.
   b. Percentage increase in defense spending executed through the digital platform.

7. What year will the deliverable be completed?

   ☒ 2021 ☐ 2022 ☐ 2023 ☐ 2024 ☐ 2025+

8. **Who or what entities will benefit from the deliverable?**
   a. Indiana entrepreneurs, businesses, colleges, universities and agencies involved in the defense cybersecurity market space.

9. **Which state or federal resources or programs overlap with this deliverable?**
   a. State and federal defense cybersecurity-related programs.

## Additional Questions

10. **What other committees and/or working groups will your team be working with to complete or plan this deliverable?**
    a. Economic Development

11. **Which state agencies, federal agencies, associations, private organizations, non-profit organizations, etc. will need to be involved to complete or plan this deliverable?**
    a. Indiana Economic Development Corporation, Crane, Indiana National Guard, National Center for Complex Operations, Inc., Sagamore Institute, Prime / Mid / Small Cybersecurity Industry, PTAC, Westgate/ARI, Indiana Universities, Atterbury-Muscatatuck.

12. **Who should be main lead of this deliverable?**
    a. IEDC Defense Development

13. **What are the expected challenges to completing this deliverable?**
    a. State budget programmed funding for maintenance / upkeep of the platform

# *Implementation Plan*

**14. Is this a one-time deliverable or one that will require sustainability**?

☐ One-time deliverable

☒ Ongoing/sustained effort

## Tactic Timeline (Please add rows as needed)

| **Tactic** | **Owner** | **% Complete** | **Deadline** | **Notes** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minimum Viable Product Phase 1 | IEDC/NCCO | 100 | 2018 | This is a pilot. |
| Marketing Plan | IEDC/NCCO | 70 | 2021 | Unfunded |
| Training | IEDC/NCCO | 0 | 2021 | Unfunded |
| Support | IEDC/NCCO | 0 | 2021-2025 | Unfunded |

## Resources and Budget (Please add rows as needed)

**15. Will staff be required to complete this deliverable?**

☐No ☒ Yes

| **Estimated Initial FTE** | **Estimated Continued FTE** | **Skillset/Role** | **Primary Source of Funding** | **Alternate Source of Funding** | **Notes** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 hours / week | 1 hour / week | Product Sponsor (Business) | Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) Grant | x | Product Owner-Decision Maker for product |
| 2 hours / week | 1 hour / week | Product Owner (Business) | OEA grant | x | Product Owner-Decision Maker for product |
| 2 hours / week | 1 hour / week | Product Technical Subject Matter Expert (Business) | OEA grant | x | Need at least one representative able to serve as a technical representative |
| 2 hours / week | 1 hour / week | Product Process Subject Matter Expert (Business) | OEA grant | x | Need one representative for each process owner if process has multiple owners |
| 25 hours / week | 25 hours / week | Product Build – Account Manager | OEA grant | x | |
| 80 hours / week | 80 hours / week | Business Analyst (Project Lead) | OEA grant | x | |
| 40 hours / week | 40 hours / week | Project Manager | OEA grant | x | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 80 hours / week | 80 hours / week | Front-End Developers | OEA grant | x | Need two or more |
| 40 hours / week | 40 hours / week | Lead System Architect | OEA grant | x |  |
| 80 hours / week | 80 hours / week | Back-End Developers | OEA grant | x | Need two or more |
| 0 hours / week | 80 hours / week | Support Personnel (Business) | OEA grant | x |  |
| 0 hours / week | 80 hours / week | Support Personnel (Technical) | OEA grant | x |  |
| 30 hours / week | 30 hours / week | Training Personnel (Business) | OEA grant | x | Need three trainers |
| 30 hours / week | 30 hours / week | Training Personnel (Business) | OEA grant | x | Need three trainers |

**16. What other resources are required to complete this deliverable?**

| **Resource** | **Justification/Need for Resource** | **Estimated Initial Cost** | **Estimated Continued Cost, if Applicable** | **Primary Source of Funding** | **Alternate Source of Funding** | **Notes** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subscription Access to External and Government Databases | Data from External and Government Databases are required in order to supply the new product with needed information assets | $5,000 | $500/month | OEA grant | x | Access to all databases |
| Cloud Infrastructure | This is required to host the application. Web Servers and Database Servers will be required. | $200,000 | $15,000/month |  |  |  |

## Benefits and Risks

**17. What is the greatest benefit of this deliverable? (Please provide qualitative and/or quantitative support.)**

a. To increase the share of defense contracts in Indiana and ensuring that all the work is performed by companies, organizations and research institutions based in Indiana – analytics attached to the digital platform.

b. The major focus and benefit are job creation, more economic and business growth opportunities in Indiana and beyond.

