

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.
Form 10-Q
August 07, 2008

[QuickLinks](#) -- Click here to rapidly navigate through this document

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-Q

**QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d)
OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

FOR THE QUARTERLY PERIOD ENDED JUNE 29, 2008

**TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d)
OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

Commission file number 0-27231

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

(Exact name of Registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware
(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)

13-3818604
(I.R.S. Employer
Identification No.)

**4810 Eastgate Mall
San Diego, CA 92121
(858) 812-7300**

(Address, including zip code, and telephone number, including
area code, of Registrant's principal executive offices)

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant: (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer" and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act (Check one):

Large accelerated filer <input type="checkbox"/>	Accelerated filer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-accelerated filer <input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller reporting company <input type="checkbox"/>
		(Do not check if a smaller reporting company)	

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes No

As of July 31, 2008 104,955,373 shares of the registrant's common stock were outstanding

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

FORM 10-Q

FOR THE QUARTERLY PERIOD ENDED JUNE 29, 2008

INDEX

	Page
PART I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION	
Item 1. Financial Statements	3
Consolidated Balance Sheets at December 31, 2007 and June 29, 2008 (unaudited)	3
Consolidated Statements of Operations for the Three and Six Months Ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 (unaudited)	4
Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the Six Months Ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 (unaudited)	5
Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (unaudited)	6
Item 2. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations	34
Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk	49
Item 4. Controls and Procedures	49
PART II. OTHER INFORMATION	
Item 1. Legal Proceedings	51
Item 1A. Risk Factors	55
Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds	70
Item 4. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders	71
Item 6. Exhibits	72

PART I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Item 1. Financial Statements

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

(in millions, except par value and number of shares)

(Unaudited)

	December 31, 2007	June 29, 2008
Assets		
Current assets:		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 8.6	\$ 17.4
Restricted cash		2.1
Accounts receivable, net	77.0	89.1
Income taxes receivable	1.0	0.8
Prepaid expenses	7.4	7.0
Note receivable	2.6	
Other current assets	8.7	8.9
Current assets of discontinued operations	1.6	0.7
Total current assets	106.9	126.0
Property and equipment, net	6.9	7.6
Goodwill	194.5	238.0
Other intangibles, net	19.9	25.0
Investments in unconsolidated affiliates	0.3	
Other assets	6.7	4.3
Non current assets of discontinued operations	0.1	0.3
Total assets	\$ 335.3	\$ 401.2
Liabilities and Stockholders' Equity		
Current liabilities:		
Accounts payable	\$ 22.7	\$ 29.2
Accrued expenses	14.5	12.6
Accrued compensation	9.9	13.7
Billings in excess of costs and earnings on uncompleted contracts	10.9	9.2
Accrual for unused office space	1.0	0.7
Current portion of long-term debt	2.6	6.4
Other current liabilities	16.6	19.4
Current liabilities of discontinued operations	5.3	4.3
Total current liabilities	83.5	95.5
Long-term debt, net of current portion	72.9	76.6
Accrual for unused office space, net of current portion	1.4	0.6
Deferred tax liabilities	2.0	2.8
Other long-term liabilities	5.6	3.6
Non current liabilities of discontinued operations	2.7	2.5
Total liabilities	168.1	181.6
Commitments and contingencies (Notes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 13)		
Stockholders' equity:		
Preferred Stock, 5,000,000 shares authorized, Series B Convertible Preferred Stock, \$.001 par value; 10,000 shares outstanding at December 31, 2007 and June 29, 2008, (liquidation preference \$5.0 million)		
Common Stock, \$.001 par value, 195,000,000 shares authorized; 78,998,922 shares and 104,954,564 issued and outstanding at December 31, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively		
Additional paid-in capital	412.7	466.2

Edgar Filing: KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC. - Form 10-Q

Accumulated deficit	(245.5)	(246.6)
Total stockholders' equity	167.2	219.6
Total liabilities and stockholders' equity	\$ 335.3	\$ 401.2

See accompanying notes to unaudited financial statements.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS

(in millions, except per share amounts)

(Unaudited)

	Three months ended		Six months ended	
	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008
Revenues	\$ 47.8	\$ 72.3	\$ 96.8	\$ 140.5
Cost of revenues	40.3	59.4	82.0	115.0
Gross profit	7.5	12.9	14.8	25.5
Selling, general and administrative expenses	10.8	11.2	19.9	23.1
Recovery of unauthorized issuance of stock options and adjustment to the liability for unused office space		(1.2)		(1.2)
Stock option investigation and related fees	5.0		6.5	
Operating income (loss)	(8.3)	2.9	(11.6)	3.6
Other income (expense):				
Interest expense, net		(2.5)		(4.8)
Other income, net	0.2	1.4	0.7	1.0
Total other income (expense), net	0.2	(1.1)	0.7	(3.8)
Income (loss) before income taxes	(8.1)	1.8	(10.9)	(0.2)
Provision for income taxes	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.9
Income (loss) from continuing operations	(8.4)	1.4	(11.4)	(1.1)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	12.6	(0.6)	(4.5)	
Net income (loss)	\$ 4.2	\$ 0.8	\$(15.9)	\$ (1.1)
Basic earnings (loss) per common share:				
Income (loss) from continuing operations	\$ (0.11)	\$ 0.02	\$(0.16)	(0.01)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	0.17	(0.01)	(0.06)	
Net income (loss)	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.01	\$(0.22)	\$ (0.01)
Diluted earnings (loss) per common share:				
Income (loss) from continuing operations	\$ (0.11)	\$ 0.02	\$(0.16)	\$ (0.01)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	0.17	(0.01)	(0.06)	
Net income (loss)	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.01	\$(0.22)	\$ (0.01)
Weighted average common shares outstanding:				
Basic	73.9	80.9	73.9	79.5
Diluted	73.9	83.8	73.9	79.5

See accompanying notes to unaudited financial statements.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

(in millions)

(Unaudited)

	Six months ended	
	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008
Operating activities:		
Net loss	\$ (15.9)	\$ (1.1)
Loss from discontinued operations	(4.5)	
Loss from continuing operations	(11.4)	(1.1)
Adjustments to reconcile net loss from continuing operations to net cash provided by continuing operations:		
Depreciation and amortization	2.5	3.5
Mark to market on swaps		(0.6)
Deferred income taxes	0.2	0.4
Change in accrual for unused office space		(0.6)
Stock-based compensation	0.3	0.4
Changes in assets and liabilities, net of acquisitions and divestitures:		
Accounts receivable	13.6	1.9
Prepaid expenses	(0.3)	0.8
Other assets	(5.4)	3.1
Accounts payable	(1.3)	2.6
Accrued expenses	4.3	(2.7)
Accrued compensation	(0.5)	(1.4)
Accrual for unused office space	(0.5)	(0.5)
Billings in excess of costs and earnings on uncompleted contracts	(0.6)	(2.7)
Other liabilities	1.4	0.8
Net cash provided by continuing operations	2.3	3.9
Investing activities:		
Cash paid or received in acquisitions, net	(6.2)	1.0
Decrease (increase) in restricted cash	1.0	(2.1)
Proceeds from the disposition of discontinued operations	18.6	2.3
Capital expenditures	(1.1)	(0.4)
Proceeds from the sale of investments		0.3
Net cash provided by investing activities from continuing operations	12.3	1.1
Financing activities:		
Borrowings under line of credit	8.0	5.0
Repayment under line of credit and term notes	(19.0)	(0.7)
Decrease in capital lease obligations	(0.2)	(0.1)
Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities from continuing operations	(11.2)	4.2
Net cash flows of continuing operations	3.4	9.2
Cash flows of discontinued operations		
Operating cash flows	5.0	(0.4)
Investing cash flows	(1.5)	
Net cash flows of discontinued operations	3.5	(0.4)

Net increase in cash and cash equivalents	6.9	8.8
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period	5.4	8.6
Cash and cash equivalents at end of period	\$ 12.3	\$ 17.4

See accompanying notes to unaudited financial statements.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(Unaudited)

Note 1. Organization and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

(a) Description of Business

Kratos Defense & Security Solutions, Inc. ("Kratos" or "the Company") was initially incorporated under the name of Wireless Facilities, Inc. in the state of New York on December 19, 1994, commenced operations in March 1995, and was reincorporated in Delaware in 1998. Under its former name of Wireless Facilities, the Company historically conducted business in three segments: Wireless Network Services, Government Network Services and Enterprise Network Services. The Company was an independent, global provider of outsourced communications and security systems engineering and integration services for the wireless communications industry through its Wireless Network Services division ("WNS"), the U.S. government through its Government Network Services division ("GNS"), and enterprise customers through its Enterprise Network Services division ("ENS").

In 2006 and 2007, the Company undertook a transformation strategy that culminated in the divestiture in 2007 of its wireless-related businesses and the Company has aggressively pursued business with the federal government, primarily the U.S. Department of Defense, through strategic acquisition. See Note 7, Acquisitions. The Company's divestiture of its European wireless engineering services business was completed in March 2007. In addition, the Company's divestiture of its domestic wireless engineering services business was completed in June 2007 and the divestiture of its wireless deployment services business was completed in July 2007. Accordingly, the accompanying financial statements reflect the divestiture of the domestic wireless engineering services and wireless network deployment business and the results of their operations through the date of divestiture as discontinued operations in the accompanying statements of operations.

As a result of the divestiture of the Company's wireless related assets and businesses in 2007, the Company changed its name from Wireless Facilities, Inc. to Kratos Defense & Security Solutions, Inc. on September 12, 2007. The name was changed to reflect the Company's revised focus as a defense contractor and security systems integrator for the federal government and for state and local agencies and reflects the Company's business going forward. Additionally, the former operating segments have been renamed as the Kratos Government Solutions ("KGS") segment, which includes all former government-related business formerly included in the GNS segment, and the Public Safety & Security ("PSS") segment, which includes all enterprise, commercial and other civilian business formerly included in the ENS segment. All financial statements prior to September 12, 2007 were issued under the Company's previous name, Wireless Facilities, Inc.

(b) Basis of Presentation

The information as of June 29, 2008, and for the three and six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 is unaudited. The consolidated balance sheet as of December 31, 2007 was derived from the Company's audited consolidated financial statements at that date. In the opinion of management, these unaudited consolidated financial statements include all adjustments, consisting of normal recurring adjustments, necessary for a fair presentation of the Company's financial position, results of operations and cash flows for the interim periods presented. The results have been prepared in accordance with the instructions to Form 10-Q and do not necessarily include all information and footnotes necessary for presentation in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. These unaudited consolidated financial statements should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and the related notes included in the Company's

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 1. Organization and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

audited annual consolidated financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2007, filed on Form 10-K on March 27, 2008 with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"). Interim operating results are not necessarily indicative of operating results expected in subsequent periods or for the year as a whole.

(c) Principles of Consolidation

The consolidated financial statements include the accounts of Kratos and its wholly-owned subsidiaries for which all inter-company transactions have been eliminated in consolidation. Kratos and its subsidiaries are collectively referred to herein as the "Company."

Investments in unconsolidated affiliates are accounted for using the cost method as the Company owns less than 20% and the Company has no significant influence over the affiliates.

(d) Fiscal Calendar

In 2008, the Company changed its fiscal year end to the last Sunday of the year with interim fiscal periods ending on the last Sunday of the last calendar month of each quarter. For fiscal year 2007, the Company's year end was December 31 with fiscal periods ending on the last calendar day of the last month of each quarter.

(e) Revenue Recognition

The Company provides services to customers under three primary types of contracts: fixed-price; time and materials; and cost reimbursable plus fixed fee. The Company realizes a portion of its revenue from long-term contracts and accounts for these contracts under the provisions of Statement of Position (SOP) 81-1, "Accounting for Performance of Construction-Type and Certain Production-Type Contracts." Revenue on fixed-price contracts is recognized using the percentage-of-completion method of accounting based on the ratio of total costs incurred to date compared to estimated total costs to complete the contract. Estimates of costs to complete include materials, direct labor, overhead, and allowable general and administrative expenses (for government contracts). While the Company generally does not incur a material amount of set-up fees for its projects, such costs, if any, are excluded from the estimated total costs to complete the contract and are expensed as incurred. Cost estimates are reviewed monthly on an individual contract basis, and are revised periodically throughout the life of the contract such that adjustments to profit resulting from revisions are made cumulative to the date of the revision. The full amount of an estimated loss associated with a contract is accrued and charged to operations in the period it is determined that it is probable a loss will be realized from the performance of the contract.

Significant management judgments and estimates, including the estimated costs to complete projects, which determine the project's percentage of completion and profit margin must be made and used in connection with the revenue recognized in any accounting period. In the future, the Company may realize actual results that differ from current estimates and the differences could be material.

Accordingly, the revenue the Company recognizes in a given financial reporting period depends on (1) the costs the Company has incurred for individual projects, (2) the Company's then current estimate of the total remaining costs to complete the individual projects and (3) current estimated contract value associated with the projects. If, in any period, the Company significantly increase or

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 1. Organization and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

decrease the estimate of the total costs to complete a project, and/or reduce or increase the associated contract value, revenue for that period would be impacted. To the extent that the Company's estimates fluctuate over time or differ from actual results, gross margins in subsequent periods may vary significantly from previous estimates. Material differences may result in the amount and timing of the Company's revenue for any period if management made different judgments or utilized different estimates. In the event the Company is unable to provide reliable cost estimates on a given project, the Company records revenue using the completed contract method. There are no contracts for which the Company utilized the completed contract method for the periods ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008.

Under the terms of substantially all of the Company's fixed price contracts, if a contract is terminated without proper cause by the customer, the customer creates unplanned/unreasonable time delays, or the customer modifies the contract tasks/scope, the Company has contractual rights to reimbursement in accordance with the terms and conditions regarding payment for work performed, but not yet billed (i.e., unbilled trade accounts receivable) at a gross profit margin that is consistent with the overall project margin. Furthermore, certain additional provisions compensate the Company for additional or excess costs incurred, whereby any scope reductions or other modifications are subject to reimbursement of costs incurred to date with a reasonable profit margin based on the contract value and completed work at that time. The inherent aforementioned risks are reflected in the Company's ongoing periodic assessment of the "total contract value" and the associated revenue recognized. Total net unbilled accounts receivable at December 31, 2007 and June 29, 2008 were \$34.2 million and \$44.4 million, respectively. The Company periodically performs work under authorizations to proceed or work orders from its customers for which a formal purchase order may not be received until after the work has commenced. As of December 31, 2007 and June 29, 2008, approximately \$0.4 million and \$0.2 million, respectively, of the Company's unbilled accounts receivable balance were under an authorization to proceed or work order from its customers where a formal purchase order had not yet been received.

Revenue from certain time and materials and fixed-price contracts are recognized when realized or realizable and earned, in accordance with Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) 104 (recognized when services are rendered at contracted labor rates, when materials are delivered and when other direct costs are incurred). Additionally, based on management's periodic assessment of the collectibility of its accounts receivable, credit worthiness and financial condition of customers, the Company determines if collection is reasonably assured prior to the recognition of revenue.

Cost reimbursable contracts for the government provide for reimbursement of costs plus the payment of a fee. The Company records the fee as costs are incurred. Under time and materials contracts, the Company is reimbursed for labor hours at negotiated hourly billing rates and is reimbursed for travel and other direct expenses at actual costs plus applied general and administrative expenses. Under certain of the Company's contractual arrangements, the Company may also recognize revenue for out-of-pocket expenses in accordance with EITF 01-14 "Income Statement Characterization of Reimbursements Received for Out-of-Pocket Expenses Incurred." Depending on the contractual arrangement, these expenses may be reimbursed with or without a fee.

Under certain of its contracts, the Company provides supplier procurement services and materials for its customers. The Company records revenue on these arrangements on a gross or net basis in

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 1. Organization and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

accordance with EITF 99-19, "Reporting Revenue Gross as a Principal versus Net as an Agent," depending on the specific circumstances of the arrangement. The Company considers the following criteria, among others, for recording revenue on a gross or net basis:

- (1) whether the Company acts as a principal in the transaction;
- (2) whether the Company takes title to the products;
- (3) whether the Company assumes risks and rewards of ownership, such as risk of loss for collection, delivery or returns;
- (4) whether the Company serves as an agent or broker, with compensation on a commission or fee basis.

(f) Inventory

Inventories that are comprised primarily of supplies including parts and materials are stated at the lower of cost or market. The Company regularly reviews inventory quantities on hand, future purchase commitments with its suppliers, and the estimated utility of its inventory. If the Company review indicates a reduction in utility below carrying value, it reduces its inventory to a new cost basis. As of December 31, 2007 and June 29, 2008, the Company had \$2.1 million and \$2.7 million, respectively, of inventories which were reflected in other current assets on the Consolidated Balance Sheets.

(g) Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles in the United States (US GAAP) requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, the disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Such estimates include revenue recognition, allowance for doubtful accounts, valuation of long-lived assets including identifiable intangibles and goodwill, accounting for income taxes including the related valuation allowance on the deferred tax asset, accruals for partial self-insurance, contingencies and litigation and contingent acquisition consideration. In the future, the Company may realize actual results that differ from the current reported estimates and if the estimates that we have used change in the future, such changes could have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial position, results of operations and cash flows.

(h) Reclassifications

Certain prior period amounts in the Consolidated Financial Statements have been reclassified to be consistent with the current period presentation.

(i) Liquidity

The Company currently carries a significant amount of debt and as such, its ability to execute on additional business opportunities may be limited due to its existing borrowing capacity. In addition, given the relatively highly leveraged liquidity position, any down-turn in its operating earnings could impair its ability to comply with the financial covenants of its existing credit facility. If the Company anticipated a potential covenant violation, it would seek relief from its lenders. This relief would have

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 1. Organization and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

some cost to the Company and such relief might not be on terms as favorable as those in its existing Credit Agreement. If the Company were to actually default due to its failure to meet the financial covenants of its Credit Agreement and inability to obtain a waiver from the lenders, the Company's Credit Agreement could require the Company to immediately repay all amounts then outstanding under the Credit Agreement and/or require the Company to pay interest at default rates per the Credit Agreement.

In the event the Company was required to repay the amount outstanding under the existing credit facility, it would need to obtain alternative sources of financing to continue its operating activities at existing levels. There can be no assurance that alternative financing would be available on acceptable terms or at all.

Note 2. Recent Accounting Pronouncements

In September 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 157, "Fair Value Measurements," (SFAS 157) which is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007 and for interim periods within those years. This statement defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value and expands the related disclosure requirements. This statement applies under other accounting pronouncements that require or permit fair value measurements. The statement indicates, among other things, that a fair value measurement assumes that the transaction to sell an asset or transfer a liability occurs in the principal market for the asset or liability or, in the absence of a principal market, the most advantageous market for the asset or liability. SFAS 157 defines fair value based upon an exit price model. Relative to SFAS 157, the FASB issued FASB Staff Positions (FSP) 157-1, 157-2, and proposed 157-c. FSP 157-1 amends SFAS 157 to exclude SFAS 13 and its related interpretive accounting pronouncements that address leasing transactions, while FSP 157-2 delays the effective date of SFAS 157 for all nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities, except those that are recognized or disclosed at fair value in the financial statements on a recurring basis. FSP 157-c clarifies the principles in SFAS 157 on the fair value measurement of liabilities. The Company adopted SFAS 157 as of January 1, 2008, with the exception of the application of the statement to non-recurring nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities. Refer to Note 9 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements for additional discussion on fair value measurements.

In February 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 159, "The Fair Value Option for Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities Including an amendment of FASB Statement No. 115," (SFAS 159) which is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007. This statement permits entities to choose to measure many financial instruments and certain other items at fair value. This statement also establishes presentation and disclosure requirements designed to facilitate comparisons between entities that choose different measurement attributes for similar types of assets and liabilities. Unrealized gains and losses on items for which the fair value option is elected would be reported in earnings. The Company has adopted SFAS 159 as of January 1, 2008 and has elected not to measure any additional financial instruments or other items at fair value.

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 141 (revised 2007), "Business Combinations" (SFAS 141(R)), which replaces SFAS No. 141, "Business Combinations." SFAS 141(R) retains the underlying concepts of SFAS 141 in that all business combinations are still required to be accounted for at fair value under the acquisition method of accounting, but SFAS 141(R) changed the method of

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 2. Recent Accounting Pronouncements (Continued)

applying the acquisition method in a number of significant aspects. Acquisition costs will generally be expensed as incurred; noncontrolling interests will be valued at fair value at the acquisition date; in-process research and development will be recorded at fair value as an indefinite-lived intangible asset at the acquisition date; restructuring costs associated with a business combination will generally be expensed subsequent to the acquisition date; and any adjustments to an entity's deferred tax assets and uncertain tax positions that occur after the measurement period will be recorded as a component of income tax expense. SFAS 141(R) is effective on a prospective basis for all business combinations for which the acquisition date is on or after the beginning of the first annual period subsequent to December 15, 2008. Additionally, SFAS 141 (R) is effective for changes to valuation allowances or acquired uncertain tax positions occurring after the effective date of SFAS 141 (R), where the acquisition date occurs prior to the effective date for SFAS 141(R). Early adoption is not permitted. The Company is currently evaluating the effects, if any, that SFAS 141(R) may have on its financial statements; however, since the Company has significant acquired deferred tax assets for which full valuation allowances were recorded at the acquisition date, SFAS 141(R) could significantly affect the results of operations if changes in the valuation allowances occur subsequent to adoption. For additional discussion on deferred tax valuation allowances, refer to Note 10 to the Consolidated Financial Statements in our Annual Report filed on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2007.