**18. How will this deliverable reduce the cybersecurity risk or impact? What is the estimated costs associated with that risk reduction?**

a. Cybersecurity is the primary service category that the platform will capture and would enable organizations, academia and research institutions to provide risk reduction at the overall State level by developing capabilities and attracting and retaining talent.
b. Minimum viable product (MVP) cost is around $500 thousand and while the final costs are still being finalized it is generally in the range of 6-10 times the cost of MVP.

**19. What is the risk or cost of not completing this deliverable?**

a. Continue losing market share in the overall defense expenditure in State of Indiana.
b. Continue losing market share in the overall cybersecurity-related defense projects expenditure.
c. The limited capability of the tool will limit the amount of potential jobs created; as well as a limiting the contribution to economic prosperity and business potential in the State of Indiana.

**20. What defines success and/or what metrics will be used to measure success? What is the baseline for your metrics?**

a. Increased dollars from DoD funded contracts awarded to Indiana vendors.
b. Number of cybersecurity and defense contracts executed through the platform in automated fashion and in alignment with Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation (DFAR).
c. Increased number of Indiana jobs created by DoD funded contracts.
d. Baselines to be provided by DoD.

**21. Are there comparable jurisdictions (e.g., other states) that have similar projects that we can compare this project to using the same metrics?**

☒No ☐ Yes

**22. Are there comparable jurisdictions (e.g., other states) that does not have a comparable project that we can use as a control to show what happens if Indiana does not complete the deliverable?**

☒No ☐ Yes

***Note:*** *From what we understand, the product being generated is the first of its kind for states / jurisdictions. The product will only generate more jobs, economic prosperity and business potential regardless of the current economic status of a given state/jurisdiction.*

## Other Implementation Factors

**23. List factors that may negatively impact the resources, timeline, or budget of this deliverable?**

a. Availability and accessibility of key stakeholders / resources for critical information and support.

**24. Does this deliverable require a change from a regulatory/policy standpoint?**

☒No ☐ Yes

**25. What will it take to support this deliverable if it requires ongoing sustainability?**

a. Strategic Guidance
b. Business Support
c. Technical Support
d. Financial Support

**26. Who has the committee/working group contacted regarding implementing this deliverable?**

a. IEDC and National Center for Complex Operations (NCCO)

**27. Can this deliverable be used by other sectors?**

☐No ☒ Yes

a. Deliverable has unlimited use potential and can be used by any other federal agency

## Communications

**28. Once completed, which stakeholders need to be informed about the deliverable?**

a. Potential companies and users of the system
b. IEDC, Indiana Procurement Technical Assistance Center (PTAC)
c. Academia and Research Institutions
d. NCCO and IEDC Defense Development internal users
e. Investors, Entrepreneurs, Donors

**29. Would it be appropriate for this deliverable to be made available on Indiana's cybersecurity website (www.in.gov/cybersecurity)?**

☐No ☒ Yes

a. A safe, secure platform for connecting, vetting, and qualifying local vendors, national vendors, and government agencies.

**30. What are other public relations and/or marketing considerations to be noted?**

a. The site will be available via the web to the public and will be advertised on other websites / social media channels.

# *Evaluation Methodology*

**Objective 1:** IEDC Defense Development and partners will develop a pilot of the Indiana defense cybersecurity market development and capture plan and system (Digital Platform) by 2021.

*Type:* ☒ Output ☐ Outcome

*Evaluative Method:*

☒ Completion
☐ Award/Recognition
☐ Survey - Convenient
☐ Survey – Scientific
☐ Assessment Comparison
☐ Scorecard Comparison
☐ Focus Group

☐ Peer Evaluation/Review
☐ Testing/Quizzing
☐ Benchmark Comparison
☐ Qualitative Analysis
☐ Quantifiable Measurement
☐ Other

**Objective 2:** Indiana increases to two percent (about $300M) of the Department of Defense (DOD) cybersecurity market share ($15B plus) by FY 2025.
*Type:* ☐ Output ☒ Outcome

*Evaluative Method:*

☒ Completion
☐ Award/Recognition
☐ Survey - Convenient
☐ Survey – Scientific
☐ Assessment Comparison
☐ Scorecard Comparison
☐ Focus Group

☒ Peer Evaluation/Review
☐ Testing/Quizzing
☒ Benchmark Comparison
☐ Qualitative Analysis
☒ Quantifiable Measurement
☐ Other

# Deliverable: Cyber Statewide Testbed

# Deliverable: Cyber Statewide Testbed

## *General Information*

1. **What is the deliverable?**
   a. Indiana defense cybersecurity product test, training and demonstration plan, and capability. (Cyber Statewide Testbed)

2. **What is the status of this deliverable?**
   ☐ Completed ☐ In-progress 25% ☒ In-progress 50% ☒ In-progress 75% ☐ Not Started

3. **Which of the following IECC goals does this deliverable meet?**
   ☐ Establish an effective governing structure and strategic direction.
   ☐ Formalize strategic cybersecurity partnerships across the public and private sectors.
   ☐ Strengthen best practices to protect information technology infrastructure.
   ☐ Build and maintain robust statewide cyber-incident response capabilities.
   ☒ Establish processes, technology, and facilities to improve cybersecurity statewide.
   ☐ Leverage business and economic opportunities related to information, critical infrastructure, and network security.
   ☐ Ensure a robust workforce and talent pipeline in fields involving cybersecurity.

4. **Which of the following categories most closely aligns with this deliverable?**
   ☐ Research – Surveys, Datasets, Whitepapers, etc.
   ☐ Informational Product – Definitions, Glossary, Guidelines, Inventory, Best Practices, etc.
   ☒ Operational Product – Programs, Processes, etc. (generally can be produced within the group or with current resources)
   ☐ Operational Proposal – Programs, Processes, etc. (generally requires additional resources)
   ☐ Templates/Toolkits – Actionable Resource Kits, Turnkey Templates
   ☐ Policy Recommendation – Recommended Changes to Law

## Objective Breakout of the Deliverable

5. **What is the resulting action or modified behavior of this deliverable?**
   a. Reposition Indiana as a thought and action leader nationally and internationally in the defense cybersecurity market space. This testbed will allow for companies, universities, local entities and military assets to test, train and demonstrate cyber capabilities.

6. **What metric or measurement will be used to define success?**
   a. Two percent, about $300 million of DOD cybersecurity market share, around $15 billion plus, by Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 as identified in contracts and grants awarded captured in usaspending.gov.

7. **What year will the deliverable be completed?**
   ☐ 2021 ☒ 2022 ☐ 2023 ☐ 2024 ☒ 2025+

8. **Who or what entities will benefit from the deliverable?**
   a. Indiana entrepreneurs, businesses, colleges, universities and agencies involved in the defense cybersecurity market space.

9. **Which state or federal resources or programs overlap with this deliverable?**
   a. State and federal defense cybersecurity related programs.

## Additional Questions

10. **What other committees and/or working groups will your team be working with to complete or plan this deliverable?**
    a. Economic Development

11. **Which state agencies, federal agencies, associations, private organizations, non-profit organizations, etc. will need to be involved to complete or plan this deliverable?**
    a. Indiana Economic Development Corporation, Crane, Indiana National Guard, National Center for Complex Operations, Inc., Sagamore Institute, Prime / Mid / Small Cybersecurity Industry.

12. **Who should be main lead of this deliverable?**
    a. IEDC Defense Development with technical expertise of Primes, Crane and Indiana National Guard assets and Indiana Office of Technology

13. **What are the expected challenges to completing this deliverable?**
    a. State budget programmed funding – (Georgia has put $40M towards Cybersecurity)

# *Implementation Plan*

14. **Is this a one-time deliverable or one that will require sustainability?**
    ☐ One-time deliverable
    ☒ Ongoing/sustained effort

## Tactic Timeline

| Tactic | Owner | % Complete | Deadline | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Multi-Threat Energy Grid (M-TEG) | IEDC/NCCO | 100 | June 2020 | |
| Muscatatuck Cybertropolis (MUTC-C) | Indiana Guard | 100 | June 2020 | |
| Indiana Cyber Ecosystem (ICE) | IEDC/NCCO | 100 | June 2020 | |
| Capture market share statistics | IEDC | 20 | Ongoing until 2025 | |