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 160, "Noncontrolling Interests in Consolidated Financial Statements - an amendment of ARB No. 51." This statement is effective for fiscal years, and interim periods within those fiscal years, beginning on or after December 15, 2008, with earlier adoption prohibited. This statement requires the recognition of a noncontrolling interest (minority interest) as equity in the consolidated financial statements and separate from the parent's equity. The amount of net income attributable to the noncontrolling interest will be included in consolidated net income on the face of the income statement. It also amends certain of ARB No. 51's consolidation procedures for consistency with the requirements of SFAS 141(R). This statement also includes expanded disclosure requirements regarding the interests of the parent and its noncontrolling interest. The Company is currently evaluating this new statement and anticipates that the statement will not have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In December 2007, the EITF issued Issue No. 07-1, "Accounting for Collaborative Arrangements." This Issue is effective for financial statements issued for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008 and interim periods within those fiscal years, and shall be applied retrospectively to all prior periods presented for all collaborative arrangements existing as of the effective date. This Issue requires that transactions with third parties (i.e., revenue generated and costs incurred by the partners) should be reported in the appropriate line item in each company's financial statement pursuant to the guidance in EITF Issue No. 99-19, "Reporting Revenue Gross as a Principal versus Net as an Agent." This Issue also includes enhanced disclosure requirements regarding the nature and purpose of the arrangement, rights and obligations under the arrangement, accounting policy, amount and income statement classification of collaboration transactions between the parties. The Company is currently evaluating this new statement and anticipates that the statement will not have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In March 2008, the FASB issued SFAS No. 161, "Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities, an amendment of FASB Statement No. 133" (SFAS 161). This statement is

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 2. Recent Accounting Pronouncements (Continued)

intended to improve transparency in financial reporting by requiring enhanced disclosures of an entity's derivative instruments and hedging activities and their effects on the entity's financial position, financial performance, and cash flows. SFAS 161 applies to all derivative instruments within the scope of SFAS 133, "Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities" (SFAS 133) as well as related hedged items, bifurcated derivatives, and nonderivative instruments that are designated and qualify as hedging instruments. Entities with instruments subject to SFAS 161 must provide more robust qualitative disclosures and expanded quantitative disclosures. SFAS 161 is effective prospectively for financial statements issued for fiscal years and interim periods beginning after November 15, 2008, with early application permitted. The Company is currently evaluating the disclosure implications of this statement and anticipates that the statement will not have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In April 2008, the FASB issued FSP FAS No. 142-3, which amends the factors that must be considered in developing renewal or extension assumptions used to determine the useful life over which to amortize the cost of a recognized intangible asset under FAS No. 142, "Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets." The FSP requires an entity to consider its own assumptions about renewal or extension of the term of the arrangement, consistent with its expected use of the asset, and is an attempt to improve consistency between the useful life of a recognized intangible asset under FAS No. 142 and the period of expected cash flows used to measure the fair value of the asset under FAS No. 141, "Business Combinations." The FSP is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and the guidance for determining the useful life of a recognized intangible asset must be applied prospectively to intangible assets acquired after the effective date. The FSP is not expected to have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In May 2008, the FASB issued Financial Accounting Standard (FAS) No. 162, "The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles." The statement is intended to improve financial reporting by identifying a consistent hierarchy for selecting accounting principles to be used in preparing financial statements that are prepared in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles. Unlike Statement on Auditing Standards (SAS) No. 69, "The Meaning of Present in Conformity With GAAP," FAS No. 162 is directed to the entity rather than the auditor. The statement is effective 60 days following the SEC's approval of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) amendments to AU Section 411, "The Meaning of Present Fairly in Conformity with GAAP," and is not expected to have any impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In June 2008, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued FASB Staff Position (FSP) Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF) No. 03-6-1, "Determining Whether Instruments Granted in Share-Based Payment Transactions Are Participating Securities." Under the FSP, unvested share-based payment awards that contain rights to receive nonforfeitable dividends (whether paid or unpaid) are participating securities, and should be included in the two-class method of computing EPS. The FSP is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and interim periods within those years, and is not expected to have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 3. Stockholders' Equity

The Company had the following three stock option plans under which shares were available for grant at June 29, 2008: the 1999 Equity Incentive Plan (the "1999 Plan"), the 2000 Non-Statutory Stock Option Plan (the "2000 Plan") and the 2005 Equity Incentive Plan (the "2005 Plan"). In addition, the Company has a Restricted Stock Unit Agreement (the "RSU Agreement") to govern the issuance of restricted stock units ("RSU") to executive officers under the Company's 2005 Equity Incentive Plan (the "Plan").

The following table summarizes the Company's Restricted Stock Unit activity:

(Shares in Thousands)	Restricted Stock Units	Weighted-Average Grant-Date Fair Value
Nonvested balance, December 31, 2007	2,156	\$ 2.28
Grants	760	2.05
Payments		
Cancellations/Forfeitures		
Nonvested balance, June 29, 2008	2,916	\$ 2.22

The following table shows the amounts recognized in the financial statements for the three and six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 for share-based compensation expense related to employees (in millions, except per share data). The share-based compensation expense for the three and six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 primarily relates to the grant of restricted stock units. In addition, for the three and six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, there was no incremental tax benefit from stock options exercised in the period.

	For the Three Months Ended		For the Six Months Ended	
	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008
Cost of revenues	\$	\$	\$	\$
Selling, general and administrative	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
Total cost of employee share-based compensation included in income (loss) from continuing operations, before income tax	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
Amount of income tax recognized in earnings				
Amount charged against income from continuing operations	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
Amount charged against income (loss) from discontinued operations	0.4		0.4	
Total charged against income	\$ 0.5	\$ 0.2	\$ 0.7	\$ 0.4
Total impact on net income (loss) per common share:				
Basic	\$(0.01)	\$	\$(0.01)	\$
Diluted	\$(0.01)	\$	\$(0.01)	\$

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 3. Stockholders' Equity (Continued)

A summary of the changes in Stockholders' Equity for the periods ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 is provided below (in millions):

	Six Months Ended June 30, 2007	Six Months Ended June 29, 2008
Stockholders' equity, beginning of period	\$ 187.1	\$ 167.2
Stock based compensation and Employee Stock Purchase Plan	0.7	0.4
Working capital adjustment for Haverstick acquisition		1.3
Cumulative effect adjustment upon adoption of FIN No. 48	(0.1)	
Additional paid-in-capital for acquisition		51.8
Net loss	(15.9)	(1.1)
Stockholders' equity, end of period	\$ 171.8	\$ 219.6

The Company has two classes of stock, Series B Convertible Preferred Stock and Common Stock. There was no issuance, redemption or conversion of the Series B Convertible Preferred Stock in the most recent fiscal year ended December 31, 2007 or for the period ended June 29, 2008. Common stock issued by the Company for the most recent fiscal year ended December 31, 2007 and through the period ended June 29, 2008 was as follows: (in millions)

	Year ended December 31, 2007	Six Months Ended June 29, 2008
Shares outstanding at the beginning of the period	73.9	79.0
Common stock issued for acquisitions	4.6	26.0
Stock based compensation	0.4	
Stock options exercised	0.1	
Shares outstanding at the end of the period	79.0	105.0

The Company has an Employee Stock Purchase Plan (ESPP) which was approved in 1999 and subsequently suspended effective January 1, 2006. The Company reactivated the ESPP on April 1, 2008.

Note 4. Net Income (Loss) Per Common Share

The Company calculates net income (loss) per share in accordance with SFAS No. 128, "Earnings Per Share". Under SFAS No. 128, basic net income (loss) per common share is calculated by dividing net income (loss) by the weighted-average number of common shares outstanding during the reporting

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 4. Net Income (Loss) Per Common Share (Continued)

period. Diluted net income (loss) per common share reflects the effects of potentially dilutive securities (in millions).

	For the Three Months Ended June 30		For the Six Months Ended June 29	
	2007	2008	2007	2008
Anti-dilutive weighted shares from stock options excluded from calculation	10.0	8.9	10.4	8.9
Anti-dilutive weighted shares from preferred stock excluded from calculation	1.0		1.0	1.0
Anti-dilutive weighted shares of common stock contingently issuable				2.9

Note 5. Income Taxes

The Company adopted the provisions of Financial Accounting Standards Board Interpretations (FIN) 48 on January 1, 2007. The total liability for unrecognized tax benefits as of the date of adoption was \$4.7 million. Additionally, the Company has a tax refund claim of \$2.4 million for which it has not recorded any benefit under FIN 48 or prior standards. As a result of the implementation of FIN 48, the Company recognized a \$0.7 million increase in the liability for unrecognized tax benefits, with \$0.2 million net decrease in valuation allowance, \$0.1 million charged to retained earnings, and \$0.4 million recorded to goodwill. In addition, the Company reduced its gross deferred tax assets by \$10.8 million for unrecognized tax benefits, which was offset by a reduction in its valuation allowance by the same amount.

As of December 31, 2007, the Company had \$15.2 million of unrecognized tax benefits. During the first quarter of 2008, this amount was reduced by \$1.2 million relating to the expiration of statutes of limitations resulting in unrecognized tax benefits at March 31, 2008 of \$14.0 million. The reduction in unrecognized tax benefits was recorded as a tax benefit from discontinued operations for \$1.1 million and a reduction to goodwill for \$0.1 million. As of June 29, 2008, the Company had \$14.1 million of unrecognized tax benefits. The Company recognizes interest and penalties related to unrecognized tax benefits in its provision for income taxes. There were no material amounts recorded during the period ended June 30, 2007 and \$0.1 million during the period ended June 29, 2008.

The Company believes that it is reasonably possible that as much as \$3.1 million of the FIN 48 tax liabilities will expire within 12 months of June 29, 2008 due to the expiration of various applicable statutes of limitations and possible settlement of a pending income tax refund claim.

The negative tax rate of 450% for the six month period ended June 29, 2008 is a function of the relationship between certain minimum taxes that the Company is subject to regardless of its income.

The Company is subject to taxation in the U.S. and various state tax jurisdictions. The Company's tax years for 2000 and forward are subject to examination by the U.S. and state tax authorities due to the existence of net operating loss carryforwards. Generally, the Company's tax years for 2002 and forward are subject to examination by various foreign tax authorities.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 5. Income Taxes (Continued)

In assessing the realizability of deferred tax assets, management considers on a periodic basis, whether it is more likely than not that some portion or all of the deferred tax assets will not be realized. As such, management has determined that it is appropriate to maintain a full valuation allowance against its deferred tax assets, with the exception of an amount equal to its deferred tax liabilities which can be expected to reverse. Management will continue to evaluate the necessity to maintain a valuation allowance against its net deferred tax asset.

Note 6. Significant Transactions

On December 28, 2006, the Board of Directors of the Company approved a plan to divest portions of the Company's business where critical mass had not been achieved. This plan involved the divestiture of the Company's EMEA (Europe, Middle East and Asia) operations and its remaining South American operations. The Company determined that these operations met the criteria to be classified as held for sale. Accordingly, these operations were reflected as discontinued in accordance with SFAS No. 144, "Accounting for the Impairment or Disposal of Long-Lived Assets" in the accompanying consolidated financial statements.

The EMEA operations were sold to LCC International, Inc. (LCC) on March 9, 2007 for \$4.0 million in cash, \$3.3 million of which was received on that date. The Company also received approximately \$1.8 million from its EMEA operations, prior and subsequent to the closing date as payment on outstanding intercompany debt. The sale of EMEA generated a gain on disposition of \$3.3 million. The balance of the \$0.7 million sales price was withheld as security for the satisfaction of certain indemnification obligations and was payable on March 31, 2008. In the fourth quarter of 2007, the Company recorded a reserve of \$0.7 million on the remaining sales price holdback based on the Company's assessment of LCC's available liquidity and ability to pay following the Company's review of LCC's most recently filed financial statements, thereby reducing the net estimated gain on this transaction to \$2.6 million. In May 2008, the Company and LCC reached an agreement related to the \$0.7 million holdback amount, under which LCC has agreed to pay the Company the outstanding balance in \$100,000 increments each month commencing June 30, 2008. The Company did not receive the payments due on June 30, 2008 or July 31, 2008. While the Company intends to vigorously pursue collection of the amounts, there is a substantial likelihood the Company will not receive payment of the amount due in light of LCC's apparent current available liquidity.

On April 20, 2007, the Company entered into an Equity Purchase Agreement to sell all of the issued and outstanding equity of its interests of its wholly owned subsidiary WFI Brazil Techlogia en Telecomunicaciones LTDA, to Strategic Project Services, LLC (SPS). The consideration included the assumption of substantially all outstanding liabilities of WFI Brazil, nominal cash consideration, and additional earn-out consideration based on 25 percent of net receivables collected subsequent to the closing date. With respect to the additional earn-out consideration, the Company has not received and does not expect to receive any payments. The Company recorded an impairment charge of approximately \$5.2 million as of December 31, 2006 to reduce the current carrying value of the Brazil operations to their estimated fair value based upon indications of interest at that time. In the second quarter of 2007, when this business was sold, a gain on disposition of \$0.2 million was recorded primarily due to lower than expected selling costs.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 6. Significant Transactions (Continued)

On May 29, 2007, the Company entered into an Asset Purchase Agreement with LCC pursuant to which the Company agreed to sell to LCC all of the assets used in the conduct of the operation of the Company's Wireless Network Services business segment that provides engineering services to the non-government wireless communications industry in the United States.

The transaction was completed on June 4, 2007. The aggregate consideration paid by LCC in connection with the Acquisition was \$46 million. LCC delivered a subordinated promissory note for the principal amount of \$21.6 million (the "*Subordinated Promissory Note*"), paid \$17 million at closing and paid final working capital adjustments of \$2.4 million through an amendment to the Subordinated Promissory Note, and the Company retained an estimated \$5.0 million in net working capital of the business.

On July 5, 2007, the Company sold the \$21.6 million subordinated promissory note taken in the sale of assets to LCC in exchange for approximately \$19.6 million in net cash proceeds, reflecting a discount from par value of less than five percent and aggregate transaction fees of approximately \$1 million. The note was acquired by a fund affiliated with Silver Point Capital, L.P. The Company collected \$2.3 million in January 2008, net of a \$0.1 million discount from Silver Point in accordance with the terms of the note agreement for the working capital portion of the note. The Company did not provide any guaranty for LCC's payment obligations for the note.

On July 24, 2007, the Company completed the sale to an affiliate of Platinum Equity of its wireless deployment services portion of the Wireless Network Services segment and the Wireless Facilities trade and corporate names. The total consideration for the acquisition was \$24 million including \$18 million in cash at closing, subject to typical post-closing working capital adjustments, and an aggregate \$6 million in a three-year earn-out arrangement. The Company provided certain transition services to Platinum Equity for a period of nine months pursuant to a Transition Services Agreement. Under an employee leasing arrangement with Platinum Equity, the Company serviced the payroll for the deployment business employees until October 1, 2007. On September 25, 2007, in accordance with the acquisition agreement, the Company provided its working capital calculation to Platinum Equity. On July 16, 2008, the Company came to an agreement with Platinum Equity on a working capital adjustment of \$5.0 million. In connection with that resolution, the earn-out arrangement was terminated. The adjustment is to be paid in installments with the first amount of \$2.5 million due on July 31, 2008 and payments of \$0.5 million monthly thereafter until paid in full in December 2008. As of June 29, 2008, the balance of \$5.0 million has been reflected in other current liabilities. As of August 6, 2008, the \$2.5 million initial payment had not been made.

The Company determined that the U.S. engineering and U.S. deployment operations met the criteria to be classified as held for sale in the first quarter of 2007. Accordingly, the Company has reflected these operations as discontinued and assessed these assets for impairment in accordance with SFAS No. 144, "Accounting for the Impairment or Disposal of Long-Lived Assets". The Company determined that the assets of the U.S. deployment operations were impaired and recorded an impairment charge of approximately \$13.4 million. The fair value of the assets was determined by utilizing the sale price less estimated costs to sell the business. The Company subsequently recorded a gain in discontinued operations from the sale of the U.S. engineering operations of \$14.8 million. Upon the divestiture of the deployment business, the Company recorded a loss from disposal of \$1.9 million, reflecting the closing working capital adjustment and final closing balance sheet. In addition, the

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 6. Significant Transactions (Continued)

Company recorded a charge for an excess facility accrual of approximately \$1.1 million related to certain facility leases of deployment field offices that were not assumed by Platinum.

The determination that the U.S. engineering business and U.S. deployment operations met the criteria to be classified as held for sale in the first quarter of 2007 was also a triggering event under SFAS 142 Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets ("SFAS 142") that resulted in an accelerated review of the Company's goodwill and intangibles assets with indefinite lives. In accordance with SFAS 142, the Company allocated the goodwill for the WNS reporting unit based upon the fair value of the engineering business and the deployment business. The fair values used were based upon market information obtained as a result of the sale of the businesses. This resulted in an impairment charge of approximately \$7.2 million related to goodwill for this reporting unit which was recorded in the first quarter of 2007.

In addition, in accordance with EITF 87-24, *Allocation of Interest to Discontinued Operations* ("EITF 87-24"), interest expense incurred on the debt that was required to be repaid as a result of the sales of our wireless network services business was allocated to discontinued operations for the periods presented. During the quarter ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, interest expense allocated to discontinued operations was approximately \$1.0 million and zero, respectively. For the six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, interest expense allocated to discontinued operations was approximately \$2.1 million and zero, respectively. For the six months ended June 29, 2008, the primary activity related to discontinued operations was a reduction in tax contingencies net of a charge for impairment of assets and the adjustment related to the agreement of the working capital with Platinum Equity. The following table presents the results of discontinued operations (in millions):

	For the Three Months Ended		For the Six Months Ended June 30	
	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008
Revenue	\$ 32.6	\$	\$ 79.6	\$
Net income (loss) before taxes	\$ 12.6	\$ (0.4)	\$ (5.6)	\$ (0.9)
Provision (benefit) for income taxes		0.2	(1.1)	(0.9)
Net income (loss) after taxes	\$ 12.6	\$ (0.6)	\$ (4.5)	\$

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 6. Significant Transactions (Continued)

The following is a summary of the assets and liabilities of discontinued operations as of December 31, 2007 and June 29, 2008 (in millions):

	December 31, 2007	June 29, 2008
Cash	\$ 0.3	\$ 0.2
Accounts receivable, net	0.8	
Other current assets	0.5	0.5
Current assets of discontinued operations	\$ 1.6	\$ 0.7
Other non-current assets	\$ 0.1	\$ 0.3
Non-current assets of discontinued operations	\$ 0.1	\$ 0.3
Accounts payable	\$	\$ 0.1
Accrued expenses	3.7	3.2
Income tax contingencies	1.2	0.6
Other current liabilities	0.4	0.4
Current liabilities of discontinued operations	\$ 5.3	\$ 4.3
Non-current income tax contingencies	\$ 2.0	\$ 1.9
Other non-current liabilities	0.7	0.6
Non-current liabilities of discontinued operations	\$ 2.7	\$ 2.5

Note 7. Acquisitions

The following tables summarize the changes in the carrying amounts of goodwill and other finite-life intangible assets for the six months ended June 29, 2008 (in millions):

	Government Network Services
Goodwill	
Balance as of December 31, 2007	\$ 194.5
Acquisition of SYS	41.0
Purchase accounting adjustments	2.5
Balance as of June 29, 2008	\$ 238.0

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 7. Acquisitions (Continued)

	December 31, 2007			June 29, 2008		
	Gross Value	Accumulated Amortization	Net Value	Gross Value	Accumulated Amortization	Net Value
Intangible Assets						
Acquired finite-lived intangible assets						
Customer relationships	\$ 15.0	\$ (2.6)	\$ 12.4	\$ 17.4	\$ (3.4)	\$ 14.0
Contracts and backlog	11.6	(4.2)	7.4	12.2	(5.6)	6.6
Non-compete agreements	1.3	(1.2)	0.1	1.5	(1.3)	0.2
Intellectual property	0.4	(0.4)		4.6	(0.4)	4.2
Total	\$ 28.3	\$ (8.4)	\$ 19.9	\$ 35.7	\$ (10.7)	\$ 25.0

Consolidated amortization expense related to intangible assets subject to amortization was \$0.7 million and \$1.1 million for the quarters ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively. Consolidated amortization expense related to intangible assets subject to amortization was \$1.4 million and \$2.3 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively.

On June 28, 2008, the Company acquired San Diego-based SYS Technologies ("SYS"). SYS provides a range of Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Combat Systems, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C5ISR) and net-centric solutions to federal, state, local and other customers. The combination of SYS and Kratos creates a broad, complementary set of offerings, and positions the organization to deliver proven capabilities to a wider spectrum of customers in the areas of highly-specialized engineering and IT solutions and services, specifically in the areas of weapon systems life cycle support and extension, military range operations, missile and weapon system testing, and C5ISR. The amount of goodwill assigned in the following preliminary allocation of purchase price is primarily attributable to the aforementioned advantages of this acquisition. Further, goodwill assigned to this transaction has not yet been allocated to the Company's reportable segments.

The purchase price of \$55.2 million includes direct transaction costs of \$2.3 million and restructuring costs to be paid by Kratos. The value of the purchase price related to the common stock issued was derived from the number of shares of Kratos common stock issued of 25.3 million, based on 20.1 million shares of SYS common stock outstanding and the exchange ratio of 1.2582 for each SYS share, at a price of \$2.022 per share, the average closing price of Kratos shares of common stock for the two days prior to, including, and two days subsequent to the public announcement of the merger on February 21, 2008. After the signing the definitive merger agreement in February 2008, senior management of Kratos and SYS have been developing a plan to restructure and/or exit certain business activities of SYS. The plan includes a comprehensive assessment of personnel, relocation of personnel, facility consolidation and exit strategies for certain lines of business. As of June 29, 2008, the plan tentatively estimates approximately \$1.3 million of restructuring costs associated with personnel, and additional costs of \$0.4 million for facilities consolidation. Personnel, facilities consolidation and exit costs are still being developed, therefore, the estimated restructuring liabilities are subject to change as plans become finalized. The Company expects to finalize the restructuring plan as soon as possible, but no later than June 28, 2009.

The Consolidated Statement of Operations for the three and six month periods ended June 29, 2008 does not include the results of operations for SYS.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 7. Acquisitions (Continued)

The following summarizes the preliminary allocation of the purchase price, including transaction costs of \$2.3 million, to the fair value of the assets acquired and liabilities assumed at the date of acquisition (in millions):

Accounts receivable, net	\$ 14.0
Total current assets, net of accounts receivable	6.0
Property, plant, and equipment	1.6
Intangible assets	7.4
Goodwill	41.0
Other assets	0.2
Total assets	70.2
Current liabilities	(13.7)
Other liabilities	(1.3)
Net assets acquired	\$ 55.2

The goodwill recorded in this transaction is not tax deductible

The Company is currently reviewing the preliminary fair value of assets acquired and liabilities assumed, including valuations associated with identified intangible assets, as well as restructuring costs. Adjustments to the purchase price allocation are expected, and there can be no assurance that such adjustments will not be material. The Company expects to finalize the purchase price allocation by December 2008, or if later, by June 28, 2009.

On December 31, 2007, the Company acquired Indianapolis Indiana headquartered Haverstick Consulting, Inc. (Haverstick) as part of the Kratos Government Solutions segment. Haverstick provides rocket and missile test and evaluation, weapons systems support, and professional services to the U.S. Army, U.S. Air Force, U.S. Navy, NASA, and other federal, state and local agencies. Through the Haverstick acquisition, the Company expanded its customer footprint within the Department of Defense (DoD), and enhanced its presence with the U.S. Air Force, a key growth area for Kratos. The aforementioned factors are the primary reason for the purchase price of Haverstick and the amount subsequently assigned to goodwill.

The total purchase price was \$90.2 million including transaction costs incurred by the Company of \$0.5 million. The purchase price paid to Haverstick was \$89.7 million comprised of \$70.3 million in cash and the issuance of 7.48 million shares of the Company's common stock valued at \$2.60 per share or an aggregate stock consideration of \$19.4 million. The value of the shares issued was determined by averaging the market price of the stock two days before and two days after the announcement of the acquisition, November 5, 2007. The Company paid \$81.1 million, \$66.7 million of which was cash paid at closing, \$2.4 million was paid shortly thereafter, and \$12.0 million in common stock. The Company held back \$8.6 million (the Holdback Consideration) to secure any negative working capital adjustments required by the merger agreement and the Company's indemnity rights. The Holdback Consideration is comprised of both cash and Kratos stock in the amounts of \$1.2 million and \$7.4 million, respectively, and accrues interest at a rate of LIBOR plus 4% until paid. The Holdback Consideration will be released in 50% increments on the 12th month and 21st month of the anniversary date of the acquisition. In addition to the indemnity holdback, the agreement also calls for a post closing working

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 7. Acquisitions (Continued)

capital adjustment. To fund the acquisition, the Company secured a new credit facility of \$85.0 million arranged by KeyBanc Capital Markets. The credit facility, which includes a \$25.0 million line of credit and \$60.0 million in term notes, replaced the Company's previous credit facility which had an outstanding principal balance of \$6.0 million on the date of closing.