## Resources and Budget

### 15. Will staff be required to complete this deliverable?

☐No ☒ Yes

| Estimated Initial FTE | Estimated Continued FTE | Skillset/Role | Primary Source of Funding | Alternate Source of Funding | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 5 | Project Management | DOE Grant | X | |

### 16. What other resources are required to complete this deliverable?

| Resource | Justification/ Need for Resource | Estimated Initial Cost | Estimated Continued Cost, if Applicable | Primary Source of Funding | Alternate Source of Funding | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M-TEG Design/Construct | Self-Explanatory | $22M | $1M / year | DOE Grant | X | |
| M-TEG Technical Project Lead & Analysis | Self-Explanatory | $1.2M | $1.2M / year | DOE Grant | X | |
| M-TEG Construction Project Manager & Required Studies | Self-Explanatory | $2.2M | $200K / year | DOE Grant | X | |
| M-TEG Program Management & Business Operations | Self-Explanatory | $1M | $1M / year | DOE Grant | X | |
| M-TEG Contingency | Self-Explanatory | $3.2M | N/A | DOE Grant | X | |
| M-TEG Phase II | Self-Explanatory | $20M | $20M | Private/State (80%/20%) | X | |
| M-TEG Phase III | Self-Explanatory | $20M | $20M | Private/State (80%/20%) | X | |
| Cybertropolis Project Management & Required Studies | Self-Explanatory | $1.5M | $1.5M | State | X | |
| Cybertropolis Design/Construct | Self-Explanatory | $10M | $10M | Private/State (80%/20%) | X | |
| Indiana Cyber Ecosystem | Self-Explanatory | $2M | $2M | State | X | |

## Benefits and Risks

**17. What is the greatest benefit of this deliverable?**

a. This deliverable establishes Indiana as a thought and action leader in the national and international cybersecurity market.

**18. How will this deliverable reduce the cybersecurity risk or impact? What is the estimated costs associated with that risk reduction?**

a. This deliverable provides to the state, nation and world a capability to rapidly identify and respond to cyber threats against critical infrastructure.

**19. What is the risk or cost of not completing this deliverable?**

a. Indiana surrenders cybersecurity market dominance to other states.

**20. What defines success and/or what metrics will be used to measure success? What is the baseline for your metrics?**

a. Success equals capture of five percent of international cybersecurity market share by end of calendar year 2023.

**21. Are there comparable jurisdictions (e.g., other states) that have similar projects that we can compare this project to using the same metrics?**

☐No ☐ Yes

**22. Are there comparable jurisdictions (e.g., other states) that do not have a comparable project that we can use as a control to show what happens if Indiana does not complete the deliverable?**

☒No ☐ Yes

## Other Implementation Factors

**23. List factors that may negatively impact the resources, timeline, or budget of this deliverable?**

a. Award of DoE M-TEG Phase I grant

**24. Does this deliverable require a change from a regulatory/policy standpoint?**

☒No ☐ Yes

**25. What will it take to support this deliverable if it requires ongoing sustainability?**

a. This deliverable will be self-sustaining through public-private business model no later than (NLT) end of calendar year 2022.

**26. Who has the committee/working group contacted regarding implementing this deliverable?**

a. NCCO, IEDC, state and national stakeholders.

**27. Can this deliverable be used by other sectors?**

☐No ☒ Yes

a. Any sector involved in critical infrastructure and product protection training or testing will benefit from this deliverable.

## Communications

**28. Once completed, which stakeholders need to be informed about the deliverable?**

a. IEDC Defense Development

**29. Would it be appropriate for this deliverable to be made available on Indiana's cybersecurity website (www.in.gov/cybersecurity)?**

☐No ☒ Yes

**30. What are other public relations and/or marketing considerations to be noted?**

a. This deliverable will have an embedded public relations and marketing component.

# *Evaluation Methodology*

**Objective 1:** IEDC Defense Development will establish a nationally recognized cybersecurity test bed in Indiana by June 2021.

*Type:* ☒ Output ☐ Outcome

*Evaluative Method:*

☒ Completion<br>
☐ Award/Recognition<br>
☐ Survey - Convenient<br>
☐ Survey – Scientific<br>
☐ Assessment Comparison<br>
☐ Scorecard Comparison<br>
☐ Focus Group

☐ Peer Evaluation/Review<br>
☐ Testing/Quizzing<br>
☐ Benchmark Comparison<br>
☐ Qualitative Analysis<br>
☐ Quantifiable Measurement<br>
☐ Other

**Objective 2:** Indiana captures five percent of international cybersecurity market share of cybersecurity test, training, and demonstration plan and capability by December 2025.

*Type:* ☐ Output ☒ Outcome

*Evaluative Method:*

☐ Completion<br>
☐ Award/Recognition<br>
☐ Survey - Convenient<br>
☐ Survey – Scientific<br>
☐ Assessment Comparison<br>
☐ Scorecard Comparison<br>
☐ Focus Group

☐ Peer Evaluation/Review<br>
☐ Testing/Quizzing<br>
☐ Benchmark Comparison<br>
☐ Qualitative Analysis<br>
☒ Quantifiable Measurement<br>
☐ Other

# Deliverable: Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) Compliant Program

# Deliverable: Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) Compliant Program

## *General Information*

1. **What is the deliverable?**
   a. The Indiana Economic Development Corporation (PTAC/ ISBDC/Defense) and Purdue University (MEP/cyberTAP) are forming a partnership to support Indiana small businesses becoming level 1 Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) Compliant.

2. **What is the status of this deliverable?**
   ☐ Completed ☐ In-progress 25% ☐ In-progress 50% ☒ In-progress 75% ☐ Not Started

3. **Which of the following IECC goals does this deliverable meet?**
   ☐ Establish an effective governing structure and strategic direction.
   ☒ Formalize strategic cybersecurity partnerships across the public and private sectors.
   ☐ Strengthen best practices to protect information technology infrastructure.
   ☐ Build and maintain robust statewide cyber-incident response capabilities.
   ☐ Establish processes, technology, and facilities to improve cybersecurity statewide.
   ☐ Leverage business and economic opportunities related to information, critical infrastructure, and network security.
   ☐ Ensure a robust workforce and talent pipeline in fields involving cybersecurity.

4. **Which of the following categories most closely aligns with this deliverable?**
   ☐ Research – Surveys, Datasets, Whitepapers, etc.
   ☒ Informational Product – Definitions, Glossary, Guidelines, Inventory, Best Practices, etc.
   ☐ Operational Product – Programs, Processes, etc. (generally can be produced within the group or with current resources)
   ☐ Operational Proposal – Programs, Processes, etc. (generally requires additional resources)
   ☐ Templates/Toolkits – Actionable Resource Kits, Turnkey Templates
   ☐ Policy Recommendation – Recommended Changes to Law

## Objective Breakout of the Deliverable

5. **What is the resulting action or modified behavior of this deliverable?**
   a. Deliver CMMC technical assistance services to walk companies through the process of implementing CMMC standards and moving toward certification.

6. **What metric or measurement will be used to define success?**
    a. Clients Assisted or spoken with: Level 1- 40-60 – stretch goal (Fully implementing CMMC L1 controls).

    *Note: depending on level of assistance needed, the level of companies assisted can fluctuate.*

7. **What year will the deliverable be completed?**

    ☒ 2021 ☐ 2022 ☐ 2023 ☐ 2024 ☐ 2025+

8. **Who or what entities will benefit from the deliverable?**
    a. Indiana small businesses

9. **Which state or federal resources or programs overlap with this deliverable?**
    a. Not Applicable. State agencies are not directly involved with the CMMC process, except IEDC. DLA (DoD) manages the CMMC process. Any potential overlap may come from third party vendors or other federal agencies who may provide additional resources that could be applicable to CMMC (i.e., SBA).

## Additional Questions:

10. **What other committees and/or working groups will your team be working with to complete or plan this deliverable?**
    a. Defense at this present time.

11. **Which state agencies, federal agencies, associations, private organizations, non-profit organizations, etc. will need to be involved to complete or plan this deliverable?**
    a. IEDC and Purdue University

12. **Who should be main lead of this deliverable?**
    a. Bryan Langley and Chris Jeffers

13. **What are the expected challenges to completing this deliverable?**
    a. Formulating a process that addressing a fluctuating defense program, with an increased demand and need for Indiana companies.