In February 2008, the Company and Haverstick agreed on the working capital calculation called for in the agreement. The calculation resulted in a working capital adjustment due to Haverstick in an amount of \$1.5 million. The working capital adjustment was paid with 697,315 shares of Company stock on June 30, 2008, valued at \$1.3 million and cash of \$0.2 million in April 2008.

Until the date on which the shares of stock became salable, interest accrued on the value of the closing stock at a floating rate of one-month LIBOR plus four percent (4%) per annum. The shares became saleable on June 30, 2008 and 167,692 additional shares were issued in satisfaction of the accrued interest.

The following table summarizes supplemental statement of operations information on an unaudited pro forma basis as if the acquisitions of Haverstick and SYS had occurred on January 1, 2007 and includes adjustments that were directly attributable to the transactions or were not expected to have a continuing impact on the Company, with the exception of approximately \$3.0 million of acquisition costs of SYS included in the supplemental statement of operations for the three months ended June 29, 2008. The pro forma results are for illustrative purposes only for the applicable period and do not purport to be indicative of the actual results which would have occurred had the transaction been completed as of the beginning of the period, nor are they indicative of results of operations which may occur in the future (all unaudited amounts, all, except per share amounts are in millions):

	For the Three Months Ended		For the Six Months Ended	
	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008
Pro forma revenues	\$ 94.2	\$ 90.1	\$ 186.4	\$ 177.0
Pro forma net income (loss)	\$ 3.6	\$ (2.1)	\$ (17.5)	\$ (4.0)
Basic pro forma net loss per share	\$ 0.03	\$ (0.02)	\$ (0.17)	\$ (0.04)
Diluted pro forma net loss per share	\$ 0.03	\$ (0.02)	\$ (0.17)	\$ (0.04)

Contingent Acquisition Consideration

In connection with certain business acquisitions, the Company may agree to make additional future payments to sellers contingent upon achievement of specific performance-based milestones by the acquired entities. Pursuant to the provisions of SFAS No. 141, such amounts are accrued, and therefore, recorded by the Company when the contingency is resolved beyond a reasonable doubt and the additional consideration becomes payable. The other current liabilities on the accompanying Consolidated Balance Sheet as of June 29, 2008 include \$2.4 million for Madison Research Corporation (MRC) and \$0.6 million for Haverstick. Included in other long-term liabilities is \$0.6 million for Haverstick with the contingent common stock consideration of \$8.2 million reflected as additional paid in capital for contingent consideration in the accompanying Consolidated Financial Statements.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 7. Acquisitions (Continued)

The MRC holdback of approximately \$2.4 million was originally due in April 2008 and this date has been extended to provide additional time to resolve outstanding indemnification obligations. The Company expects to make this payment in the latter half of 2008. The remaining amounts for Haverstick of \$1.2 million in cash and \$8.2 million in common stock are due in equal payments in December 2008 and September 2009. The holdback arrangements accrue interest in accordance with the terms of the purchase agreements.

A summary of the contingent acquisition consideration as of December 31, 2007 and June 29, 2008 is summarized in the following table (in millions):

	Haverstick	MRC	Total
Balance as of December 31, 2007	\$ 8.6	2.3	\$ 10.9
Post acquisition adjustments and interest accruals	0.8	0.1	0.9
Balance as of June 29, 2008	\$ 9.4	\$ 2.4	\$ 11.8

Note 8. Notes Payable and Other Financing Arrangements**(a) Credit Agreement**

On December 31, 2007, the Company entered into a credit facility of \$85.0 million with KeyBanc Capital Markets which replaced the October 2, 2006 credit agreement with Key Bank. This credit facility provides for two term loans consisting of a first lien term note of \$50.0 million and a second lien term note of \$10.0 million, as well as, a first lien \$25 million revolving line of credit. The \$10.0 million term loan has a five and one half year term with principal payments required quarterly beginning on March 31, 2008 of \$25,000 through March 31, 2013 with the final balance of \$9.5 million due on June 30, 2013. The \$50.0 million term loan has a five year term with principal payments required quarterly beginning on March 31, 2008 of \$0.6 million in 2008, \$1.3 million in 2009, \$2.5 million in 2010, and \$4.1 million in 2011 and 2012. The term loans have a provision which states that once the full amount of the note has been borrowed, the notes cannot be paid down and reborrowed again. The revolving line of credit has a four year term which expires on December 31, 2011 and contains provisions typical in such arrangements. All loans under the new credit facility have an interest rate equal to a base rate defined as a fluctuating rate per annum equal to the higher of (a) the Federal Funds Rate plus 0.5% and (b) the rate of interest in effect for such day as publicly announced from time to time by KeyBank as its "prime rate" plus a margin for the term loans of 6.5% to 7.5% and a margin of 1.0% to 3.25% on the revolving line of credit. The applicable margin at date of borrowing is determined by the ratio of the Company's aggregate debt to its EBITDA for the previous four fiscal quarters. The Company used the credit facility to fund the acquisition of Haverstick Consulting Inc. (Haverstick) and to retire the outstanding debt from the October 2006 agreement.

The Credit Facilities contain covenants which impose certain restrictions on the Company's ability to, among other things, incur additional debt, pay dividends, make investments or sell assets. Additionally, certain non-recurring cash inflows such as proceeds from asset sales, insurance recoveries, and equity offerings may have to be used to pay down indebtedness and may not be reborrowed. In addition, the Credit Facilities contain certain financial covenants which are defined by the terms of the agreements. These financial covenants include a maximum first lien leverage ratio, a maximum total

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 8. Notes Payable and Other Financing Arrangements (Continued)

leverage ratio, a minimum liquidity ratio, a minimum fixed charge coverage ratio, and a minimum consolidated EBITDA at various dates for the \$50.0 million term loan and the \$25.0 million revolver as outlined in the following table.

Date	Maximum First Lien Leverage Ratio	Maximum Total Leverage Ratio	Minimum Liquidity Ratio	Minimum Fixed Charge Coverage Ratio	Minimum Consolidated EBITDA (in millions)
December 31, 2007 - 2008	3.22 to 4.76:1.00	3.76 to 5.68:1.00	1.56 to 1.33:1.00	1.05 to 0.50:1.00	\$16.1 to \$19.4
2009	2.97 to 2.33:1.00	2.78 to 3.50:1.00	1.60 to 1.58:1.00	1.11 to 1.02:1.00	\$19.8 to \$21.5
2010	1.75 to 2.00:1.00	2.25 to 2.50:1.00	1.54 to 1.49:1.00	1.10 to 1.06:1.00	\$21.5 to \$23.4
2011	1.75:1.00	2.25:1.00	1.55 to 1.53:1.00	1.10:1.00	\$24.4 to \$26.5
2012	1.75:1.00	2.25:1.00	1.42 to 1.54:1.00	1.10:1.00	\$26.7 to \$27.6

The \$10.0 million subordinated term loan also provides for similar financial covenants.

As of June 29, 2008, the Company's outstanding balance on the facility was \$79.9 million and the weighted average interest rate on the debt borrowed during the quarter and six months ended June 29, 2008 was 12.07% and 11.73% respectively. As of June 29, 2008, the unused line of credit under the revolving line of credit was \$2.9 million. The only restriction on the use of these funds is that the Company must be in compliance with covenants of the credit facility. The Company was in compliance with all covenants under the credit facility as of June 29, 2008.

In July 2008, we paid \$1.7 million related to the 2007 securities litigation settlement. This amount was partially funded with \$1.2 million of the funds placed in the restricted account. The Company expects to pay an additional \$3.0 million related to the settlement of the 2004 Securities litigation in the third quarter of this year. Approximately \$1.0 million of this amount will come from the restricted cash account and the balance will come from cash in the Company's operating accounts.

On February 11, 2008, the Company entered into a three derivative financial instruments with Key Bank to reduce the Company's exposure to its variable interest rates on its outstanding debt. These instruments initially hedged \$70 million of its LIBOR-based floating rate debt with the amounts hedged decreasing over time. The derivatives mature on March 31, 2010 and March 31, 2011 and result in an average fixed rate of 3.16% for the term of the agreements. The Company designated these instruments as cash flow hedges. In March 2008, as a result of the amendment to the Company's credit facility, which included a LIBOR floor rate of 4.25%, the Company determined that these instruments were no longer highly effective as a hedge. As a result, a charge of \$0.7 million from marking the derivative financial instruments to market has been reflected in other income (expense), net rather than in other comprehensive income on the Company's Consolidated Balance Sheet as of March 30, 2008. For the quarter ended June 29, 2008, the result of marking the derivatives to market was a \$1.3 million gain reflected in other income (expense), net. The net gain associated with the derivatives for the six months ended June 29, 2008 was \$0.6 million. Future gains and losses on these derivative instruments as well as the offsetting gain or loss on the hedged item attributable to the hedged risk will continue to be recognized in the Company's Statement of Operations. See Note 9.

In March 2008, the Company entered into a tentative agreement to settle the 2004 and 2007 securities class action litigation actions and, as a result, the Company recorded a \$4.9 million charge in the quarter ended December 31, 2007 to accrue its share of the settlement amounts and an estimate

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 8. Notes Payable and Other Financing Arrangements (Continued)

for a contingent liability associated with legal proceedings related to the derivative actions, net of the amounts to be covered by the Company's insurance carriers. As a consequence of recording this legal settlement, the Company did not meet certain of the financial covenants in accordance with the credit facility. Accordingly, on March 27, 2008, the Company obtained an amendment and waiver from its lenders to waive the impact of the legal settlement amounts on its financial covenants as of December 31, 2007 and the affected future periods. The amendment also amended the credit facility to provide for an increase in the LIBOR floor rate to 4.25% and to require that the Company set aside in a restricted account approximately 50% of the proceeds of the recovery from the theft of stock options by its former stock option administrator, or approximately \$1.7 million, to fund these settlement amounts. In April 2008, \$1.7 million was transferred to a restricted cash account and in July 2008, an additional \$0.6 million was transferred for the amount received from the insurance carriers as settlement on the theft of stock options. The lenders have also reserved the right to require the Company to utilize the entire amount of the \$3.4 million in proceeds received from the theft of stock options to permanently pay down indebtedness. This right can be exercised no earlier than 60 days from March 27, 2008 and expires upon the Company's compliance with financial covenants under the credit facility for the four consecutive quarters commencing after January 1, 2008.

On June 26, 2008, the Company entered into a second amendment to its credit facility in order to obtain changes necessary to complete the merger with SYS. The amendment specifically approves the Unsecured Subordinated Convertible Notes issued by SYS as subordinated debt under the credit facility provided that a Subordination Agreement is obtained from the note holders representing no less than 95% of the aggregate principal amount of all Subordinated Notes which was subsequently completed in July 2008. In addition, the amendment provides for an add-back for amounts representing actual transaction costs incurred by an acquired entity in the computation of Consolidated EBITDA, as defined in the credit agreement, in any acquisition in which 100% of the purchase price is paid in Equity Securities of the Company.

As of June 29, 2008, the Company had outstanding convertible notes payable which were acquired as the result of the SYS acquisition totaling \$3.1 million, of which \$0.8 was payable to related parties. The convertible notes payable are unsecured and subordinated to the Company's bank debt and bear interest at 10% per annum payable quarterly. Principal is due February 14, 2009 and the notes are convertible at any time into shares of common stock at a conversion rate of \$2.86 per share.

Note 9. Fair Value Measurement

The Company adopted SFAS 157 as of January 1, 2008, with the exception of the application of the statement to non-recurring nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities. Non-recurring nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities for which it has not applied the provisions of SFAS 157 include those measured at fair value in goodwill impairment testing, indefinite lived intangible assets measured at fair value for impairment testing, asset retirement obligations initially measured at fair value, and those initially measured at fair value in a business combination.

SFAS 157 establishes a valuation hierarchy for disclosure of the inputs to valuation used to measure fair value. This hierarchy prioritizes the inputs into three broad levels as follows. Level 1 inputs are quoted prices (unadjusted) in active markets for identical assets or liabilities. Level 2 inputs are quoted prices for similar assets and liabilities in active markets or inputs that are observable for the

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 9. Fair Value Measurement (Continued)

asset or liability, either directly or indirectly through market corroboration, for substantially the full term of the financial instrument. Level 3 inputs are unobservable inputs based on the Company's own assumptions used to measure assets and liabilities at fair value. A financial asset or liability's classification within the hierarchy is determined based on the lowest level input that is significant to the fair value measurement.

The following table provides the assets and liabilities carried at fair value measured on a recurring basis as of June 29, 2008 (in millions):

Fair Value Measurements at June 29, 2008 Using

	Total Carrying Value June 29, 2008	Quoted prices in active markets (Level 1)	Significant other observable inputs (Level 2)	Significant unobservable inputs (Level 3)
Derivative assets	\$ 0.6	\$	\$ 0.6	\$

The significant Level 2 observable inputs utilized to value the Company's derivative financial instruments are based upon calculations provided by an investment advisor and are validated with the use of a nationally recognized financial reporting service.

Note 10. Customer Information

The following table presents the Company's key customers from continuing operations for the periods presented and the percentage of net sales made to such customers (in millions):

Key Customersa	For the Three Months Ended				For the Six Months Ended			
	June 30, 2007		June 29, 2008		June 30, 2007		June 29, 2008	
U.S. Navy	\$ 8.7	18.2%	\$ 24.1	33.3%	\$ 18.1	18.7%	\$ 46.1	32.8%
U.S. Army	\$ 13.3	27.8%	\$ 14.5	20.1%	\$ 23.3	24.1%	\$ 27.1	19.3%
Foreign Military Sales	\$ 4.6	9.6%	\$ 2.5	3.5%	\$ 10.1	10.4%	\$ 6.2	4.4%

The customers are all part of Kratos Government Solutions. The top five customers accounted for approximately 65% and 62% of total revenue for the three and six months ended June 29, 2007, respectively, and for approximately 65% of total revenue for the three and six months ended June 29, 2008.

Note 11. Segment Information

Prior to the divestiture of our wireless-related business, the Company had three operating segments: Wireless Network Services (WNS) segment, Enterprise Network Services (ENS) segment, and Government Network Services (GNS) segment. Following the divestiture of the WNS segment and corporate name change, the Company reorganized into two operating segments, Kratos Government Solutions (KGS) (formerly GNS) and Public Safety and Security (PSS) (formerly ENS). The financial statements in this Quarterly Report are presented in a manner consistent with the new operating structure.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 11. Segment Information (Continued)

Certain income and charges are not allocated to segments in the Company's management reports because they are not considered in evaluating the segments' operating performance. Unallocated charges are related to corporate expenses previously allocated to the discontinued Wireless Network Services segment, share based compensation charges and related tax adjustments, expenses related to the stock option investigation that was completed in September 2007, a benefit for the insurance proceeds received for the theft of stock options and a benefit related to a change in estimate for the Company's unused office space. These charges are included in corporate activities in the table below. Revenues and operating income generated by the Company's current reporting segments for the three and six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 are as follows (in millions):

	Three months ended		Six months ended	
	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008	June 30, 2007	June 29, 2008
Revenues:				
Government Solutions	\$ 35.5	\$ 59.2	\$ 72.5	\$ 114.1
Public Safety & Security	12.3	13.1	24.3	26.4
Total revenues	\$ 47.8	\$ 72.3	\$ 96.8	\$ 140.5
Operating income (loss):				
Government Solutions	\$ 0.7	\$ 1.8	\$ 2.6	\$ 2.6
Public Safety & Security	\$ (1.6)	\$ 0.1	\$ (3.7)	\$ 0.2
Corporate activities	\$ (7.4)	\$ 1.0	\$ (10.5)	\$ 0.8
Total operating income (loss)	\$ (8.3)	\$ 2.9	\$ (11.6)	\$ 3.6

Segment assets as of December 31, 2007 were \$292.4 million for the Government Solutions segment and \$22.5 million for the Public Safety and Security Segment. Both segments in total will have increased assets due to the acquisition of SYS of approximately \$55.2 million. As of June 29, 2008 the allocation of the SYS assets to the segments has not been determined.

Note 12. Related Party Transactions

In 2002, the Company issued 90,000 shares of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock in a private placement to entities affiliated with one of the directors of the Company (40,000 shares), to a brother of the previous Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Company (10,000 shares) and to an unrelated third-party investor (40,000 shares).

As of June 29, 2008, a total of 10,000 shares of Series B Convertible Stock remain outstanding with a total liquidation preference of \$5.0 million.

The Company acquired unsecured subordinated notes payable as a result of the SYS acquisition and \$0.8 million of the notes are held by employees of SYS who are now employees of the Company.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 13. Legal Matters

Contingencies

IPO Securities Litigation

Beginning in June 2001, the Company and certain of its officers and directors were named as defendants in several parallel class action shareholder complaints filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, now consolidated under the caption, *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation*, Case No. 01-CV-4779. In the amended complaint, the plaintiffs allege that the Company, certain of its officers and directors, and the underwriters of the Company's initial public offering ("IPO") violated section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 based on allegations that the Company's registration statement and prospectus failed to disclose material facts regarding the compensation to be received by, and the stock allocation practices of, the IPO underwriters. The plaintiffs seek unspecified monetary damages and other relief. Similar complaints were filed in the same court against hundreds of other public companies ("Issuers") that conducted IPOs of their common stock in the late 1990s and 2000 (the "IPO Cases").

In June 2004, the Issuers (including the Company) executed a settlement agreement with the plaintiffs that would, among other things, result in the dismissal with prejudice of all claims against the Issuers and their officers and directors and the assignment of certain potential Issuer claims to the plaintiffs. On February 15, 2005, the court issued a decision certifying a class action for settlement purposes and granting preliminary approval of the settlement subject to modification of certain bar orders contemplated by the settlement. On August 31, 2005, the court reaffirmed class certification and preliminary approval of the modified settlement in a comprehensive Order. On February 24, 2006, the court dismissed litigation filed against certain underwriters in connection with certain claims to be assigned under the settlement. On April 24, 2006, the court held a Final Fairness Hearing to determine whether to grant final approval of the settlement. On December 5, 2006, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the lower court's earlier decision certifying as class actions the six IPO Cases designated as "focus cases." Thereafter, the District Court ordered a stay of all proceedings in all of the IPO Cases pending the outcome of plaintiffs' petition to the Second Circuit for rehearing en banc and resolution of the class certification issue. On April 6, 2007, the Second Circuit denied plaintiffs' rehearing petition, but clarified that the plaintiffs may seek to certify a more limited class in the District Court. Accordingly, the settlement was terminated pursuant to stipulation and will not receive final approval.

Plaintiffs filed amended complaints in the six focus cases in August 2007. The Company is not one of the focus case issuers. In September 2007, the Company's named officers and directors again extended the tolling agreement with plaintiffs. In September 2007, plaintiffs moved to certify the classes alleged in the focus cases and to appoint class representatives and class counsel in those cases. The focus case issuers filed motions to dismiss the claims against them in November 2007 and an opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification in December 2007. The Court denied the motions to dismiss on March 16, 2008. The deadline for the focus case defendants to answer is August 31, 2008. Due to the inherent uncertainties of litigation, the ultimate outcome of this matter cannot be predicted. In accordance with FASB No. 5, "Accounting for Contingencies," the Company believes any contingent liability related to this claim is not probable or estimable and therefore no amounts have been accrued in regards to this matter.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 13. Legal Matters (Continued)

2004 Securities Litigation

In August 2004, following the Company's announcement on August 4, 2004 that it intended to restate its financial statements for the fiscal years ended December 31, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003, the Company and certain of its current and former officers and directors were named as defendants ("Defendants") in several securities class action lawsuits filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California. These actions were filed on behalf of those who purchased, or otherwise acquired, the Company's common stock between April 26, 2000 and August 4, 2004. The lawsuits generally allege that, during that time period, Defendants made false and misleading statements to the investing public about the Company's business and financial results, causing its stock to trade at artificially inflated levels. Based on these allegations, the lawsuits allege that Defendants violated the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the plaintiffs seek unspecified damages. These actions have been consolidated into a single action *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 04CV1589-JAH. Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint on April 1, 2005. Defendants filed their motion to dismiss this first amended complaint on April 14, 2005. The plaintiffs then requested leave to amend their first amended complaint. The plaintiffs filed their Second Amended Complaint on June 9, 2005, this time on behalf of those who purchased, or otherwise acquired, the Company's common stock between May 5, 2003 and August 4, 2004. Defendants filed their motion to dismiss this Second Amended Complaint on July 14, 2005. The motion to dismiss was taken under submission on October 20, 2005 and on March 8, 2006, the Court granted the Defendants' motion. However, plaintiffs were granted the right to amend their complaint within 45 days and subsequently filed their Third Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint on April 24, 2006. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss this complaint on June 8, 2006. On May 7, 2007, the Court denied the Defendants' motion to dismiss. Defendants' filed their answer to the plaintiffs' complaint on July 13, 2007. In February 2008, following a voluntary mediation of the matter, the parties reached a tentative agreement to settle the class action. Under the tentative settlement, plaintiffs and the class will dismiss all claims, with prejudice, in exchange for a cash payment in the total amount of \$12 million. The Company's directors' and officers' liability insurers will pay the settlement amount in accordance with the Company's insurance policies, less any applicable retention or co-insurance obligations that are expected to be paid directly by the Company. The Company estimates that the amount of its payment toward the settlement will be approximately \$2.4 million. The Company has accrued approximately \$2.4 million as of June 29, 2008 related to this matter. In June, the parties executed a Memorandum of Understanding documenting the essential terms of the proposed settlement and the parties currently are drafting the documents necessary to seek a determination by the Court that the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate. The Company makes no assurances at this time that the parties will reach agreement on settlement terms, that the Court will approve the proposed settlement terms or that the matter ultimately will be settled. Despite the tentative settlement reached in this action, the Company believes that the allegations lack merit.

In 2004, two derivative lawsuits were filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California against certain of the Company's current and former officers and directors: *Pedicini v. Wireless Facilities, Inc.*, Case No. 04CV1663; and *Roth v. Wireless Facilities, Inc.*, Case No. 04CV1810. These actions were consolidated into a single action in *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Derivative Litigation*, Lead Case No 04CV1663-JAH. These lawsuits contain factual allegations that are substantially similar to those made in the class action lawsuits, but the plaintiffs in these lawsuits assert

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 13. Legal Matters (Continued)

claims for breach of fiduciary duty, gross mismanagement, abuse of control, waste of corporate assets, violation of Sarbanes Oxley Act section 304, unjust enrichment and insider trading. The plaintiffs in these lawsuits seek unspecified damages and equitable and/or injunctive relief. The lead plaintiff filed a consolidated complaint on March 21, 2005. On May 3, 2005, the defendants filed motions to dismiss this action, to stay this action pending the resolution of the consolidated non-derivative securities case pending in the Southern District of California, and to dismiss the complaint against certain non-California resident defendants. Pursuant to a request by the Court, Defendants' motions were withdrawn without prejudice pending a decision on defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint against the non-California resident defendants. On March 20, 2007, the Court ruled that it lacked personal jurisdiction over five of the six non-California defendants and dismissed them from the federal derivative complaint. On March 27, 2007, plaintiffs filed an amended derivative complaint setting forth all of the same allegations from the original complaint and adding allegations regarding the Company's stock option granting practices. Basically, plaintiffs allege that the Company "backdated" or "springloaded" employee stock option grants so that the options were granted at less than fair market value. The amended complaint names all of the original defendants (including those dismissed for lack of jurisdiction) as well as nine new defendants. On July 2, 2007, the non-California resident defendants moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction. On October 17, 2007, the Court took the motion under submission without oral argument. On February 26, 2008, the Court again ruled that it lacked personal jurisdiction over five of the six non-California defendants and dismissed them from the amended federal derivative complaint. Plaintiffs subsequently moved the Court for certification and entry of final judgment of the Court's order dismissing the non-residents for lack of personal jurisdiction so that the plaintiffs may seek immediate appellate review of the matter. On July 10, 2008, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for certification, which was not opposed by defendants. Plaintiffs have 30 days from that order to seek permission from the Ninth Circuit to appeal the jurisdictional order. The parties have conferred and discussed the Court's personal jurisdictional order and certification order and have stipulated to a briefing schedule for any remaining motions to dismiss that the Company, along with the individual defendants subject to the court's jurisdiction, may bring in an effort to dismiss the complaint as to them. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, such motions must be brought on or before August 6, 2008. The Company believes that the allegations lack merit and intends to vigorously defend all claims asserted. It is impossible at this time to assess whether or not the outcome of these proceedings will have a material adverse effect on the Company.

In April 2007, another derivative complaint was filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Hameed v. Tayebi, Case No. 07-CV-0680 BTM(RBB) (the "Hameed Action"), against several of the Company's current and former officers and directors. The allegations in this new derivative complaint mirror the amended allegations in the 2004 federal derivative action. Pursuant to the Court's order and agreement of the parties, the defendants' responses to the complaint in the Hameed Action were stayed until the Court ruled on the motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction in the 2004 derivative litigation. As noted above, on February 26, 2008, the Court ruled that it lacked personal jurisdiction over five of the non-California defendants named in the 2004 derivative action, including three that were also named in the Hameed Action. The parties have conferred and discussed the Court's order and have stipulated to a briefing schedule for any remaining motions to dismiss that the Company or the individual defendants may bring in an effort to dismiss the Hameed Action. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, such motions must be brought on or before August 6, 2008.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 13. Legal Matters (Continued)

At this time, the parties have not set a date by which such motions must be brought. The Company believes that the allegations lack merit and intends to vigorously defend all claims asserted. It is impossible at this time to assess whether or not the outcome of these proceedings will have a material adverse effect on the Company.

In August and September 2004, two virtually identical derivative lawsuits were filed in California Superior Court for San Diego County against certain of the Company's current and former officers and directors. These actions contain factual allegations similar to those of the federal lawsuits, but the plaintiffs in these cases assert claims for violations of California's insider trading laws, breaches of fiduciary duty, abuse of control, gross mismanagement, waste of corporate assets and unjust enrichment. The plaintiffs in these actions seek unspecified damages, equitable and/or injunctive relief and disgorgement of all profits, benefits and other compensation obtained by defendants. These lawsuits have been consolidated into one action *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Derivative Litigation*, California Superior Court, San Diego County, Lead Case No. GIC 834253. The plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Shareholder Derivative Complaint on October 14, 2004. This action has been stayed pending a decision in federal court on a motion to dismiss the federal derivative lawsuits. In April 2008, the parties notified the Court of the status of the federal action and the court continued the stay for an additional six months. The Court also ordered the parties to file an updated status report in October 2008. The Company believes that the allegations lack merit and intends to vigorously defend all claims asserted. It is impossible at this time to assess whether or not the outcome of these proceedings will have a material adverse effect on the Company.

The Company has recorded an accrual for a contingent liability associated with the legal proceedings related to the derivative actions of \$0.8 million based on the Company's estimate of the potential amount it would have to pay in relation to these lawsuits.

2007 Securities Litigation

In March and April 2007, there were three federal class actions filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California against the Company and several of its current and former officers and directors. These class action lawsuits followed the Company's March 12, 2007 public announcement that it was conducting a voluntary internal review of its stock option granting processes. These actions have been consolidated into a single action, *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Securities Litigation II*, Master File No. 07-CV-0482-BTM-NLS. The consolidated class action complaint was filed on November 19, 2007. In March 2008, following a voluntary mediation of the matter, the parties reached a tentative agreement to settle the class action. Under the settlement proposal, plaintiffs and the class will dismiss all claims, with prejudice, in exchange for a cash payment in the amount of \$4.5 million. The Company's directors' and officers' liability insurers will pay the settlement amount, less any applicable retention or co-insurance obligations and contributions that are expected to be paid directly by the Company. The Company estimates that the total amount of its payment toward the settlement will be approximately \$1.7 million. The Company has accrued approximately \$1.7 million as of June 29, 2008 related to this matter. In May 2008, the parties executed a Memorandum of Understanding documenting the essential terms of the proposed settlement and the parties currently are drafting the documents necessary to seek a determination by the Court that the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate. The Company makes no assurances at this time

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 13. Legal Matters (Continued)

that the parties will reach agreement or settlement terms, the Court will approve the proposed settlement terms or that the matter ultimately will be settled. Despite the tentative settlement reached in this action, the Company believes that the allegations lack merit.

Other Litigation and Government Investigations

In January 2005, a former independent contractor of the Company filed a lawsuit in Brazil against the Company's subsidiary, WFI de Brazil, to which he had been assigned for a period of time. He sought to be designated an employee of WFI de Brazil and entitled to severance and related compensation pursuant to Brazilian labor law. The individual sought back wages, vacation pay, stock option compensation and related benefits in excess of \$0.5 million. This matter was argued before the appropriate labor court in July 2005 and in July, 2006, the labor court awarded the individual the Brazilian currency equivalent of approximately \$0.6 million for his back wages, vacation pay and certain other benefits. The Company filed an appeal in the matter on July 20, 2006 and is challenging the basis for the award on several theories. The Company has accrued approximately \$0.6 million as of June 29, 2008 related to this matter. On August 22, 2007, the appeals court partially upheld the Company's appeal, although it upheld the individual's designation as an employee. The court is reviewing possible damage calculations before publishing a final decision. The Company's counsel is preparing a motion for clarification of the judgment due to omissions in the decision.

On March 28, 2007, three plaintiffs, on behalf of a purported class of similarly situated employees and contractors, filed a lawsuit against the Company in the Superior Court of the State of California, Alameda County. The suit alleges various violations of the California Labor Code and seeks payments for allegedly unpaid straight time and overtime, meal period pay and associated penalties. The Company and the plaintiffs have agreed to venue for the suit in San Diego County. Although the Company believes that the allegations lack merit, it has agreed in principle with the plaintiffs to settle their claims for an aggregate amount in the range of \$0.3 million to \$0.5 million, to include individual and incentive awards, attorneys' fees and administrative costs, subject to court approval. The actual amount paid by the Company will depend upon the number of responses received from members of the purported class of plaintiffs. The Company has recorded an accrual for a contingent liability associated with this legal proceeding in the amount of \$0.3 million.

On May 3, 2007, Kratos announced that it had filed a lawsuit against a former employee who previously served as its stock option administrator and left Kratos in mid-2004, and his spouse. The lawsuit sought to recover damages resulting from the theft by a former employee of Kratos stock options and common stock valued in excess of \$6.3 million. The thefts, which appear to have taken place during 2002 and 2003, were discovered through the Kratos review of its past practices related to the granting and pricing of employee stock options with the assistance of its outside counsel and forensic computer consultants. The complaint also alleged that the former employee attempted to cover up the scheme by, among other things, deleting entries from the records of Kratos.

Kratos promptly reported to the SEC the discovery of the theft. The SEC initiated an informal inquiry and commenced an enforcement action against the former employee. The U.S. Attorney's Office also forwarded a grand jury subpoena to Kratos seeking records related to the former employee and Kratos' historical option granting practices. The SEC filed a federal lawsuit and obtained a temporary restraining order and asset freeze against the former employee and his spouse. The U.S.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)

(Unaudited)

Note 13. Legal Matters (Continued)

Attorney's Office indicted him for the theft and he pled guilty to federal criminal charges and has been sentenced to 46 months in prison and currently is incarcerated. On April 1, 2008, the SEC notified Kratos that it had completed its informal investigation and that it did not intend to recommend any enforcement action by the SEC against the Company. Kratos has cooperated with, and intends to continue to cooperate with the U.S. Attorney's Office on this matter and otherwise. The former employee and his wife entered into a settlement agreement with Kratos on October 5, 2007, turning over substantially all of their assets to Kratos in settlement of the damages incurred in the theft. On February 15, 2008, the SEC approved the settlement. On February 19, 2008, the court entered a final judgment approving the settlement. Kratos has obtained the assets, which aggregate approximately \$3.4 million, and is in the process of liquidating the remaining assets which approximate \$0.1 million in value. In June 2008, the Company's insurance carrier agreed to reimburse the Company for \$0.6 million related to the theft of stock options. As a result, a benefit for this amount has been recorded in the recovery of unauthorized issuance of stock options and adjustment to the liability for unused office space line item for the three and six month periods ended June 29, 2008 in the accompanying Consolidated Statements of Operations.

In addition to the foregoing matters, from time to time, the Company may become involved in various claims, lawsuits and legal proceedings that arise in the ordinary course of business. However, litigation is subject to inherent uncertainties, and an adverse result in these or other matters may arise from time to time that may harm the Company's business. The Company is currently not aware of any such legal proceedings or claims that it believes will have, individually or in the aggregate, a material adverse affect on our business, financial condition, operating results or cash flows.

Item 2. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations

This report contains forward-looking statements. These statements relate to future events or our future financial performance. In some cases, you can identify forward-looking statements by terminology such as "may," "will," "should," "expect," "plan," "anticipate," "believe," "estimate," "predict," "potential" or "continue," the negative of such terms or other comparable terminology. These statements are only predictions. Actual events or results may differ materially. Factors that may cause our results to differ include, but are not limited to: changes in the scope or timing of our projects; changes or cutbacks in spending or the appropriation of funding by the federal government of the U.S. Department of Defense, which could cause delays or cancellations of key government contracts; the timing, rescheduling or cancellation of significant customer contracts and agreements, or consolidation by or the loss of key customers; risks that the integration of Haverstick and SYS will prove more costly, take more time, or be more distracting than currently anticipated; risks of adverse regulatory action or litigation; risks associated with debt leverage; failure to obtain court approval of the proposed litigation settlement or to ultimately settle the litigation; failure to successfully consummate acquisitions or integrate acquired operations; and competition in the marketplace which could reduce revenues and profit margins.

Although we believe that the expectations reflected in the forward-looking statements are reasonable, we cannot guarantee future results, levels of activity, performance or achievements. Moreover, neither we, nor any other person, assume responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the forward-looking statements. We are under no obligation to update any of the forward-looking statements after the filing of this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q to conform such statements to actual results or to changes in our expectations.

Certain of the information set forth herein, including costs and expenses that exclude the impact of stock compensation expense and amortization costs of purchased intangibles in 2007 and 2008, may be considered non-GAAP financial measures. We believe this information is useful to investors because it provides a basis for measuring the operating performance of our business and our cash flow, excluding the effect of stock compensation expense that would normally be included in the most directly comparable measures calculated and presented in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. Our management uses these non-GAAP financial measures along with the most directly comparable GAAP financial measures in evaluating our operating performance, capital resources and cash flow. Non-GAAP financial measures should not be considered in isolation from, or as a substitute for, financial information presented in compliance with GAAP, and non-financial measures as reported by Kratos may not be comparable to similarly titled amounts reported by other companies.

The following discussion should be read in conjunction with our unaudited consolidated financial statements and the related notes and other financial information appearing elsewhere in this Form 10-Q. Readers are also urged to carefully review and consider the various disclosures made by us which attempt to advise interested parties of the factors which affect our business, including without limitation the disclosures made under the caption "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations," under the caption "Risks Related to Our Business," and the audited consolidated financial statements and related notes included in our Annual Report filed on Form 10-K, for the year ended December 31, 2007 and other reports and filings made with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Overview

We provide mission critical engineering, IT services and warfighter solutions to the U.S. Government and government agencies, as well as to state and local agencies and commercial customers. Our principal services are related to, but are not limited to, Command, Control, Communications, Computing, Combat Systems Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C5ISR), weapon systems lifecycle support and extension, military range operations and technical services, missile, rocket and weapon test and evaluation, mission launch services, public safety, security and surveillance, advanced network engineering services and IT services, and critical infrastructure design and integration services.

We offer our customers solutions and expertise to support their mission-critical needs by leveraging our skills across these core service areas.

Historically, the majority of our business was concentrated in the area of wireless network services, and our business operated in three reportable segments: Wireless Network Services, Government Network Services, and Enterprise Network Services. In 2006, we were an independent provider of outsourced engineering and network deployment services, security systems engineering and integration services and other technical services for the wireless communications industry, the U.S. government, and enterprise customers.

In 2006 and 2007, we undertook a transformation strategy whereby we divested our wireless-related businesses and chose to pursue business with the federal government, primarily the U.S. Department of Defense, through strategic acquisitions and organic growth. We divested assets in our Wireless Network Services segment and renamed our Enterprise Network Services segment "Public Safety and Security". Today, under the new corporate name of Kratos Defense & Security Solutions, Inc., we are organized into two primary operating segments: Kratos Government Solutions (KGS) and Public Safety & Security (PSS).

The financial statements in this Quarterly Report are presented in a manner consistent with our new operating structure. For additional information regarding our operating segments, see Note 12 of Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements. From a customer and solutions perspective, we view our business as an integrated whole, leveraging skills and assets wherever possible.

Kratos Government Solutions Segment (KGS)

Our Kratos Government Solutions segment provides engineering, information technology and technical services to federal, state, and local government agencies, but primarily the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). Our work includes weapon systems lifecycle support and extension; C5ISR; military range operations and technical services; missile, rocket, and weapon systems test and evaluation; mission launch services; public safety and security services; advanced network engineering and information technology services; and public safety, security and surveillance systems integration. Our KGS segment also focuses on the homeland security market with products and services aimed at supporting first responders.

Public Safety and Security Segment (PSS)

Our Public Safety and Security segment provides system design, deployment, integration, monitoring and support services for public safety, security and surveillance networks for state and local governments and commercial customers. Public safety and security networks have been traditionally segregated into systems such as voice, data, access control, video surveillance, and temperature control and fire and life safety. We provide services that combine such systems and offer integrated solutions on an Ethernet-based platform. We also offer solutions that combine voice, data, electronic security and building automation systems with fixed or wireless connectivity solutions. Our target markets are retail, healthcare, education, sports and entertainment, municipal government, correctional facilities and other public facilities. Our commitments to these markets and our ability to provide feature-rich, cost-effective solutions have allowed us to become one of the larger independent integrators for these types of systems. We maintain regional office locations, comprised of Kratos Mid-Atlantic, Kratos Southeast, and Kratos Southwest, where we are focused on security, surveillance and other building automation and integration services.

Divestiture of Wireless Network Business

On December 28, 2006, our Board approved a plan to divest portions of our business where critical mass had not been achieved. This plan involved the divestiture of our EMEA operations and

our remaining South American operations. The EMEA operations were sold to LCC International, Inc. ("LCC") on March 9, 2007 for \$4.0 million in cash, \$3.3 million of which was received on that date. We also received approximately \$1.8 million from our EMEA operations prior and subsequent to the closing date as payment on outstanding intercompany debt. The balance of the \$0.7 million sales price was withheld as security for the satisfaction of certain indemnification obligations and was payable on March 31, 2008. Based upon our review of the most recently available financial statements of the buyer, as of December 31, 2007, we have concern about their ability to pay this holdback, due to their available liquidity. We have recorded a reserve of \$0.7 million for this receivable. In May 2008, we reached an agreement with LCC for the payment of the \$0.7 million holdback amount, under which LCC has agreed to pay as the outstanding balance in \$0.1 million increments each month commencing June 30, 2008. We have not yet received the payments due on June 30, 2008 or July 31, 2008. While we intend to vigorously pursue collection of the amounts, there is a substantial likelihood that we will not receive payment of the amount due, in light of LCC's apparent available liquidity amounts.

We recorded an impairment charge of \$5.2 million in the fourth quarter of 2006 to reduce the current carrying value of our South American operations to their estimated fair value based upon current indications of interest.

On April 20, 2007, we entered into an Equity Purchase Agreement to sell all of the issued and outstanding equity of its interests of our wholly-owned subsidiary WFI de Brazil Techlogia en Telecomunicaciones LTDA to Strategic Project Services, LLC (SPS). The consideration included the assumption of substantially all outstanding liabilities of WFI Brazil, nominal cash consideration, and additional earn-out consideration based on 25 percent of net receivables collected subsequent to the closing date. With respect to the additional earn-out consideration, the Company has not received and does not anticipate receiving any payments.

On May 29, 2007, we entered into an Asset Purchase Agreement with LCC International, Inc. for the sale of all of the assets used in the conduct of the operation of our engineering services business of our Wireless Network Services segment that provided engineering services to the non-government wireless communications industry in the United States, for aggregate consideration of \$46 million. LCC delivered a subordinated promissory note for the principal amount of \$21.6 million (the "Subordinated Promissory Note"), paid \$17 million at closing and paid final working capital adjustments of \$2.4 million through an amendment to the Subordinated Promissory Note. We retained an estimated \$5.0 million in net working capital. The transaction was completed on June 4, 2007.

On July 5, 2007, we sold the \$21.6 million Subordinated Promissory Note to Silver Point Capital, L.P. ("Silver Point") in a transaction arranged by KeyBanc Capital Markets ("KeyBanc"). We received approximately \$19.6 million in net cash proceeds, reflecting a discount from par value of less than five percent and aggregate transaction fees of approximately \$1 million, which includes a \$0.75 million fee to KeyBanc, an affiliate of our lender. On January 30, 2008, we received net proceeds of approximately \$2.3 million on the working capital adjustment from Silver Point, net of a \$0.1 million discount from par value. We did not provide any guaranty for LCC's payment obligations under the note.

On July 7, 2007, we entered into a definitive agreement with an affiliate of Platinum Equity to sell our deployment services business of our wireless network services segment for total consideration payable of \$24 million, including \$18 million in cash at closing (subject to typical post closing working capital adjustments) and an aggregate \$6 million in a three-year earn-out arrangement. We also agreed to provide certain transition services for a period of six months. The assets sold to Platinum Equity included all of our wireless deployment business and the Wireless Facilities name. The transaction closed on July 24, 2007. As a result of these engineering and deployment services divestitures in 2007, the Wireless Network Services segment has been classified as a discontinued operation in this Quarterly Report and all prior year results presented herein have been reclassified to reflect these businesses as

discontinued operations in accordance with SFAS No. 144, "Accounting for the Impairment or Disposal of Long-Lived Assets".

On September 25, 2007, we provided the working capital calculation to Platinum Equity, which indicated a working capital adjustment was due to Platinum Equity primarily due to cash collected on accounts receivables by us prior to the close of the transaction that exceeded our previous estimate of working capital to be delivered to Platinum Equity. On July 16, 2008, we came to an agreement with Platinum Equity on a working capital adjustment of \$5.0 million. The adjustment is to be paid in installments with the first amount of \$2.5 million due on July 31, 2008 and payments of \$0.5 million monthly thereafter until paid in full in December 2008. As of June 29, 2008, the balance \$5.0 million has been reflected in other current liabilities. As of August 6, 2008, the initial \$2.5 million payment had not been made.

Recent Acquisitions

On December 31, 2007, we completed our acquisition of Indianapolis, Indiana headquartered Haverstick Consulting, Inc. ("Haverstick") as part of our KGS segment. Haverstick provides rocket and missile test and evaluation, weapons systems support, and professional services to the U.S. Army, U.S. Air Force, U.S. Navy, NASA, and other federal, state and local agencies. Through the Haverstick acquisition, we expanded our customer relationship within the DoD and enhanced our presence with the U.S. Air Force, a key growth area for Haverstick.

The total purchase price was \$90.2 million including transaction costs incurred by Kratos of \$0.5 million. The purchase price paid to Haverstick of \$89.7 million was paid in a combination of \$70.3 million of cash and common stock valued at \$19.4 million. We paid \$66.7 million in cash at closing, \$2.4 million in cash shortly thereafter and \$12.0 million of common stock. In addition, \$1.2 million in cash and \$7.4 million in stock was held back to secure any negative working capital adjustments required by the merger agreement and our indemnity rights. The holdback consideration, which accrues interest in accordance with the terms of the agreement until paid, will be released on the 12th month and 21st month after the date of the acquisition. In addition to the indemnity holdback, the agreement also calls for a post closing working capital adjustment. To fund the acquisition, we secured a new credit facility of \$85.0 million arranged by KeyBanc Capital Markets. The credit facility, which includes a \$25.0 million line of credit and \$60.0 million in term notes, replaced our previous credit facility, which had an outstanding principal balance of \$6.0 million on December 31, 2007.

In February 2008, we and Haverstick agreed on the working capital calculation called for in the agreement. The calculation resulted in a working capital adjustment due to Haverstick in an amount of \$1.5 million. The working capital adjustment was paid with 697,315 shares of Company stock valued at \$1.3 million and cash of \$0.2 million in April 2008.

Until the date on which the shares of stock became salable interest shall accrued on the value of the closing stock at a floating rate of one-month LIBOR plus four percent (4%) per annum. The shares became saleable on June 30, 2008, and 167,692 additional shares were issued in satisfaction of the accrued interest.

On June 28, 2008, we completed our merger with SYS Technologies ("SYS"), a San Diego-based company. The merger of SYS into Kratos enhances Kratos' position as a premier mid-tier federal, state and local government contractor in the United States in the areas of C5ISR, IT services and public safety and homeland security solutions. The combination of SYS and Kratos creates a broad, complementary set of offerings, and positions the organization to deliver proven capabilities to a wider spectrum of customers.

The purchase price of \$55.2 million included direct transaction costs of \$2.3 million to be paid by Kratos. The value of the purchase price related to the common stock issued was derived from the

number of shares of Kratos common stock issued of 25.3 million, based on 20.1 million shares of SYS common stock outstanding and the exchange ratio of 1.2582 for each SYS share, at a price of \$2.022 per share, the average closing price of Kratos shares of common stock for the two days prior to, including, and two days subsequent to the public announcement of the merger on February 21, 2008.

A complete description of our business is set forth in our Form 10-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on March 27, 2008.

As of June 29, 2008, we consider the following factors to be important in understanding our financial statements.

Kratos Government Solutions' business with the U.S. government and prime contractors is generally performed under cost reimbursable, fixed-price or time and materials contracts. Cost reimbursable contracts for the government provide for reimbursement of costs plus the payment of a fee. Some cost reimbursable contracts include incentive fees that are awarded based on performance on the contract. Under fixed-price contracts, we agree to perform certain work for a fixed price. Under time and materials contracts, we are reimbursed for labor hours at negotiated hourly billing rates and reimbursed for travel and other direct expenses at actual costs plus applied general and administrative expenses. Our Public Security and Safety contracts are primarily fixed-price contracts whereby revenue is recognized using the percentage-of-completion method of accounting under the provisions of Statement of Position (SOP) 81-1, "Accounting for Performance of Construction Type and Certain Production Type Contracts." For contracts offered on a time and material basis, we recognize revenues as services are performed.