# *Implementation Plan*

**14.** Is this a one-time deliverable or one that will require sustainability?

☐ One-time deliverable<br>
☒ Ongoing/sustained effort

## Tactic Timeline

| Tactic | Owner | % Complete | Deadline | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Process to manage support | IEDC/Purdue | 100 | Oct 2021 | Program is expected to be active in Dec. |

## Resources and Budget

**15. Will staff be required to complete this deliverable?** ☐No ☒ Yes

| Estimated Initial FTE | Estimated Continued FTE | Skillset/Role | Primary Source of Funding | Alternate Source of Funding | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N/A | N/A | Existing staff | IEDC | | This process has been built in using existing funds |

**16. What other resources are required to complete this deliverable?**

| Resource | Justification/Need for Resource | Estimated Initial Cost | Estimated Continued Cost, if Applicable | Primary Source of Funding | Alternate Source of Funding | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Purdue | Already built in | | | | | |

## Benefits and Risks

**17. What is the greatest benefit of this deliverable?**

a. Support Indiana small businesses becoming level 1 Cybersecurity Maturity Model Compliant (CMMC)

**18. How will this deliverable reduce the cybersecurity risk or impact? What are the estimated costs associated with that risk reduction?**

a. It is based on CMMC compliance that includes a cost that will be incumbered on businesses. The support we are providing helps them move to L1 certification, so the cost and support is more around getting companies equipped.

**19. What is the risk or cost of not completing this deliverable?**

a. Indiana companies not being CMMC compliant and losing defense contracts.

**20. What defines success and/or what metrics will be used to measure success? What is the baseline for your metrics?**

a. Based on how many companies we can support through the process. 40-60 companies.

**21. Are there comparable jurisdictions (e.g., other states) that have similar projects that we can compare this project to using the same metrics?**

☒No ☐ Yes

22. **Are there comparable jurisdictions (e.g., other states) that does not have a comparable project that we can use as a control to show what happens if Indiana does not complete the deliverable?**

☐No ☒ Yes

a. The partnership between IEDC and Purdue is unique among most states because we are leveraging available resources to support companies.

## Other Implementation Factors

23. **List factors that may negatively impact the resources, timeline, or budget of this deliverable?**

a. No Response

24. **Does this deliverable require a change from a regulatory/policy standpoint?**

☒No ☐ Yes

a. If yes, what is the change and what could be the fiscal impact if the change is made? No – however additional support from the state will help us increase the resources available to companies, although the cost of being CMMC compliant falls primarily on the company

25. **What will it take to support this deliverable if it requires ongoing sustainability? Federal and state funding.**

a. Both

26. **Who has the committee/working group contacted regarding implementing this deliverable?**

a. IEDC and Purdue customers and vendors

27. **Can this deliverable be used by other sectors?**

☐No ☒ Yes,

a. Any committee that works with businesses and eventually, government sectors

## Communications

28. **Once completed, which stakeholders need to be informed about the deliverable?**

a. Indiana small businesses and IEDC stakeholder groups, to include the IECC. Purdue will also provide information to their clients and customers.

29. **Would it be appropriate for this deliverable to be made available on Indiana's cybersecurity website (www.in.gov/cybersecurity)?**

☐No ☒ Yes

30. **What are other public relations and/or marketing considerations to be noted?**

a. No Response

# *Evaluation Methodology*

**Objective 1:** IEDC and partners will develop a Cybersecurity Capability Maturity Model (CMMC) framework in Indiana by December 2021.

*Type:* ☒ Output ☐ Outcome

*Evaluative Method:*

☒ Completion
☐ Award/Recognition
☐ Survey - Convenient
☐ Survey – Scientific
☐ Assessment Comparison
☐ Scorecard Comparison
☐ Focus Group

☐ Peer Evaluation/Review
☐ Testing/Quizzing
☐ Benchmark Comparison
☐ Qualitative Analysis
☐ Quantifiable Measurement
☐ Other

**Objective 2:** IEDC and partners will promote Cybersecurity Capability Maturity Model (CMMC) in Indiana to 80% of key stakeholders and associations by January 2022.

*Type:* ☐ Output ☒ Outcome

*Evaluative Method:*

☐ Completion
☐ Award/Recognition
☐ Survey - Convenient
☐ Survey – Scientific
☐ Assessment Comparison
☐ Scorecard Comparison
☐ Focus Group

☐ Peer Evaluation/Review
☐ Testing/Quizzing
☐ Benchmark Comparison
☐ Qualitative Analysis
☒ Quantifiable Measurement
☐ Other

# Supporting Documentation

# Supporting Documentation

This section contains all the associated documents that are referenced in this strategic plan and can be used for reference, clarification, and implementation details.

There are no supporting documents at this time