Cost of revenues includes direct compensation, living, travel and benefit expenses for project-related personnel, payments to third-party subcontractors, cost of materials, project-related incentive compensation based upon the successful achievement of certain project performance goals, allocation of overhead costs and other direct project-related expenses. Selling, general and administrative expenses include compensation and benefits for corporate service employees and similar costs for billable employees whose time and expenses cannot be assigned to a project (underutilization costs), expendable computer software and equipment, facilities expenses and other operating expenses not directly related and/or allocated to projects. General and administrative costs include all corporate and administrative functions that support existing operations and provide infrastructure to facilitate our future growth. Additionally, our sales personnel and senior corporate executives have, as part of their compensation packages, periodic and annual bonus/commission incentives based on the attainment of specified performance goals.

We consider the following factors when determining if collection of a receivable is reasonably assured: comprehensive collection history; results of our communications with customers; the current financial position of the customer; and the relevant economic conditions in the customer's country. If we have had no prior experience with the customer, we review reports from various credit organizations to ensure that the customer has a history of paying its creditors in a reliable and effective manner. If the financial condition of our customers were to deteriorate, and adversely affect their financial ability to make payments, additional allowances would be required. Additionally, on certain contracts whereby we perform services for a prime/general contractor, a specified percentage of the invoiced trade accounts receivable may be retained by the customer until we complete the project. We periodically review all retainages for collectibility and record allowances for doubtful accounts when deemed appropriate, based on our assessment of the associated risks.

We believe that our Kratos Government Solutions segment will build and expand our customer relationships within the DoD, Department of Homeland Security and other non-DoD state and local agencies by taking advantage of the significant opportunities for companies with substantial expertise in advanced engineering and information technology. We believe we will experience continued growth in revenues and operating income from this operating segment. The acquisitions of Haverstick on

December 31, 2007 and SYS on June 28, 2008 resulted in the addition of nearly 900 highly skilled technical professionals and engineers with expertise in the areas of military weapons and target range support as well as targets and missile operations and maintenance.

Balance Sheet Changes June 29, 2008 Compared to December 31, 2007

Total assets increased from \$335.3 million as of December 31, 2007 to \$401.2 million as of June 29, 2008. The primary changes are in cash, accounts receivable and goodwill which are directly attributable to the acquisition of SYS. In addition, additional paid-in capital increased \$53.5 million, again driven primarily by the SYS acquisition.

Comparison of Results for the Three Months Ended June 30, 2007 to the Three Months Ended June 29, 2008

Revenues. Revenues increased \$24.5 million from \$47.8 million for the three months ended June 30, 2007 to \$72.3 million for the three months ended June 29, 2008. This increase was due to \$22.3 million in revenues from Haverstick, which was acquired in December 2007, and additional organic growth in our Government Solutions (KGS) segment of \$1.4 million or 3.9% which was primarily related to growth on one of our C5ISR programs for the Navy. Growth in our Public Safety & Security (PSS) segment was primarily related to an increase in building automation and security projects performed over the prior year in our mid-atlantic and southwest markets.

Revenues by operating segment for the three months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 are as follows (in millions):

	2007	2008	\$ change	% change
Government Solutions	\$35.5	\$59.2	\$ 23.7	66.8%
Public Safety & Security	12.3	13.1	0.8	6.5
Total revenues	\$47.8	\$72.3	\$ 24.5	51.3

As described in the section "Critical Accounting Principles and Estimates" and in the footnotes to our unaudited consolidated financial statements, a portion of our revenue is derived from fixed-price contracts whereby revenue is calculated using the percentage-of-completion method based on the ratio of total costs incurred to date compared to estimated total costs to complete the contract. These estimates are reviewed monthly on a contract-by-contract basis, and are revised periodically throughout the life of the contract such that adjustments to profit resulting from revisions are made cumulative to the date of the revision. Significant management judgments and estimates, including the estimated costs to complete projects, which determine the project's percentage of completion, must be made and used in connection with the revenue recognized in any accounting period. Material differences may result in the amount and timing of our revenue for any period if management makes different judgments or utilizes different estimates. During the reporting periods contained herein, we did experience revenue and margin adjustments of certain projects based on the aforementioned factors, but the effect of such adjustments, both positive and negative, when evaluated in total were determined to be immaterial to the consolidated financial statements.

Cost of Revenues. Cost of revenues increased from \$40.3 million for the three months ended June 30, 2007 to \$59.4 million for the three months ended June 29, 2008 primarily as a result of the increase in revenue related to the acquisition of Haverstick. Gross margin increased from 15.7% to 17.8%, for the three months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively. The increase in gross margin primarily resulted from an improved performance in our PSS segment for which margins increased from 20.3% for the three months ended June 30, 2007 to 27.5% for the three months ended June 29, 2008, and due to higher gross margins in our KGS segment as a result of our Haverstick acquisition.

Edgar Filing: KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC. - Form 10-Q

Selling, General and Administrative Expenses. Selling, general and administrative expenses ("SG&A") increased from \$10.8 million in the three months ended June 30, 2007 to \$11.2 million in the three months ended June 29, 2008. As a percentage of revenues, SG&A decreased from 22.6% to 15.5% for the three month period ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively. SG&A increased by \$4.1 million as a result of the Haverstick acquisition which was substantially offset by a reduction of \$3.7 million related to cost reductions that occurred after the sale of our legacy wireless businesses in 2007. Included in SG&A for the three months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 is amortization of purchased intangibles of \$0.7 million and \$1.1 million, respectively. Excluding the impact of the amortization of purchased intangibles, SG&A decreased from 21.1% to 14.0% for the three months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively.

Recovery of Unauthorized Issuance of Stock Options and Adjustment to the Liability for Unused Office Space. In the second quarter of 2008, our insurance carrier agreed to reimburse us for \$0.6 million related to the theft of stock options and common stock by our former stock option administrator which occurred in 2002 and 2003. In addition, we reevaluated our excess facility accrual for obligations under facility leases and determined that a portion of our corporate facility will be used commencing in the third quarter of 2008. This change in estimate is primarily attributable to our acquisition of SYS which occurred on June 28, 2008. As a result we recorded a \$0.6 million reversal in our excess facility accrual in the second quarter of 2008.

Stock Option Investigation and Related Fees. The costs in the second quarter of 2007 of \$5.0 million were comprised of legal, accountant and other professional fees related to our equity award review which was completed in September 2007 and the government inquiries by the Department of Justice and the recently completed inquiries by the SEC.

Other Income (Expense), Net. Net other income (expense) decreased from income of \$0.2 million to an expense of \$1.1 million for the three months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively.

Other income for the three months ended June 30, 2007 was primarily related to the sale of assets. Total interest expense related to our prior Credit Facility for the three months ended June 30, 2007 was \$1.1 million. In accordance with EITF 87-24, *Allocation of Interest to Discontinued Operations*, interest expense on the debt of \$1.0 million for the three months ended June 30, 2007 that was required to be repaid as a result of the sales of our wireless network services business was allocated to discontinued operations for the periods presented. See Note 6, Significant Transactions.

For the three months ended June 29, 2008, we incurred interest expense of \$2.5 million primarily as a result of borrowings on our Credit Facility for the Haverstick acquisition. This was partially offset by other income of \$1.4 million. The other income was primarily related to marking to market our \$70 million in derivative financial instruments that were entered into to reduce our exposure to variable rates on our outstanding debt.

Provision for Income Taxes. Provision for income taxes increased from a provision of \$0.3 million or a negative 3.7% rate on a loss before income taxes of \$8.1 million in the second quarter of 2007 to a provision of \$0.4 million or 22.2% on income before income taxes of \$1.8 million. The tax provision in the second quarter of 2007 and 2008 were primarily due to an increase in the deferred tax liability related to temporary differences on indefinite life intangibles that were not offset by deferred tax assets due to the full valuation allowance we have recorded on these assets, plus certain state taxes.

Income (loss) from Discontinued Operations. Income from discontinued operations decreased from income of \$12.6 million for the three months ended June 30, 2007 to a loss of \$0.6 million for the three months ended June 29, 2008. The income in 2007 was primarily due to a gain of \$14.8 million on the sale of the Wireless Engineering Services business operations in the second quarter of 2007. Revenues and operating income (loss) generated by these businesses in the second quarter of 2007, excluding the gain on sale of engineering, through the date of divestiture and quarter end, were

approximately \$32.6 million and operating loss of \$1.2 million, respectively. For the three months ended June 29, 2008, we incurred an expense of \$0.4 million related to the settlement of the working capital adjustment with Platinum on the sale of our deployment business and a tax expense of \$0.2 million related to foreign exchange adjustments and additional interest accrued for certain foreign tax contingencies.

Comparison of Results for the Six Months Ended June 30, 2007 to the Six Months Ended June 29, 2008

Revenues. Revenues increased 45.1% from \$96.8 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 to \$140.5 million for the six months ended June 29, 2008. The \$43.7 million increase was comprised of a \$41.6 million increase in our Government Solutions Segment, primarily attributable to \$42.1 million of revenues from our acquisition of Haverstick. Growth in our PSS segment of \$2.1 million was primarily related to an increase in facility automation and security projects performed over the prior year in our mid-atlantic and southwest markets.

Revenues by operating segment for the six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008 are as follows (in millions):

	2007	2008	\$ change	% change
Government Solutions	\$72.5	\$114.1	\$ 41.6	57.4%
Public Safety & Security	24.3	26.4	2.1	8.6
Total revenues	\$96.8	\$140.5	\$ 43.7	45.1

As described in the section "Critical Accounting Principles and Estimates" and in the footnotes to our unaudited consolidated financial statements, a portion of our revenue is derived from fixed-price contracts whereby revenue is calculated using the percentage-of-completion method based on the ratio of total costs incurred to date compared to estimated total costs to complete the contract. These estimates are reviewed monthly on a contract-by-contract basis, and are revised periodically throughout the life of the contract such that adjustments to profit resulting from revisions are made cumulative to the date of the revision. Significant management judgments and estimates, including the estimated costs to complete projects, which determine the project's percent complete, must be made and used in connection with the revenue recognized in any accounting period. Material differences may result in the amount and timing of our revenue for any period if management makes different judgments or utilizes different estimates. During the reporting periods contained herein, we did experience revenue and margin adjustments of certain projects based on the aforementioned factors, but the effect of such adjustments, both positive and negative, when evaluated in total were determined to be immaterial to the consolidated financial statements.

Cost of Revenues. Cost of revenues increased from \$82.0 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 to \$115.0 million for the six months ended June 29, 2008 primarily due to the corresponding aforementioned increase in total revenues related to the Haverstick acquisition. Gross margin increased from 15.3% of total revenues for the six months ended June 30, 2007 to 18.1% for the same period in 2008. The increase in gross margin primarily resulted from increased margins in the Government Solutions segment from our Haverstick acquisition as well as improved operational performance in our PSS segment for which margins increased from 18.9% to 26.1% for the six month period ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively.

Edgar Filing: KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC. - Form 10-Q

Selling, General and Administrative Expenses. Selling, general and administrative expenses ("SG&A") increased from \$19.9 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 to \$23.1 million for the six months ended June 29, 2008, primarily reflecting SG&A of \$8.1 million incurred by Haverstick offset by a reduction of \$4.9 million related to cost reductions that occurred after the sale of our legacy wireless businesses in 2007. Included in the SG&A for the six months of 2007 and 2008 is amortization of purchased intangibles of \$1.4 million and \$2.3 million, respectively. The increase in amortization year over year is also a result of the Haverstick acquisition. As a percentage of revenues, SG&A decreased from 20.6% in the first six months of 2007 to 16.4% in the first six months of 2008, reflecting the leverage of our SG&A infrastructure with increased revenues. Excluding the impact of the amortization of purchased intangibles, SG&A decreased from 19.1% to 14.8% of revenues for the first six months of 2007 and 2008 respectively.

Recovery of Unauthorized Issuance of Stock Options and Adjustment to the Liability for Unused Office Space. In the second quarter of 2008, our insurance carrier agreed to reimburse us for \$0.6 million related to the theft of stock options and common stock by our former stock option administrator which occurred in 2002 and 2003. In addition, we reevaluated our excess facility accrual for obligations under facility leases and determined that a portion of our corporate facility will be used commencing in the third quarter of 2008. This change in estimate is primarily attributable to our acquisition of SYS which occurred on June 28, 2008. As a result we recorded a \$0.6 million reversal in our excess facility accrual in the second quarter of 2008.

Stock Option Investigation and Related Fees. The costs in the first six months of 2007 of \$6.5 million were comprised of legal, accounting and other professional fees related to our equity award review which was completed in September 2007 and the ongoing government inquiries by the Department of Justice and the recently completed inquiry by the SEC.

Other Income (Expense), Net. Net other income (expense) decreased from income of \$0.7 million to an expense of \$3.8 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 and June 29, 2008, respectively.

Other income for the six months ended June 30, 2007 was primarily related to the sale of assets. Total interest expense related to our prior Credit Facility for the six months ended June 30, 2007 was \$2.1 million. In accordance with EITF 87-24, *Allocation of Interest to Discontinued Operations*, interest expense on the debt of \$2.1 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 that was required to be repaid as a result of the sales of our wireless network services business was allocated to discontinued operations for the periods presented. See Note 6, Significant Transactions.

For the six months ended June 29, 2008, we incurred interest expense of \$4.9 million primarily as a result of borrowings on our Credit Facility for the Haverstick acquisition. This was partially offset by other income of \$1.0 million. The other income was primarily related to marking to market our \$70 million derivative financial instruments we entered into to reduce our exposure to variable rates on our outstanding debt.

Provision (benefit) for Income Taxes. Our effective income tax rate for the six months ended June 30, 2007 was a negative 4.6% provision rate, or a \$0.5 million provision on a loss before taxes of \$10.9 million, compared to a negative 450% provision rate for the six months ended June 29, 2008, or a \$0.9 million provision on a loss before taxes of \$0.2 million. The tax provisions in 2007 and 2008 were primarily due to an increase in the deferred tax liability related to temporary differences on indefinite life intangibles that were not offset by deferred tax assets due to the full valuation allowance we have recorded on these assets, plus certain state taxes. The negative tax provision of 450% in the six months ended June 29, 2008 is a function of the relationship between certain minimum taxes that we are subject to regardless of our income. It is anticipated that as pretax income increases, the tax rate will decrease substantially as these minimum taxes become a smaller percentage of pretax income.

Income (loss) from Discontinued Operations. Loss from discontinued operations changed from a loss of \$4.5 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 to zero for the six months ended June 29, 2008. In 2007, the loss was primarily due to impairment of assets related to the Wireless Deployment business of \$13.4 million and an impairment of goodwill related to this business of \$7.2 million recorded in the first quarter of 2007 partially offset by a gain of \$14.8 million on the sale of the Wireless Engineering Services business operations in the second quarter of 2007 and a gain of \$3.3 million on the sale of the EMEA business in the first quarter of 2007. Revenues and operating income (loss) generated by these businesses in the first six months of 2007, through the date of divestiture for engineering and quarter end for deployment, excluding the impairment of assets and gains on sales were approximately \$79.6 million and an operating loss of \$1.1 million, respectively. In 2008, we recognized a tax benefit of \$0.9 million primarily related to the expiration of the statute of limitations for certain foreign tax contingencies. This benefit was offset partially by an impairment charge related to retained assets and liabilities from the sale and discontinuance of these operations as well as the settlement of the working capital adjustment with Platinum on the sale of our deployment business.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

Our sources of liquidity include cash and cash equivalents, cash from operations, our credit facility and other external sources of funds. As of June 29, 2008, we had cash and cash equivalents totaling \$17.4 million and restricted cash of \$2.1 million primarily related to the requirement of our Credit Facility to set aside 50% the proceeds of the recovery amounts from the theft of stock options by its former stock option administrator to fund settlement amounts in our 2004 and 2007 securities litigation.

Our operating cash flow is used to finance trade accounts receivable, fund capital expenditures and make strategic acquisitions. Financing trade accounts receivable is necessary because, on average, the customers and payers for our services do not pay us as quickly as we pay our vendors and employees for their goods and services primarily due to contractual billing milestones that must be achieved to enable us to bill our customers. Capital expenditures consist primarily of investment in computer hardware and software and improvement of our physical properties in order to maintain suitable conditions to conduct our business.

Cash from continuing operations is primarily derived from our customer contracts in progress and associated changes in working capital components. Cash provided by continuing operations was \$3.9 million for the six months ended June 29, 2008 and \$2.3 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007.

Cash provided by investing activities from continuing operations was \$12.3 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 compared to cash provided by investing activities of \$1.1 million for the six months ended June 29, 2008. During the six months ended June 30, 2007, investing activities included proceeds of \$18.6 million from the disposition of discontinued operations, offset by capital expenditures of \$1.1 million and cash paid of \$6.2 million for contingent consideration of prior acquisitions. During the six months ended June 29, 2008, investing activities included proceeds received of \$2.3 million from the settlement of the working capital amount owed by LCC on the sale of our domestic engineering operations partially offset by cash paid for our Haverstick acquisition and cash received on our SYS acquisition. Transaction costs related to our SYS acquisition will be paid in the second half of this year. See Notes 6 and 7 to our unaudited consolidated financial statements for further discussion of our acquisitions and divestitures.

Cash used by financing activities from continuing operations was \$11.2 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 and cash provided by financing activities from continuing operations was \$4.2 million for the six months ended June 29, 2008. In 2007, borrowings of \$8.0 million under the line of credit were offset by payments of \$19.0 million under the line of credit as a result of cash received

from the sale of our wireless businesses that was required to be used to reduce our debt on our prior Credit Facility. The positive cash flow from financing activities for the 2008 period consisted primarily of \$5.0 million of borrowings from our revolver offset by required repayments on our term notes of \$0.7 million.

Cash provided by discontinued operations was \$3.5 million for the six months ended June 30, 2007 and cash used by discontinued operations was \$0.4 million for the six months ended June 29, 2008, respectively. The decrease was primarily a result of the sale of these operations in 2007.

Contractual Obligations and Commitments

In connection with our business acquisitions, we have agreed to make additional future payments to sellers based on final purchase price adjustments and the expiration of certain indemnification obligations. Pursuant to the provisions of SFAS No. 141, such amounts are accrued, and therefore, recorded by the Company when the contingency is resolved beyond a reasonable doubt and, hence, the additional consideration becomes payable. As of June 29, 2008, we have approximately \$3.5 million of cash holdback amounts and \$7.6 million of common stock holdback due for the MRC and Haverstick acquisitions; these will be released subject to indemnity rights. The MRC holdback of approximately \$2.3 million was originally due in April 2008 and this date has been extended to provide additional time to resolve outstanding indemnification obligations. We expect to make this payment in the latter half of this year. The remaining amounts for Haverstick of \$1.2 million in cash and \$7.6 million in common stock are due in equal payments in December 2008 and September 2009. The holdback arrangements accrue interest in accordance with the terms of the purchase agreements.

In addition to the indemnity holdback, the Haverstick agreement also called for a post closing working capital adjustment. In February 2008, we and Haverstick agreed on the working capital calculation called for in the agreement. The calculation resulted in a working capital adjustment due to Haverstick in an amount of \$1.5 million. The working capital adjustment was paid in April 2008 with the issuance of 697,315 common shares of our stock valued at \$1.3 million and cash of \$0.2 million.

On December 31, 2007, we entered into a new credit facility of \$85.0 million with KeyBanc Capital Markets which replaced the October 2, 2006 credit agreement with Key Bank. This credit facility provides for two term loans consisting of a first lien term note of \$50.0 million and a second lien term note of \$10.0 million, as well as a first lien \$25 million revolving line of credit. The \$10.0 million term loan has a five and one half year term with principal payments required quarterly beginning on March 31, 2008 of \$25,000 through March 31, 2013 with the final balance of \$9.5 million due on June 30, 2013. The \$50.0 million term loan has a five year term with principal payments required quarterly beginning on March 31, 2008 of \$0.6 million in 2008, \$1.3 million in 2009, \$2.5 million in 2010, and \$4.1 million in 2011 and 2012. The term loans have a provision which states that once the full amount of the note has been borrowed, the notes cannot be paid down and reborrowed again. The revolving line of credit has a four year term which expires on December 31, 2011 and contains provisions typical in such arrangements. All loans under the new credit facility have an interest rate equal to a base rate defined as a fluctuating rate per annum equal to the higher of (a) the Federal Funds Rate plus 0.5% and (b) the rate of interest in effect for such day as publicly announced from time to time by KeyBank as its "prime rate" plus a margin for the term loans of 6.5% to 7.5% and a margin of 1.0% to 3.25% on the revolving line of credit. The applicable margin at date of borrowing is determined by the ratio of our aggregate debt to our EBITDA for the previous four fiscal quarters. We used the credit facility to fund the acquisition of Haverstick and to retire outstanding debt under our October 2006 credit facility with Key Bank. The terms of the new credit agreement require us to provide certain customary covenants for a credit agreement, including certain financial covenants which vary by quarter. See Schedules 7.12(a) through (e) to both the First Lien Credit Agreement and the Second Lien Credit Agreement, which were filed as Exhibits 10.1 and 10.2 respectively, to our Current

Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on January 7, 2008. As of June 29, 2008, our outstanding balance on the facility was \$79.9 million and we had availability under the revolver of \$2.9 million.

On February 11, 2008, we entered into three interest swap agreements with Key Bank, to fix our LIBOR rate to an average of 3.16% for the term of the swap agreements. The effective date of the swaps was February 14, 2008. The notional amounts and expiration dates of the swap agreements are \$15 million and March 31, 2010; \$22.5 million and March 31, 2011; and \$32.5 million and March 31, 2011. The net benefit of the swap agreements entered into by us on February 11, 2008 has been reduced by the LIBOR floor included in the amendment and waiver discussed below.

In March 2008, we entered into a tentative agreement to settle the 2004 and 2007 securities class action litigation actions (described in Part II, Item 1 Legal Proceedings), and as a result, we recorded a \$4.9 million charge in the quarter ended December 31, 2007 to accrue our share of the settlement amounts, and an estimate for a contingent liability associated with legal proceedings related to the derivative actions, net of the amounts to be covered by our insurance carriers. As a consequence of recording this legal settlement, we did not meet certain of the financial covenants in accordance with the Credit Agreement. Accordingly, on March 27, 2008, we obtained an amendment and waiver from our lenders to waive the impact of the legal settlement amounts on our financial covenants as of December 31, 2007 and the affected future periods. The amendment also amended the credit agreement to provide for an increase in the LIBOR floor rate to 4.25% and to require that we set aside in a restricted account approximately 50% of the proceeds of the recovery from the theft of stock options by our former stock option administrator, or approximately \$1.7 million, to fund these settlement amounts. In April 2008, we transferred \$1.7 million to a restricted cash account and in July 2008, we transferred an additional \$0.6 million that we received from the insurance carriers as settlement on the theft of stock options to this restricted account. The lenders have also reserved the right to require us to utilize the entire amount of the \$3.4 million in proceeds received from the theft of stock options to permanently pay down indebtedness. This right can be exercised no earlier than 60 days from March 27, 2008 and expires upon our compliance with financial covenants under the credit agreement for the four consecutive quarters commencing after January 1, 2008. The cost related to this amendment was recorded as deferred financing costs.

On June 26, 2008, we entered into a second amendment to our credit facility in order to obtain changes necessary to complete the merger with SYS. The amendment specifically approves the Unsecured Subordinated Convertible Notes issued by SYS as subordinated debt under the credit facility provided that a subordination agreement is obtained from the note holders representing no less than 95% of the aggregate principal amount of all subordinated notes which was subsequently completed in July 2008. In addition, the amendment provides for an add-back for amounts representing actual transaction costs incurred by an acquired entity in the computation of Consolidated EBITDA, as defined in the credit agreement, in any acquisition in which 100% of the purchase price is paid by our equity securities.

As of June 29, 2008, we had outstanding convertible notes payable which were acquired as the result of the SYS acquisition totaling \$3.1 million, of which \$0.8 was payable to related parties. The convertible notes payable are unsecured and subordinate to our bank debt and bear interest at 10% per annum payable quarterly. Principal is due February 14, 2009 and the notes are convertible at any time into shares of common stock at a conversion rate of \$2.86 per share.

In July 2008, we paid \$1.7 million related to the 2007 securities litigation settlement. This amount was partially funded with \$1.2 million of the funds placed in the restricted account. We expect to pay an additional \$3.0 million related to the settlement of the 2004 Securities litigation in the third quarter of this year. Approximately \$1.0 million of this amount will come from the restricted cash account and the balance will come from our cash in our operating accounts. We expect to be reimbursed for

\$0.6 million of the payment related to the 2004 securities litigation settlement by our insurance carrier by the end of the fourth quarter of this year.

In July 2008, we agreed to a final working capital adjustment with Platinum Equity on the sale of our deployment businesses. The total amount owed to Platinum Equity is \$5.0 million and we are required to pay \$2.5 million on July 31, 2008 and then equal monthly payments of \$0.5 million from August through December of this year. As of August 6, 2008, the initial \$2.5 million payment had not been made.

Other Liquidity Matters

We intend to fund our cash requirements with cash flows from operating activities, and borrowings under our current credit facilities and potential future credit facilities. We believe these sources should be sufficient to meet our cash needs for at least the next 12 months. However, we expect to pay for the settlement of our shareholder litigation in the second half of 2008 as discussed in Note 14 Legal Matters to the unaudited consolidated financial statements included in Item 1 of Part I of this Quarterly Report, and we may need to raise additional funds to pay for this settlement. In addition, if we become subject to significant judgments, settlements, or fines related to the matters discussed in Note 13 Legal Matters, or any other matters, or incur legal fees in excess of our current expectations, we could be required to make significant payments that could materially and adversely affect our financial condition, potentially impacting our ability to access the capital markets and our compliance with our debt covenants.

As discussed in Part II, Item 1A, "Risk Factors" of this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, our quarterly and annual operating results have fluctuated in the past and may vary in the future due to a variety of factors, many of which are external to our control. If the conditions in our industry deteriorate or our customers cancel or postpone projects or if we are unable to sufficiently increase our revenues or further reduce our expenses, or if there is a real likelihood of continuing resolutions in 2009 for civilian and DoD agencies, we may experience, in the future, a significant long-term negative impact to our financial results and cash flows from operations. In such a situation we could fall out of compliance with our financial and other covenants which, if not waived, could limit our liquidity and capital resources. As of June 29, 2008 we were in compliance with all financial covenants under the credit agreements.

We currently carry a significant amount of debt and as such, our ability to execute on additional business opportunities may be limited due to existing borrowing capacity. In addition, given the relatively highly leveraged liquidity position, any down-turn in our operating earnings could impair our ability to comply with the financial covenants of our existing credit facility. If we anticipated a potential covenant violation, we would seek relief from our lenders. This relief would have some cost to us and such relief might not be on terms as favorable as those in its existing credit agreement. If we were to actually default due to our failure to meet the financial covenants of our credit agreement and inability to obtain a waiver from the lenders, our credit agreement could require us to immediately repay all amounts then outstanding under the credit agreement and/or require us to pay interest at default rates per the credit agreement.

In the event we were required to repay the amount outstanding under the existing credit facility, we would need to obtain alternative sources of financing to continue our operating activities at existing levels. There can be no assurance that alternative financing would be available on acceptable terms or at all.

Critical Accounting Principles and Estimates

There have been no significant changes to our Critical Accounting Policies or Estimates during 2008. Refer to our Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates in Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2007, as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on March 27, 2008.

Recent Accounting Pronouncements

In September 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 157, "Fair Value Measurements," (SFAS 157) which is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007 and for interim periods within those years. This statement defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value and expands the related disclosure requirements. This statement applies under other accounting pronouncements that require or permit fair value measurements. The statement indicates, among other things, that a fair value measurement assumes that the transaction to sell an asset or transfer a liability occurs in the principal market for the asset or liability or, in the absence of a principal market, the most advantageous market for the asset or liability. SFAS 157 defines fair value based upon an exit price model. Relative to SFAS 157, the FASB issued FASB Staff Positions (FSP) 157-1, 157-2, and proposed 157-c. FSP 157-1 amends SFAS 157 to exclude SFAS 13 and its related interpretive accounting pronouncements that address leasing transactions, while FSP 157-2 delays the effective date of SFAS 157 for all nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities, except those that are recognized or disclosed at fair value in the financial statements on a recurring basis. FSP 157-c clarifies the principles in SFAS 157 on the fair value measurement of liabilities. We adopted SFAS 157 as of January 1, 2008, with the exception of the application of the statement to non-recurring nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities. Refer to Note 9 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements for additional discussion on fair value measurements.

In February 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 159, "The Fair Value Option for Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities Including an amendment of FASB Statement No. 115," (SFAS 159) which is effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007. This statement permits entities to choose to measure many financial instruments and certain other items at fair value. This statement also establishes presentation and disclosure requirements designed to facilitate comparisons between entities that choose different measurement attributes for similar types of assets and liabilities. Unrealized gains and losses on items for which the fair value option is elected would be reported in earnings. The Company has adopted SFAS 159 as of January 1, 2008 and has elected not to measure any additional financial instruments or other items at fair value.

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 141 (revised 2007), "Business Combinations" (SFAS 141(R)), which replaces SFAS No. 141, "Business Combinations." SFAS 141(R) retains the underlying concepts of SFAS 141 in that all business combinations are still required to be accounted for at fair value under the acquisition method of accounting, but SFAS 141(R) changed the method of applying the acquisition method in a number of significant aspects. Acquisition costs will generally be expensed as incurred; noncontrolling interests will be valued at fair value at the acquisition date; in-process research and development will be recorded at fair value as an indefinite-lived intangible asset at the acquisition date; restructuring costs associated with a business combination will generally be expensed subsequent to the acquisition date; and any adjustments to an entity's deferred tax assets and uncertain tax positions that occur after the measurement period be recorded as a component of income tax expense. SFAS 141(R) is effective on a prospective basis for all business combinations for which the acquisition date is on or after the beginning of the first annual period subsequent to December 15, 2008. Additionally, SFAS 141 (R) is effective for changes to valuation allowances or acquired uncertain tax positions occurring after the effective date of SFAS 141 (R), where the acquisition date occurs prior to the effective date for SFAS 141 (R). Early adoption is not permitted. The Company is currently evaluating the effects, if any, that SFAS 141(R) may have on its financial statements; however, since the Company has significant acquired deferred tax assets for which full valuation allowances were recorded

at the acquisition date, SFAS 141(R) could significantly affect the results of operations if changes in the valuation allowances occur subsequent to adoption. For additional discussion on deferred tax valuation allowances, refer to Note 10 to the Consolidated Financial Statements in our 2007 Annual Report filed on Form 10-K.

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 160, "Noncontrolling Interests in Consolidated Financial Statements - an amendment of ARB No. 51." This statement is effective for fiscal years, and interim periods within those fiscal years, beginning on or after December 15, 2008, with earlier adoption prohibited. This statement requires the recognition of a noncontrolling interest (minority interest) as equity in the consolidated financial statements and separate from the parent's equity. The amount of net income attributable to the noncontrolling interest will be included in consolidated net income on the face of the income statement. It also amends certain of ARB No. 51's consolidation procedures for consistency with the requirements of SFAS 141(R). This statement also includes expanded disclosure requirements regarding the interests of the parent and its noncontrolling interest. The Company is currently evaluating this new statement and anticipates that the statement will not have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In December 2007, the EITF issued Issue No. 07-1, "Accounting for Collaborative Arrangements." This Issue is effective for financial statements issued for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and interim periods within those fiscal years, and shall be applied retrospectively to all prior periods presented for all collaborative arrangements existing as of the effective date. This Issue requires that transactions with third parties (i.e., revenue generated and costs incurred by the partners) should be reported in the appropriate line item in each company's financial statement pursuant to the guidance in EITF Issue No. 99-19, "Reporting Revenue Gross as a Principal versus Net as an Agent." This Issue also includes enhanced disclosure requirements regarding the nature and purpose of the arrangement, rights and obligations under the arrangement, accounting policy, amount and income statement classification of collaboration transactions between the parties. The Company is currently evaluating this new statement and anticipates that the statement will not have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In March 2008, the FASB issued SFAS No. 161, "Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities, an amendment of FASB Statement No. 133" (SFAS 161). This statement is intended to improve transparency in financial reporting by requiring enhanced disclosures of an entity's derivative instruments and hedging activities and their effects on the entity's financial position, financial performance, and cash flows. SFAS 161 applies to all derivative instruments within the scope of SFAS 133, "Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities" (SFAS 133) as well as related hedged items, bifurcated derivatives, and nonderivative instruments that are designated and qualify as hedging instruments. Entities with instruments subject to SFAS 161 must provide more robust qualitative disclosures and expanded quantitative disclosures. SFAS 161 is effective prospectively for financial statements issued for fiscal years and interim periods beginning after November 15, 2008, with early application permitted. The Company is currently evaluating the disclosure implications of this statement and anticipates that the statement will not have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In April 2008, the FASB issued FSP FAS No. 142-3, which amends the factors that must be considered in developing renewal or extension assumptions used to determine the useful life over which to amortize the cost of a recognized intangible asset under FAS No. 142, "Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets." The FSP requires an entity to consider its own assumptions about renewal or extension of the term of the arrangement, consistent with its expected use of the asset, and is an attempt to improve consistency between the useful life of a recognized intangible asset under FAS No. 142 and the period of expected cash flows used to measure the fair value of the asset under FAS No. 141, "Business Combinations." The FSP is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and the guidance for determining the useful life of a recognized intangible asset must be applied

prospectively to intangible assets acquired after the effective date. The FSP is not expected to have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In May 2008, the FASB issued Financial Accounting Standard (FAS) No. 162, "The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles." The statement is intended to improve financial reporting by identifying a consistent hierarchy for selecting accounting principles to be used in preparing financial statements that are prepared in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles. Unlike Statement on Auditing Standards (SAS) No. 69, "The Meaning of Present in Conformity With GAAP," FAS No. 162 is directed to the entity rather than the auditor. The statement is effective 60 days following the SEC's approval of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) amendments to AU Section 411, "The Meaning of Present Fairly in Conformity with GAAP," and is not expected to have any impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

In June 2008, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued FASB Staff Position (FSP) Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF) No. 03-6-1, "Determining Whether Instruments Granted in Share-Based Payment Transactions Are Participating Securities." Under the FSP, unvested share-based payment awards that contain rights to receive nonforfeitable dividends (whether paid or unpaid) are participating securities, and should be included in the two-class method of computing EPS. The FSP is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and interim periods within those years, and is not expected to have a significant impact on the Company's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk

The Company is exposed to market risk in connection with changes in interest rates, primarily in connection with outstanding balances under its credit facility with KeyBank National Association. Based on the Company's average outstanding balances during the six months ended June 29, 2008 a 1% change in the LIBOR rate would not impact the Company's financial position and results of operations as a result of the 4.25% LIBOR floor rate on our Credit Facility. We manage exposure to these risks through our operating and financing activities and, when deemed appropriate, through the use of derivative financial instruments. Derivative financial instruments are viewed as risk management tools and are not used for speculation or for trading purposes. Derivative financial instruments are contracted with investment grade counterparties to reduce exposure to nonperformance on such instruments.

Cash and cash equivalents as of June 29, 2008 were \$17.4 million and are primarily invested in money market interest bearing accounts. A hypothetical 10% adverse change in the average interest rate on our money market cash investments and short-term investments would have had no material effect on net income for the six months ended June 29, 2008.

Item 4. Controls and Procedures

We maintain disclosure controls and procedures, as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) promulgated under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, as amended ("Exchange Act"), designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed in our reports filed under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the Securities and Exchange Commission's rules and forms, and that such information is accumulated and communicated to our management, including our Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure. In designing and evaluating the disclosure controls and procedures, management recognized that any controls and procedures, no matter how well designed and operated, can provide only reasonable assurance of achieving the desired

control objectives, and management necessarily was required to apply its judgment in evaluating the cost benefit relationship of possible controls and procedures.

As required by Rule 13a-15(e) promulgated under the Exchange Act, we carried out an evaluation, under the supervision and with the participation of our management, including our Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer, of the effectiveness of the design and operation of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report. Based on the foregoing, our Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures were effective at the reasonable assurance level as of June 29, 2008.

There has been no change in our internal control over financial reporting during the quarter ended June 29, 2008 that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

PART II. OTHER INFORMATION

Item 1. Legal Proceedings

Contingencies

IPO Securities Litigation

Beginning in June 2001, the Company and certain of its officers and directors were named as defendants in several parallel class action shareholder complaints filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, now consolidated under the caption, *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation*, Case No. 01-CV-4779. In the amended complaint, the plaintiffs allege that the Company, certain of its officers and directors, and the underwriters of the Company's initial public offering ("IPO") violated section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 based on allegations that the Company's registration statement and prospectus failed to disclose material facts regarding the compensation to be received by, and the stock allocation practices of, the IPO underwriters. The plaintiffs seek unspecified monetary damages and other relief. Similar complaints were filed in the same court against hundreds of other public companies ("Issuers") that conducted IPOs of their common stock in the late 1990s and 2000 (the "IPO Cases").

In June 2004, the Issuers (including the Company) executed a settlement agreement with the plaintiffs that would, among other things, result in the dismissal with prejudice of all claims against the Issuers and their officers and directors and the assignment of certain potential Issuer claims to the plaintiffs. On February 15, 2005, the court issued a decision certifying a class action for settlement purposes and granting preliminary approval of the settlement subject to modification of certain bar orders contemplated by the settlement. On August 31, 2005, the court reaffirmed class certification and preliminary approval of the modified settlement in a comprehensive Order. On February 24, 2006, the court dismissed litigation filed against certain underwriters in connection with certain claims to be assigned under the settlement. On April 24, 2006, the court held a Final Fairness Hearing to determine whether to grant final approval of the settlement. On December 5, 2006, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the lower court's earlier decision certifying as class actions the six IPO Cases designated as "focus cases." Thereafter, the District Court ordered a stay of all proceedings in all of the IPO Cases pending the outcome of plaintiffs' petition to the Second Circuit for rehearing en banc and resolution of the class certification issue. On April 6, 2007, the Second Circuit denied plaintiffs' rehearing petition, but clarified that the plaintiffs may seek to certify a more limited class in the District Court. Accordingly, the settlement was terminated pursuant to stipulation and will not receive final approval.

Plaintiffs filed amended complaints in the six focus cases in August 2007. The Company is not one of the focus case issuers. In September 2007, the Company's named officers and directors again extended the tolling agreement with plaintiffs. In September 2007, plaintiffs moved to certify the classes alleged in the focus cases and to appoint class representatives and class counsel in those cases. The focus case issuers filed motions to dismiss the claims against them in November 2007 and an opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification in December 2007. The Court denied the motions to dismiss on March 16, 2008. A date for the focus case defendants to answer has not yet been set. Due to the inherent uncertainties of litigation, the ultimate outcome of this matter cannot be predicted. In accordance with FASB No. 5, "Accounting for Contingencies," the Company believes any contingent liability related to this claim is not probable or estimable and therefore no amounts have been accrued in regards to this matter.

2004 Securities Litigation

In August 2004, following the Company's announcement on August 4, 2004 that it intended to restate its financial statements for the fiscal years ended December 31, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003, the Company and certain of its current and former officers and directors were named as defendants ("Defendants") in several securities class action lawsuits filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California. These actions were filed on behalf of those who purchased, or otherwise acquired, the Company's common stock between April 26, 2000 and August 4, 2004. The lawsuits generally allege that, during that time period, Defendants made false and misleading statements to the investing public about the Company's business and financial results, causing its stock to trade at artificially inflated levels. Based on these allegations, the lawsuits allege that Defendants violated the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the plaintiffs seek unspecified damages. These actions have been consolidated into a single action *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 04CV1589-JAH. Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint on April 1, 2005. Defendants filed their motion to dismiss this first amended complaint on April 14, 2005. The plaintiffs then requested leave to amend their first amended complaint. The plaintiffs filed their Second Amended Complaint on June 9, 2005, this time on behalf of those who purchased, or otherwise acquired, the Company's common stock between May 5, 2003 and August 4, 2004. Defendants filed their motion to dismiss this Second Amended Complaint on July 14, 2005. The motion to dismiss was taken under submission on October 20, 2005 and on March 8, 2006, the Court granted the Defendants' motion. However, plaintiffs were granted the right to amend their complaint within 45 days and subsequently filed their Third Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint on April 24, 2006. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss this complaint on June 8, 2006. On May 7, 2007, the Court denied the Defendants' motion to dismiss. Defendants' filed their answer to the plaintiffs' complaint on July 13, 2007. In February 2008, following a voluntary mediation of the matter, the parties reached a tentative agreement to settle the class action. Under the tentative settlement, plaintiffs and the class will dismiss all claims, with prejudice, in exchange for a cash payment in the total amount of \$12 million. The Company's directors' and officers' liability insurers will pay the settlement amount in accordance with the Company's insurance policies, less any applicable retention or co-insurance obligations that are expected to be paid directly by the Company. The Company estimates that the amount of its payment toward the settlement will be approximately \$2.4 million. The Company has accrued approximately \$2.4 million as of June 29, 2008 related to this matter. In June, the parties executed a Memorandum of Understanding documenting the essential terms of the proposed settlement and the parties currently are drafting the documents necessary to seek a determination by the Court that the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate. The Company makes no assurances at this time that the parties will reach agreement on settlement terms, that the Court will approve the proposed settlement terms or that the matter ultimately will be settled. Despite the tentative settlement reached in this action, the Company believes that the allegations lack merit.

In 2004, two derivative lawsuits were filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California against certain of the Company's current and former officers and directors: *Pedicini v. Wireless Facilities, Inc.*, Case No. 04CV1663; and *Roth v. Wireless Facilities, Inc.*, Case No. 04CV1810. These actions were consolidated into a single action in *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Derivative Litigation*, Lead Case No 04CV1663-JAH. These lawsuits contain factual allegations that are substantially similar to those made in the class action lawsuits, but the plaintiffs in these lawsuits assert claims for breach of fiduciary duty, gross mismanagement, abuse of control, waste of corporate assets, violation of Sarbanes Oxley Act section 304, unjust enrichment and insider trading. The plaintiffs in these lawsuits seek unspecified damages and equitable and/or injunctive relief. The lead plaintiff filed a consolidated complaint on March 21, 2005. On May 3, 2005, the defendants filed motions to dismiss this action, to stay this action pending the resolution of the consolidated non-derivative securities case pending in the Southern District of California, and to dismiss the complaint against certain non-California resident defendants. Pursuant to a request by the Court, Defendants' motions were

withdrawn without prejudice pending a decision on defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint against the non-California resident defendants. On March 20, 2007, the Court ruled that it lacked personal jurisdiction over five of the six non-California defendants and dismissed them from the federal derivative complaint. On March 27, 2007, plaintiffs filed an amended derivative complaint setting forth all of the same allegations from the original complaint and adding allegations regarding the Company's stock option granting practices. Basically, plaintiffs allege that the Company "backdated" or "springloaded" employee stock option grants so that the options were granted at less than fair market value. The amended complaint names all of the original defendants (including those dismissed for lack of jurisdiction) as well as nine new defendants. On July 2, 2007, the non-California resident defendants moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction. On October 17, 2007, the Court took the motion under submission without oral argument. On February 26, 2008, the Court again ruled that it lacked personal jurisdiction over five of the six non-California defendants and dismissed them from the amended federal derivative complaint. Plaintiffs subsequently moved the Court for certification and entry of final judgment of the Court's order dismissing the non-residents for lack of personal jurisdiction so that the plaintiffs may seek immediate appellate review of the matter. On July 10, 2008, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for certification, which was not opposed by defendants. Plaintiffs have 30 days from that order to seek permission from the Ninth Circuit to appeal the jurisdictional order. The parties have conferred and discussed the Court's personal jurisdictional order and certification order and have stipulated to a briefing schedule for any remaining motions to dismiss that the Company, along with the individual defendants subject to the court's jurisdiction, may bring in an effort to dismiss the complaint as to them. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, such motions must be brought on or before August 6, 2008. The Company believes that the allegations lack merit and intends to vigorously defend all claims asserted. It is impossible at this time to assess whether or not the outcome of these proceedings will have a material adverse effect on the Company.

In April 2007, another derivative complaint was filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Hameed v. Tayebi, Case No. 07-CV-0680 BTM(RBB) (the "Hameed Action"), against several of the Company's current and former officers and directors. The allegations in this new derivative complaint mirror the amended allegations in the 2004 federal derivative action. Pursuant to the Court's order and agreement of the parties, the defendants' responses to the complaint in the Hameed Action were stayed until the Court ruled on the motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction in the 2004 derivative litigation. As noted above, on February 26, 2008, the Court ruled that it lacked personal jurisdiction over five of the non-California defendants named in the 2004 derivative action, including three that were also named in the Hameed Action. The parties have conferred and discussed the Court's order and have stipulated to a briefing schedule for any remaining motions to dismiss that the Company or the individual defendants may bring in an effort to dismiss the Hameed Action. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, such motions must be brought on or before August 6, 2008. At this time, the parties have not set a date by which such motions must be brought. The Company believes that the allegations lack merit and intends to vigorously defend all claims asserted. It is impossible at this time to assess whether or not the outcome of these proceedings will have a material adverse effect on the Company.

In August and September 2004, two virtually identical derivative lawsuits were filed in California Superior Court for San Diego County against certain of the Company's current and former officers and directors. These actions contain factual allegations similar to those of the federal lawsuits, but the plaintiffs in these cases assert claims for violations of California's insider trading laws, breaches of fiduciary duty, abuse of control, gross mismanagement, waste of corporate assets and unjust enrichment. The plaintiffs in these actions seek unspecified damages, equitable and/or injunctive relief and disgorgement of all profits, benefits and other compensation obtained by defendants. These lawsuits have been consolidated into one action *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Derivative Litigation*, California Superior Court, San Diego County, Lead Case No. GIC 834253. The plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Shareholder Derivative Complaint on October 14, 2004. This action has been stayed

pending a decision in federal court on a motion to dismiss the federal derivative lawsuits. In April 2008, the parties notified the Court of the status of the federal action and the court continued the stay for an additional six months. The Court also ordered the parties to file an updated status report in October 2008. The Company believes that the allegations lack merit and intends to vigorously defend all claims asserted. It is impossible at this time to assess whether or not the outcome of these proceedings will have a material adverse effect on the Company.

The Company has recorded an accrual for a contingent liability associated with the legal proceedings related to the derivative actions of \$0.8 million based on the Company's estimate of the potential amount it would have to pay in relation to these lawsuits.

2007 Securities Litigation

In March and April 2007, there were three federal class actions filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California against the Company and several of its current and former officers and directors. These class action lawsuits followed the Company's March 12, 2007 public announcement that it was conducting a voluntary internal review of its stock option granting processes. These actions have been consolidated into a single action, *In re Wireless Facilities, Inc. Securities Litigation II*, Master File No. 07-CV-0482-BTM-NLS. The consolidated class action complaint was filed on November 19, 2007. In March 2008, following a voluntary mediation of the matter, the parties reached a tentative agreement to settle the class action. Under the settlement proposal, plaintiffs and the class will dismiss all claims, with prejudice, in exchange for a cash payment in the amount of \$4.5 million. The Company's directors' and officers' liability insurers will pay the settlement amount, less any applicable retention or co-insurance obligations and contributions that are expected to be paid directly by the Company. The Company estimates that the total amount of its payment toward the settlement will be approximately \$1.7 million. The Company has accrued approximately \$1.7 million as of June 29, 2008 related to this matter. In May, the parties executed a Memorandum of Understanding documenting the essential terms of the proposed settlement and the parties currently are drafting the documents necessary to seek a determination by the Court that the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate. The Company makes no assurances at this time that the parties will reach agreement or settlement terms, the Court will approve the proposed settlement terms or that the matter ultimately will be settled. Despite the tentative settlement reached in this action, the Company believes that the allegations lack merit.

Other Litigation and Government Investigations

In January 2005, a former independent contractor of the Company filed a lawsuit in Brazil against the Company's subsidiary, WFI de Brazil, to which he had been assigned for a period of time. He sought to be designated an employee of WFI de Brazil and entitled to severance and related compensation pursuant to Brazilian labor law. The individual sought back wages, vacation pay, stock option compensation and related benefits in excess of \$0.5 million. This matter was argued before the appropriate labor court in July 2005 and in July, 2006, the labor court awarded the individual the Brazilian currency equivalent of approximately \$0.6 million for his back wages, vacation pay and certain other benefits. The Company filed an appeal in the matter on July 20, 2006 and is challenging the basis for the award on several theories. The Company has accrued approximately \$0.6 million as of June 29, 2008 related to this matter. On August 22, 2007, the appeals court partially upheld the Company's appeal, although it upheld the individual's designation as an employee. The court is reviewing possible damage calculations before publishing a final decision. The Company's counsel is preparing a motion for clarification of the judgment due to omissions in the decision.

On March 28, 2007, three plaintiffs, on behalf of a purported class of similarly situated employees and contractors, filed a lawsuit against the Company in the Superior Court of the State of California, Alameda County. The suit alleges various violations of the California Labor Code and seeks payments

for allegedly unpaid straight time and overtime, meal period pay and associated penalties. The Company and the plaintiffs have agreed to venue for the suit in San Diego County. Although the Company believes that the allegations lack merit, it has agreed in principle with the plaintiffs to settle their claims for an aggregate amount in the range of \$0.3 million to \$0.5 million, to include individual and incentive awards, attorneys' fees and administrative costs, subject to court approval. The actual amount paid by the Company will depend upon the number of responses received from members of the purported class of plaintiffs. The Company has recorded an accrual for a contingent liability associated with this legal proceeding in the amount of \$0.3 million.

On May 3, 2007, Kratos announced that it had filed a lawsuit against a former employee who previously served as its stock option administrator and left Kratos in mid-2004, and his spouse. The lawsuit sought to recover damages resulting from the theft by a former employee of Kratos stock options and common stock valued in excess of \$6.3 million. The thefts, which appear to have taken place during 2002 and 2003, were discovered through the Kratos review of its past practices related to the granting and pricing of employee stock options with the assistance of its outside counsel and forensic computer consultants. The complaint also alleged that the former employee attempted to cover up the scheme by, among other things, deleting entries from the records of Kratos.

Kratos promptly reported to the SEC the discovery of the theft. The SEC initiated an informal inquiry and commenced an enforcement action against the former employee. The U.S. Attorney's Office also forwarded a grand jury subpoena to Kratos seeking records related to the former employee and Kratos' historical option granting practices. The SEC filed a federal lawsuit and obtained a temporary restraining order and asset freeze against the former employee and his spouse. The U.S. Attorney's Office indicted him for the theft and he pled guilty to federal criminal charges and has been sentenced to 46 months in prison and currently is incarcerated. On April 1, 2008, the SEC notified Kratos that it had completed its informal investigation and that it did not intend to recommend any enforcement action by the SEC against the Company. Kratos has cooperated with, and intends to continue to cooperate with the U.S. Attorney's Office on this matter and otherwise. The former employee and his wife entered into a settlement agreement with Kratos on October 5, 2007, turning over substantially all of their assets to Kratos in settlement of the damages incurred in the theft. On February 15, 2008, the SEC approved the settlement. On February 19, 2008, the court entered a final judgment approving the settlement. Kratos has obtained the assets, which aggregate approximately \$3.4 million, and is in the process of liquidating the remaining assets which approximate \$0.1 million in value.

In addition to the foregoing matters, from time to time, the Company may become involved in various claims, lawsuits and legal proceedings that arise in the ordinary course of business. However, litigation is subject to inherent uncertainties, and an adverse result in these or other matters may arise from time to time that may harm the Company's business. The Company is currently not aware of any such legal proceedings or claims that it believes will have, individually or in the aggregate, a material adverse affect on our business, financial condition, operating results or cash flows.

Item 1A. Risk Factors

Risks Related to Our Business

You should carefully consider the following risk factors and all other information contained herein as well as the information included in this Quarterly Report, and other reports and filings made with the SEC in evaluating our business and prospects. Risks and uncertainties, in addition to those we describe below, that are not presently known to us or that we currently believe are immaterial may also impair our business operations. If any of the following risks occur, our business and financial results could be harmed and the price of our common stock could decline. You should also refer to the other information contained in this report, including our unaudited consolidated financial statements and related notes.

Edgar Filing: KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC. - Form 10-Q

Our business could be adversely affected by changes in the contracting or fiscal policies of the federal government and governmental entities.

We derive a significant portion of our revenue from contracts with the U.S. federal government and government agencies and subcontracts under federal government prime contracts, and the success of our business and growth of our business will continue to depend on our successful procurement of government contracts either directly or through prime contractors. Accordingly, changes in government contracting policies or government budgetary constraints could directly affect our financial performance. Among the factors that could adversely affect our business are:

changes in fiscal policies or decreases in available government funding, including budgetary constraints affecting federal government spending generally, or specific departments or agencies in particular;

the adoption of new laws or regulations or changes to existing laws or regulations;

changes in political or social attitudes with respect to security and defense issues;

changes in federal government programs or requirements, including the increased use of small business providers;

changes in or delays related to government restrictions on the export of defense articles and services;

potential delays or changes in the government appropriations process; and

delays in the payment of our invoices by government payment offices.

These and other factors could cause governments and government agencies, or prime contractors that use us as a subcontractor, to reduce their purchases under existing contracts, to exercise their rights to terminate contracts at-will or to abstain from exercising options to renew contracts, any of which could have an adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. Many of our government customers are subject to stringent budgetary constraints. The award of additional contracts from government agencies could be adversely affected by spending reductions or budget cutbacks at these agencies.

We derive a substantial amount of our revenues from the sale of our solutions either directly or indirectly to U.S. government entities pursuant to government contracts, which differ materially from standard commercial contracts, involve competitive bidding and may be subject to cancellation or delay without penalty, any of which may produce volatility in our revenues and earnings.

Government contracts frequently include provisions that are not standard in private commercial transactions, and are subject to laws and regulations that give the federal government rights and remedies not typically found in commercial contracts, including provisions permitting the federal government to:

terminate our existing contracts;

reduce potential future income from our existing contracts;

modify some of the terms and conditions in our existing contracts;

suspend or permanently prohibit us from doing business with the federal government or with any specific government agency;

impose fines and penalties;

subject us to criminal prosecution;

suspend work under existing multiple year contracts and related task orders if the necessary funds are not appropriated by Congress;

decline to exercise an option to extend an existing multiple year contract; and

claim rights in technologies and systems invented, developed or produced by us.

In addition, government contracts are frequently awarded only after formal competitive bidding processes, which have been and may continue to be protracted and typically impose provisions that permit cancellation in the event that necessary funds are unavailable to the public agency. Competitive procurements impose substantial costs and managerial time and effort in order to prepare bids and proposals for contracts that may not be awarded to us. In many cases, unsuccessful bidders for government agency contracts are provided the opportunity to formally protest certain contract awards through various agencies, administrative and judicial channels. The protest process may substantially delay a successful bidder's contract performance, result in cancellation of the contract award entirely and distract management. We may not be awarded contracts for which we bid, and substantial delays or cancellation of purchases may follow our successful bids as a result of such protests.

Certain of our government contracts also contain "organizational conflict of interest" clauses that could limit our ability to compete for certain related follow-on contracts. For example, when we work on the design of a particular solution, we may be precluded from competing for the contract to install that solution. While we actively monitor our contracts to avoid these conflicts, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to avoid all organizational conflict of interest issues.

We face intense competition from many competitors that have greater resources than we do, which could result in price reductions, reduced profitability or loss of market share.

We operate in highly competitive markets and generally encounter intense competition to win contracts from many other firms, including mid-tier federal contractors with specialized capabilities and large defense and IT services providers. Competition in our markets may increase as a result of a number of factors, such as the entrance of new or larger competitors, including those formed through alliances or consolidation. These competitors may have greater financial, technical, marketing and public relations resources, larger client bases and greater brand or name recognition than we do. These competitors could, among other things:

divert sales from us by winning very large-scale government contracts, a risk that is enhanced by the recent trend in government procurement practices to bundle services into larger contracts;

force us to charge lower prices; or

adversely affect our relationships with current clients, including our ability to continue to win competitively awarded engagements in which we are the incumbent.

If we lose business to our competitors or are forced to lower our prices, our revenue and our operating profits could decline. In addition, we may face competition from our subcontractors who, from time-to-time, seek to obtain prime contractor status on contracts for which they currently serve as a subcontractor to us. If one or more of our current subcontractors are awarded prime contractor status on such contracts in the future, it could divert sales from us or could force us to charge lower prices, which could cause our margins to suffer.

Recent acquisitions and potential future acquisitions could prove difficult to integrate, disrupt our business, dilute stockholder value and strain our resources.

We have completed several acquisitions of complementary businesses in recent years, including our December 2007 acquisition of Haverstick Consulting, Inc. and our June 2008 acquisition of SYS Technologies, Inc. The success of these acquisitions will depend in part on the success in integrating the

operations, technologies and personnel of Haverstick and SYS. The failure to successfully integrate the operations of the two companies or otherwise to realize any of the anticipated benefits of the acquisition could seriously harm our results of operations.

We continually evaluate opportunities to acquire new businesses as part of our ongoing strategy and we may in the future acquire additional companies that we believe could complement or expand our business or increase our customer base. Acquisitions involve numerous risks, including:

difficulties in integrating operations, technologies, accounting and personnel;

difficulties in supporting and transitioning customers of acquired companies;

difficulties or delays in transitioning federal government contracts pursuant to federal acquisition regulations;

diversion of financial and management resources from existing operations;

potential loss of key employees;

federal acquisition regulations may require us to enter into government novation agreements, a potentially time-consuming process; and

inability to generate sufficient revenue to offset acquisition costs.

Acquired companies may have liabilities or adverse operating issues that we fail to discover through due diligence prior to the acquisition. In particular, to the extent that prior owners of any acquired businesses or properties failed to comply with or otherwise violated applicable laws or regulations, or failed to fulfill their contractual obligations to the federal government or other clients, we, as the successor owner, may be financially responsible for these violations and failures and may suffer reputational harm or otherwise be adversely affected. Acquisitions also frequently result in the recording of goodwill and other intangible assets which are subject to potential impairments in the future that could harm our financial results. In addition, if we finance acquisitions by issuing convertible debt or equity securities, our existing stockholders may be diluted, which could affect the market price of our stock. As a result, if we fail to properly evaluate acquisitions or investments, we may not achieve the anticipated benefits of any such acquisitions, and we may incur costs in excess of what we anticipate.

We agreed to indemnify acquirers of our divested operations against specified losses in connection with the sale of these operations, and any demands for indemnification may result in expenses we do not anticipate and distract the attention of our management from our continuing businesses.

We agreed to indemnify acquirers of our divested operations against specified losses in connection with their sale and generally retain responsibility for various legal liabilities that accrued prior to closing. We also made representations and warranties to these acquirers about the condition of the divested businesses and agreed to working capital adjustment provisions that could obligate us to make substantial payments to some of these acquirers. If any acquirer makes an indemnification claim because it has suffered a loss or a third party has commenced an action against the divested business, or if we are required to make payments in settlement of working capital adjustments, we may incur substantial expenses resolving such claims or defending against the third party action, which would harm our operating results. In addition, our ability to defend ourselves may be impaired because our former employees are now employees of the acquirer or other companies, and our management may have to devote a substantial amount of time to resolving the claim. In addition, these indemnity claims may divert management attention from responsibilities related to the daily ongoing concerns of the

business. In addition, we may be required to expend substantial resources trying to determine which party has responsibility for the claim, even if we are ultimately found to be not responsible.

Our financial results may vary significantly from quarter to quarter.

We expect our revenue and operating results to vary from quarter to quarter. Reductions in revenue in a particular quarter could lead to lower profitability in that quarter because a relatively large amount of our expenses are fixed in the short-term. We may incur significant operating expenses during the start-up and early stages of large contracts and may not be able to recognize corresponding revenue in that same quarter. We may also incur additional expenses when contracts expire, are terminated or are not renewed.

In addition, payments due to us from federal government agencies may be delayed due to billing cycles or as a result of failures of government budgets to gain congressional and administration approval in a timely manner. The federal government's fiscal year ends September 30. If a federal budget for the next federal fiscal year has not been approved by that date in each year, our clients may have to suspend engagements that we are working on until a budget has been approved. Any such suspensions may reduce our revenue in the fourth quarter of that year or the first quarter of the subsequent year. The federal government's fiscal year end can also trigger increased purchase requests from clients for equipment and materials. Any increased purchase requests we receive as a result of the federal government's fiscal year end would serve to increase our third or fourth quarter revenue, but will generally decrease profit margins for that quarter, as these activities generally are not as profitable as our typical offerings.

Additional factors that may cause our financial results to fluctuate from quarter to quarter include those addressed elsewhere in these Risk Factors and the following, among others:

the terms of customer contracts that affect the timing of revenue recognition;

variability in demand for our services and solutions;

commencement, completion or termination of contracts during any particular quarter;

timing of award or performance incentive fee notices;

timing of significant bid and proposal costs;

variable purchasing patterns under the GSA Schedule 70 Contracts, government wide acquisition contracts (GWACs), blanket purchase agreements and other indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts;

restrictions on and delays related to the export of defense articles and services;

costs related to ongoing government inquiries;

strategic decisions by us or our competitors, such as acquisitions, divestitures, spin-offs and joint ventures;

strategic investments or changes in business strategy;

changes in the extent to which we use subcontractors;

seasonal fluctuations in our staff utilization rates;

changes in our effective tax rate including changes in our judgment as to the necessity of the valuation allowance recorded against our deferred tax assets; and

the length of sales cycles.

Significant fluctuations in our operating results for a particular quarter could cause us to fall out of compliance with the financial covenants contained in our credit facility, which if not waived by the lender, could restrict our access to capital and cause us to take extreme measures to pay down our debt under the credit facility. In addition, fluctuations in our financial results could cause our stock price to decline.

If we fail to establish and maintain important relationships with government entities and agencies and other government contractors, our ability to bid successfully for new business may be adversely affected.

To develop new business opportunities, we primarily rely on establishing and maintaining relationships with various government entities and agencies. We may be unable to successfully maintain our relationships with government entities and agencies, and any failure to do so could materially adversely affect our ability to compete successfully for new business. In addition, we often act as a subcontractor or in "teaming" arrangements in which we and other contractors bid together on particular contracts or programs for the federal government or government agencies. As a subcontractor or team member, we often lack control over fulfillment of a contract, and poor performance on the contract could tarnish our reputation, even when we perform as required. We expect to continue to depend on relationships with other contractors for a portion of our revenue in the foreseeable future. Moreover, our revenue and operating results could be materially adversely affected if any prime contractor or teammate chooses to offer a client services of the type that we provide or if any prime contractor or teammate teams with other companies to independently provide those services.

We derive a significant portion of our revenues from a limited number of customers.

We have derived, and believe that we will continue to derive, a significant portion of our revenues from a limited number of customers. To the extent that any significant customer uses less of our services or terminates its relationship with us, our revenues could decline significantly. As a result, the loss of any significant client could seriously harm our business. For the six month period ended June 29, 2008, two customers comprised approximately 69% and 52% of our federal business revenues and total revenues, respectively, and our five largest customers accounted for approximately 86% and 65% of our total federal business revenues and total revenues, respectively. None of our customers are obligated to purchase additional services from us. As a result, the volume of work that we perform for a specific customer is likely to vary from period to period, and a significant client in one period may not use our services in a subsequent period.

Our margins and operating results may suffer if we experience unfavorable changes in the proportion of cost-plus-fee or fixed-price contracts in our total contract mix.

Although fixed-price contracts entail a greater risk of a reduced profit or financial loss on a contract compared to other types of contracts we enter into, fixed-price contracts typically provide higher profit opportunities because we may be able to benefit from cost savings. In contrast, cost-plus-fee contracts are subject to statutory limits on profit margins, and generally are the least profitable of our contract types. Our federal government customers typically determine what type of contract we enter into. Cost-plus-fee and fixed-price contracts in our federal business accounted for approximately 37.7% and 36.8%, respectively, of our federal business revenues for the period ended June 29, 2008. To the extent that we enter into more cost-plus-fee or less fixed-price contracts in proportion to our total contract mix in the future, our margins and operating results may suffer.

Our cash flow and profitability could be reduced if expenditures are incurred prior to the final receipt of a contract.

We provide various professional services and sometimes procure equipment and materials on behalf of our federal government customers under various contractual arrangements. From time to time, in order to ensure that we satisfy our customers' delivery requirements and schedules, we may elect to initiate procurement in advance of receiving final authorization from the government customer or a prime contractor. If our government or prime contractor customers' requirements should change or if the government or the prime contractor should direct the anticipated procurement to a contractor other than us or if the equipment or materials become obsolete or require modification before we are under contract for the procurement, our investment in the equipment or materials might be at risk if we cannot efficiently resell them. This could reduce anticipated earnings or result in a loss, negatively affecting our cash flow and profitability.

Loss of our GSA contracts or GWACs would impair our ability to attract new business.

We are a prime contractor under several GSA contracts and GWAC schedule contracts. We believe that our ability to provide services under these contracts will continue to be important to our business because of the multiple opportunities for new engagements each contract provides. If we were to lose our position as prime contractor on one or more of these contracts, we could lose substantial revenues and our operating results could suffer. GSA contracts and other GWACs typically have a one or two-year initial term with multiple options exercisable at the government client's discretion to extend the contract for one or more years. We cannot be assured that our government clients will continue to exercise the options remaining on our current contracts, nor can we be assured that our future clients will exercise options on any contracts we may receive in the future.

Failure to properly manage projects may result in additional costs or claims.

Our engagements often involve large scale, highly complex projects. The quality of our performance on such projects depends in large part upon our ability to manage the relationship with our customers, and to effectively manage the project and deploy appropriate resources, including third-party contractors, and our own personnel, in a timely manner. Any defects or errors or failure to meet clients' expectations could result in claims for substantial damages against us. Our contracts generally limit our liability for damages that arise from negligent acts, error, mistakes or omissions in rendering services to our clients. However, we cannot be sure that these contractual provisions will protect us from liability for damages in the event we are sued. In addition, in certain instances, we guarantee customers that we will complete a project by a scheduled date. If the project experiences a performance problem, we may not be able to recover the additional costs we will incur, which could exceed revenues realized from a project. Finally, if we underestimate the resources or time we need to complete a project with capped or fixed fees, our operating results could be seriously harmed.

The loss of any member of our senior management could impair our relationships with federal government clients and disrupt the management of our business.

We believe that the success of our business and our ability to operate profitably depends on the continued contributions of the members of our senior management. We rely on our senior management to generate business and execute programs successfully. In addition, the relationships and reputation that many members of our senior management team have established and maintain with federal government personnel contribute to our ability to maintain strong client relationships and to identify new business opportunities. We do not have any employment agreements providing for a specific term of employment with any member of our senior management. The loss of any member of our senior management could impair our ability to identify and secure new contracts, to maintain good client relations and to otherwise manage our business.

If we fail to attract and retain skilled employees or employees with the necessary security clearances, we might not be able to perform under our contracts or win new business.

The growth of our business and revenue depends in large part upon our ability to attract and retain sufficient numbers of highly qualified individuals who have advanced information technology and/or engineering skills. These employees are in great demand and are likely to remain a limited resource in the foreseeable future. Certain federal government contracts require us, and some of our employees, to maintain security clearances. Obtaining and maintaining security clearances for employees involves a lengthy process, and it is difficult to identify, recruit and retain employees who already hold security clearances. In addition, some of our contracts contain provisions requiring us to staff an engagement with personnel that the client considers key to our successful performance under the contract. In the event we are unable to provide these key personnel or acceptable substitutions, the client may terminate the contract and we may lose revenue.

If we are unable to recruit and retain a sufficient number of qualified employees, our ability to maintain and grow our business could be limited. In a tight labor market, our direct labor costs could increase or we may be required to engage large numbers of subcontractor personnel, which could cause our profit margins to suffer. Conversely, if we maintain or increase our staffing levels in anticipation of one or more projects and the projects are delayed, reduced or terminated, we may underutilize the additional personnel, which would increase our general and administrative expenses, reduce our earnings and possibly harm our results of operations.

If our subcontractors fail to perform their contractual obligations, our performance and reputation as a prime contractor and our ability to obtain future business could suffer.

As a prime contractor, we often rely upon other companies to perform work we are obligated to perform for our clients as subcontractors. As we secure more work under our GWAC vehicles, we expect to require an increasing level of support from subcontractors that provide complementary and supplementary services to our offerings. Depending on labor market conditions, we may not be able to identify, hire and retain sufficient numbers of qualified employees to perform the task orders we expect to win. In such cases, we will need to rely on subcontracts with unrelated companies. Moreover, even in favorable labor market conditions, we anticipate entering into more subcontracts in the future as we expand our work under our GWACs. We are responsible for the work performed by our subcontractors, even though in some cases we have limited involvement in that work.

If one or more of our subcontractors fail to satisfactorily perform the agreed-upon services on a timely basis or violate federal government contracting policies, laws or regulations, our ability to perform our obligations as a prime contractor or meet our clients' expectations may be compromised. In extreme cases, performance or other deficiencies on the part of our subcontractors could result in a client terminating our contract for default. A termination for default could expose us to liability, including liability for the agency's costs of reprocurement, could damage our reputation and could hurt our ability to compete for future contracts.

Our failure to comply with complex procurement laws and regulations could cause us to lose business and subject us to a variety of penalties.

We must comply with laws and regulations relating to the formation, administration and performance of federal government contracts, which affect how we do business with our clients and may impose added costs on us. In addition, the federal government, including the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), audits and reviews our performance on contracts, pricing practices, cost structure and compliance with applicable laws, regulations and standards. The DCAA reviews a contractor's internal control systems and policies, including the contractor's purchasing, property, estimating, compensation and management information systems, and the contractor's compliance with

such policies. Any costs found to be improperly allocated to a specific contract will not be reimbursed, while such costs already reimbursed must be refunded. Adverse findings in a DCAA audit could materially affect our competitive position and result in a substantial adjustment to our revenue and profit.

The commercial business arena in which we operate has relatively low barriers to entry and increased competition could result in margin erosion, which would make profitability even more difficult to sustain.

Other than the technical skills required in our commercial business, the barriers to entry in this area are relatively low. We do not have any intellectual property rights in this segment of our business to protect our methods and business start-up costs do not pose a significant barrier to entry. The success of our commercial business is dependent on our employees, customer relations and the successful performance of our services. If we face increased competition as a result of new entrants in our markets, we could experience reduced operating margins and loss of market share and brand recognition.

If our commercial customers do not invest in security systems and other new in-building technologies such as wireless local area networks and/or IP-based networks, our business will suffer.

We intend to devote significant resources to developing our enterprise-based wireless local area networks (WLAN), but we cannot predict that we will achieve widespread market acceptance amongst the enterprises we identify as potential customers. It is possible that some enterprises will determine that capital constraints and other factors outweigh their need for WLAN systems. As a result, we may be affected by a significant delay in the adoption of WLAN by enterprises, which would harm our business.

If we experience systems or service failure, our reputation could be harmed and our clients could assert claims against us for damages or refunds.

We create, implement and maintain IT solutions that are often critical to our clients' operations. We have experienced, and may in the future experience, some systems and service failures, schedule or delivery delays and other problems in connection with our work. If we experience these problems, we may:

lose revenue due to adverse client reaction;

be required to provide additional services to a client at no charge;

receive negative publicity, which could damage our reputation and adversely affect our ability to attract or retain clients; and

suffer claims for substantial damages.

In addition to any costs resulting from product or service warranties, contract performance or required corrective action, these failures may result in increased costs or loss of revenue if clients postpone subsequently scheduled work or cancel, or fail to renew, contracts.

While many of our contracts limit our liability for consequential damages that may arise from negligence in rendering services to our clients, we cannot assure you that these contractual provisions will be legally sufficient to protect us if we are sued. In addition, our errors and omissions and product liability insurance coverage may not be adequate, may not continue to be available on reasonable terms or in sufficient amounts to cover one or more large claims, or the insurer may disclaim coverage as to some types of future claims. The successful assertion of any large claim against us could seriously harm our business. Even if not successful, these claims could result in significant legal and other costs, may be a distraction to our management and may harm our reputation.

Security breaches in sensitive federal government systems could result in the loss of clients and negative publicity.

Many of the systems we develop, install and maintain involve managing and protecting information involved in intelligence, national security and other sensitive or classified federal government functions. A security breach in one of these systems could cause serious harm to our business, damage our reputation and prevent us from being eligible for further work on sensitive or classified systems for federal government clients. We could incur losses from such a security breach that could exceed the policy limits under our errors and omissions and product liability insurance. Damage to our reputation or limitations on our eligibility for additional work resulting from a security breach in one of the systems we develop, install and maintain could materially reduce our revenue.

Our employees may engage in misconduct or other improper activities, which could cause us to lose contracts.

We are exposed to the risk that employee fraud or other misconduct could occur. Misconduct by employees could include intentional failures to comply with federal government procurement regulations, engaging in unauthorized activities or falsifying time records. Employee misconduct could also involve the improper use of our clients' sensitive or classified information, which could result in regulatory sanctions against us and serious harm to our reputation and could result in a loss of contracts and a reduction in revenues. It is not always possible to deter employee misconduct, and the precautions we take to prevent and detect this activity may not be effective in controlling unknown or unmanaged risks or losses, which could cause us to lose contracts or cause a reduction in revenues.

Our business is dependent upon our ability to keep pace with the latest technological changes.

The market for our services is characterized by rapid change and technological improvements. Failure to respond in a timely and cost effective way to these technological developments would result in serious harm to our business and operating results. We have derived, and we expect to continue to derive, a substantial portion of our revenues from providing innovative engineering services and technical solutions that are based upon today's leading technologies and that are capable of adapting to future technologies. As a result, our success will depend, in part, on our ability to develop and market service offerings that respond in a timely manner to the technological advances of our customers, evolving industry standards and changing client preferences.

If we are unable to manage our growth, our business could be adversely affected.

Sustaining our growth has placed significant demands on our management, as well as on our administrative, operational and financial resources. For us to continue to manage our growth, we must continue to improve our operational, financial and management information systems and expand, motivate and manage our workforce. If we are unable to manage our growth while maintaining our quality of service and profit margins, or if new systems that we implement to assist in managing our growth do not produce the expected benefits, our business, prospects, financial condition or operating results could be adversely affected.

We may be harmed by intellectual property infringement claims and our failure to protect our intellectual property could enable competitors to market products and services with similar features.

We may become subject to claims from our employees or third parties who assert that software and other forms of intellectual property that we use in delivering services and solutions to our clients infringe upon intellectual property rights of such employees or third parties. Our employees develop some of the software and other forms of intellectual property that we use to provide our services and solutions to our clients, but we also license technology from other vendors. If our employees, vendors,

or other third parties assert claims that we or our clients are infringing on their intellectual property rights, we could incur substantial costs to defend those claims. If any of these infringement claims are ultimately successful, we could be required to cease selling or using products or services that incorporate the challenged software or technology, obtain a license or additional licenses from our employees, vendors, or other third parties, or redesign our products and services that rely on the challenged software or technology.

We attempt to protect our trade secrets by entering into confidentiality and intellectual property assignment agreements with third parties, our employees and consultants. However, these agreements can be breached and, if they are, there may not be an adequate remedy available to us. In addition, others may independently discover our trade secrets and proprietary information and in such cases we could not assert any trade secret rights against such party. Enforcing a claim that a party illegally obtained and is using our trade secret is difficult, expensive and time consuming, and the outcome is unpredictable. If we are unable to protect our intellectual property, our competitors could market services or products similar to our services and products, which could reduce demand for our offerings. Any litigation to enforce our intellectual property rights, protect our trade secrets or determine the validity and scope of the proprietary rights of others could result in substantial costs and diversion of resources, with no assurance of success.

The matters relating to our internal review of our stock option granting practices and the restatement of our financial statements have exposed us to civil litigation claims, regulatory proceedings and government proceedings which could have a material adverse effect on us.

In the summer of 2006, our current executive management team, which has been in place since 2004, initiated an investigation of our past stock option granting practices (the "Equity Award Review") in reaction to media reports regarding stock option granting practices of public companies. The Equity Award Review was conducted with oversight from the Board and assistance from our outside counsel. In February 2007, the Board appointed a Special Committee of the Board to review the adequacy of the Equity Award Review and the recommendations of management regarding historical option granting practices, and to make recommendations and findings regarding those practices and individual conduct. The Special Committee was not charged with making, and did not make, any evaluation of the accounting determinations or tax adjustments. The Special Committee was comprised of a non-employee director who had not served on our Compensation Committee before 2005.

The Equity Award Review encompassed all grants of options to purchase shares of our common stock and other equity awards made since two months prior to our IPO in November 1999 through December 2006. We also reviewed all option grants that were entered into our stock option database (Equity Edge) after our IPO with a grant date before November 1999, as well as other substantial grants issued prior to our IPO, consisting of more than 14,000 grants. We further reviewed all option grants with a grant date that preceded an employee's date of hire. As part of the review, interviews of 18 current and former officers, directors, employees and attorneys were conducted, and more than 40 million pages of electronic and hard copy documents were searched for relevant information. The Special Committee also conducted its own separate review of the option granting practices during the tenure of current executive management team through additional interviews and document collection and review with the assistance of its own separate counsel and FTI Consulting.

The Equity Award Review established the absence of contemporaneous evidence supporting a substantial number of the previously-recorded option grants, substantially all of which were made in the period from 1998 through late 2003. During this period of time, in some instances, documents, data and interviews suggest that option grants were prepared or finalized days or, in some cases, weeks or months after the option grant date recorded in our books. The affected grants include options issued to certain newly-hired employees but dated prior to their employment start dates and options issued to non-employees, including advisors to the Board erroneously designated as employees. The Special

Committee also concluded that certain former employees and former officers participated in making improper option grants, including the selection of grant dates with the benefit of hindsight, and in the deferral of the recording of otherwise approved option grants.

In light of the Equity Award Review, the Audit Committee of our Board concluded that our prior financial statements for periods from 1998 through our filing of interim financial statements for the period ended September 30, 2006, could no longer be relied upon and must be restated. Our management determined that, from fiscal year 1998 through fiscal year 2005, we had unrecorded non-cash equity-based compensation charges associated with our equity incentive plans. These charges are material to our financial statements for the years ended December 31, 1998 through 2005, the periods to which such charges would have related. Previously filed annual reports on Form 10-K and quarterly reports on Form 10-Q affected by the restatements have not been and will not be amended and should not be relied upon. Our Annual Report on Form 10-K filed on September 11, 2007 superseded and replaced in their entirety all of our previously issued financial statements and related reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Our past stock option granting practices and the restatement of our prior financial statements have exposed and may continue to expose us to greater risks associated with litigation, regulatory proceedings and government inquiries and enforcement actions. As described in Part II, Item 1, "Legal Proceedings," several derivative complaints have been filed in state and federal courts against our current directors, some of our former directors and some of our current and former executive officers pertaining to allegations relating to stock option grants. The SEC initiated an informal inquiry into our historical stock option granting practices and we received a subpoena from the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of California for the production of documents relating to our historical stock option granting practices. On April 1, 2008, the SEC notified us that it had completed its informal investigation and that it did not intend to recommend any enforcement action by the SEC against us. We are cooperating with the the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of California, and expect to continue to do so.

The period of time necessary to resolve the U.S. Attorneys Office inquiry is uncertain, and we cannot predict the outcome of the inquiry or whether we will face additional government inquiries, investigations or other actions related to our historical stock option grant practices. Subject to certain limitations, we are obligated to indemnify our current and former directors, officers and employees in connection with the investigation of our historical stock option practices, the pending DOJ and recently concluded SEC inquiries and any future government inquiries, investigations or actions. These inquiries could require us to expend significant management time and incur significant legal and other expenses, and could result in civil and criminal actions seeking, among other things, injunctions against us and the payment of significant fines and penalties by us, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, business, results of operations and cash flow.

If a federal government investigation uncovers improper or illegal activities, including any potential improper or illegal activities related to our stock option review or related matters, we may be subject to civil and criminal penalties and administrative sanctions, including termination of contracts, forfeiture of profits, suspension of payments, fines and suspension or debarment from doing business with federal government agencies. In addition, we could suffer serious harm to our reputation and competitive position if allegations of impropriety were made against us, whether or not true. If our reputation or relationship with federal government agencies were impaired, or if the federal government otherwise ceased doing business with us or significantly decreased the amount of business it does with us, our revenue and operating profit would decline.

If we fail to maintain an effective system of internal controls, we may not be able to accurately report our financial results or prevent fraud.

Effective internal controls are necessary for us to provide reliable financial reports. If we cannot provide reliable financial reports, our operating results could be misstated, our reputation may be harmed and the trading price of our stock could be negatively affected. Our management has concluded that there are no material weaknesses in our internal controls over financial reporting as of December 31, 2007. However, there can be no assurance that our controls over financial processes and reporting will be effective in the future or that additional material weaknesses or significant deficiencies in our internal controls will not be discovered in the future. Any failure to remediate any future material weaknesses or implement required new or improved controls, or difficulties encountered in their implementation, could harm our operating results, cause us to fail to meet our reporting obligations or result in material misstatements in our financial statements or other public disclosures. Inferior internal controls could also cause investors to lose confidence in our reported financial information, which could have a negative effect on the trading price of our stock. In addition, from time to time we acquire businesses which could have limited infrastructure and systems of internal controls. Performing assessments of internal controls, implementing necessary changes, and maintaining an effective internal controls process is costly and requires considerable management attention, particularly in the case of newly acquired entities.

We may need additional capital in the future to fund the growth of our business, and financing may not be available.

We currently anticipate that our available capital resources, including our credit facility and operating cash flows, will be sufficient to meet our expected working capital and capital expenditure requirements for at least the next 12 months. However, such resources may not be sufficient to fund the long-term growth of our business or the expenses associated with the ongoing litigation, litigation settlements and government inquiries. In particular, we may experience a negative operating cash flow due to billing milestones and project timelines in certain of our contracts.

We may raise additional funds through public or private debt or equity financings if such financings become available on favorable terms or we may expand our credit facility to fund future acquisitions and for general corporate purposes. However, due to the current challenges in the lending markets, we can provide no assurance that the lender would agree to extend additional or continuing credit under that facility. We could fall out of compliance with financial and other covenants contained in our credit facility which, if not waived, would restrict our access to capital and could require us to pay down our existing debt under the credit facility. Any new financing or offerings would likely dilute our stockholders' equity ownership. In addition, additional financing may not be available on terms favorable to us, or at all. If adequate funds are not available or are not available on acceptable terms, we may not be able to take advantage of unanticipated opportunities, develop new products or otherwise respond to competitive pressures. In any such case, our business, operating results or financial condition could be materially adversely affected.

Our ability to make payments on our debt will be contingent on our future operating performance, which will depend on a number of factors that are outside of our control.

Our debt service obligations are estimated to be approximately \$11 million to \$13 million in 2008, including approximately \$2.6 million of principal repayments. This debt service may have an adverse impact on our earnings and cash flow, which could in turn negatively impact our stock price.

Our ability to make principal and interest payments on our debt is contingent on our future operating performance, which will depend on a number of factors, many of which are outside of our

control. The degree to which we are leveraged could have other important negative consequences, including the following:

we must dedicate a substantial portion of our cash flows from operations to the payment of our indebtedness, reducing the funds available for future working capital requirements, capital expenditures, acquisitions or other general corporate requirements;

a significant portion of our borrowings are, and will continue to be, at variable rates of interest, which may result in higher interest expense in the event of increases in interest rates;

we may be more vulnerable to a downturn in the industries in which we operate or a downturn in the economy in general;

we may be limited in our flexibility to plan for, or react to, changes in our businesses and the industries in which we operate;

we may be placed at a competitive disadvantage compared to our competitors that have less debt;

we may determine it to be necessary to dispose of certain assets or one or more of our businesses to reduce our debt; and

our ability to borrow additional funds in excess of our current financing may be limited.

We may not generate sufficient cash flow from operations and future borrowings may not be available in amounts sufficient to enable us to pay our indebtedness or to fund our other liquidity needs. Moreover, we may need to refinance all or a portion of our indebtedness on or before maturity. In such a case, we cannot make assurances that we will be able to refinance any of our indebtedness on commercially reasonable terms or at all. If we are unable to make scheduled debt payments or comply with the other provisions of our debt instruments, our various lenders may be permitted under certain circumstances to accelerate the maturity of the indebtedness owed to them and exercise other remedies provided for in those instruments and under applicable law.

We are subject to restrictive debt covenants pursuant to our indebtedness. These covenants may restrict our ability to finance our business and, if we do not comply with the covenants or otherwise default under them, we may not have the funds necessary to pay all amounts that could become due and the lenders could foreclose on substantially all of our assets.

Our indebtedness contains covenants that, among other things, significantly restricts and, in some cases, effectively eliminates our ability and the ability of our subsidiaries to:

incur additional debt;

create or incur liens;

secure performance bonds by letters of credit, thereby limiting the amount of work we may bid on or perform;

pay dividends or make other equity distributions to our stockholders;

make investments;

sell assets;

issue or become liable on a guarantee;

create or acquire new subsidiaries;

effect a merger or consolidation, or sell all or substantially all of our assets; and

raise capital via equity securities.

In addition, we must comply with certain financial covenants. In the event we failed to meet any of such covenants and were unable to cure such breach or otherwise renegotiate such covenants, our lenders would have significant rights to deny future access to liquidity and/or seize control of substantially all of our assets. The material financial covenants with which we must comply include a maximum first lien leverage ratio, a maximum total leverage ratio, a minimum liquidity ratio, a minimum fixed charge coverage ratio, and a minimum consolidated EBITDA.

The covenants contained in our indebtedness and any credit agreement governing future debt may significantly restrict our future operations. Furthermore, upon the occurrence of any event of default, our lenders could elect to declare all amounts outstanding under such agreements, together with accrued interest, to be immediately due and payable. If those lenders were to accelerate the payment of those amounts, our assets may not be sufficient to repay those amounts in full.

We are also subject to interest rate risk due to our indebtedness at variable interest rates, based on a base rate or LIBOR plus an applicable margin. Shifts in interest rates could have a material adverse effect on us.

We may be required to prepay our indebtedness prior to its stated maturity, which may limit our ability to pursue business opportunities.

Pursuant to the terms of certain of our indebtedness, in certain instances we are required to prepay outstanding indebtedness prior to its stated maturity date. Specifically, certain non-recurring cash inflows such as proceeds from asset sales, insurance recoveries, and equity offerings may have to be used to pay down indebtedness and may not be reborrowed. These prepayment provisions may limit our ability to utilize this cash flow to pursue business opportunities.

Our stock price may be volatile, which may result in lawsuits against us and our officers and directors.

The stock market in general and the stock prices of government services companies in particular, have experienced volatility that has often been unrelated to or disproportionate to the operating performance of those companies. The market price of our common stock has fluctuated in the past and is likely to fluctuate in the future. Factors which could have a significant impact on the market price of our common stock include, but are not limited to, the following:

quarterly variations in operating results;

announcements of new services by us or our competitors;

the gain or loss of significant customers;

changes in analysts' earnings estimates;

rumors or dissemination of false information;

pricing pressures;

short selling of our common stock;

impact of litigation and ongoing government inquiries;

general conditions in the market;

political and/or military events associated with current worldwide conflicts; and

events affecting other companies that investors deem comparable to us.

Edgar Filing: KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC. - Form 10-Q

Companies that have experienced volatility in the market price of their stock have frequently been the object of securities class action litigation. We and certain of our current and former officers and directors have been named defendants in class action and derivative lawsuits. These matters and any other securities class action litigation and derivative lawsuits in which we may be involved could result in substantial costs to us and a diversion of our management's attention and resources, which could materially harm our financial condition and results of operations.

Our charter documents and Delaware law may deter potential acquirers and may depress our stock price.

Certain provisions of our charter documents and Delaware law, as well as certain agreements we have with our executives, could make it substantially more difficult for a third party to acquire control of us. These provisions include:

authorizing the board of directors to issue preferred stock;

prohibiting cumulative voting in the election of directors;

prohibiting stockholder action by written consent;

establishing advance notice requirements for nominations for election to our board of directors or for proposing matters that can be acted on by stockholders at meetings of our stockholders;

Section 203 of the Delaware General Corporation Law, which prohibits us from engaging in a business combination with an interested stockholder unless specific conditions are met; and

a number of our executives have agreements with us that entitle them to payments in certain circumstances following a change in control.

We have a stockholder rights plan which may discourage certain types of transactions involving an actual or potential change in control and may limit our stockholders' ability to approve transactions that they deem to be in their best interests. As a result, these provisions may depress our stock price.

We may incur goodwill impairment charges in our reporting entities which could harm our profitability.

A significant portion of our net assets come from goodwill and other intangible assets. In accordance with Statement of Financial Accounting Standards, or SFAS, No. 142, "Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets," we periodically review the carrying values of our goodwill to determine whether such carrying values exceed the fair market value. Our acquired companies are subject to annual review for goodwill impairment. If impairment testing indicates that the carrying value of a reporting unit exceeds its fair value, the goodwill of the reporting unit is deemed impaired. Accordingly, an impairment charge would be recognized for that reporting unit in the period identified, which could reduce our profitability.

Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Uses of Proceeds

In February 2008, the Company and the former shareholders of Haverstick Consulting, Inc. agreed on the working capital calculation called for in the Agreement and Plan of Reorganization dated as of November 2, 2007. The calculation resulted in a working capital adjustment due to Haverstick in an amount of \$1.5 million. The working capital adjustment was paid in part with 697,315 shares of Company stock. The shares issued pursuant to the settlement of the working capital adjustment with Haverstick were issued without registration under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the "Securities Act"), in reliance upon the exemption provided by Section 4(2) under the Securities Act and Regulation D thereunder.

Item 4. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders

At the Company's Annual Meeting of Stockholders held on June 25, 2008, the following individuals were re-elected as directors of the Company for one-year terms: Scott I. Anderson, Bandel L. Carano, Eric M. DeMarco, William A. Hoglund and Scot B. Jarvis. For each elected director the results of the voting were:

	Affirmative Votes	Votes Withheld
Scott I. Anderson	59,684,244	15,993,771
Bandel L. Carano	58,025,941	17,652,074
Eric M. DeMarco	75,149,665	528,650
William A. Hoglund	57,995,904	17,682,111
Scot B. Jarvis	58,542,077	17,135,938

At the Annual Meeting our stockholders also voted to approve the following proposals:

Ratify Grant Thornton LLP Ernst & Young LLP as the Company's independent registered public accounting firm for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2008. The results of the voting on this proposal were:

Affirmative Votes	Negative Votes	Abstentions	Broker Non-Votes
75,482,303	117,920	77,791	0

Approve an amendment to the Kratos 1999 Employee Stock Purchase Plan to increase the aggregate number of shares that may be issued under the plan by 1,500,000 shares. The results of the voting on this proposal were:

Affirmative Votes	Negative Votes	Abstentions	Broker Non-Votes
59,081,246	1,757,053	276,999	14,562,717

Approve an amendment to the Kratos 2005 Equity Incentive Plan to increase the aggregate number of shares that may be issued under the plan by 2,500,000 shares. The results of the voting on this proposal were:

Affirmative Votes	Negative Votes	Abstentions	Broker Non-Votes
43,593,103	17,243,783	273,412	14,562,717

Approve the issuance of the Company's common stock pursuant to the Agreement and Plan of Merger and Reorganization, dated as of February 20, 2008, by and among the Company, White Shadow, Inc. and SYS. The results of the voting on this proposal were:

Affirmative Votes	Negative Votes	Abstentions	Broker Non-Votes
59,866,750	280,867	67,861	14,562,717

To approve any motion to adjourn or postpone the Annual Meeting to a later day or dates, if necessary, to solicit additional proxies if there are insufficient votes at the time of the Annual Meeting to approve the proposals listed above. The results of the voting on this proposal were:

Affirmative Votes	Negative Votes	Abstentions	Broker Non-Votes
55,981,894	19,563,830	132,291	

71

Item 6. Exhibits

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Description	Incorporated by Reference		Filed Furnished Herewith
		Form	Filing Date/ Period End Date	
2.1	Agreement, dated as of March 9, 2007, by and between LCC Wireless Engineering Services Limited and the Company**	10K	12/31/06	
2.2	Asset Purchase Agreement, dated May 29, 2007, by and between the Company and LCC International, Inc.**	8-K	05/30/07	
2.3	Asset Purchase Agreement, dated July 7, 2007, by and between the Company and Burgundy Acquisition Corporation**	8-K	07/12/07	
2.4	Agreement and Plan of Merger dated November 2, 2007, by and among the Company, Kratos Government Solutions, Haverstick Acquisition Corp. and Haverstick Consulting, Inc.**	8-K	11/7/07	
2.5	Agreement and Plan of Merger and Reorganization, dated February 20, 2008 by and among the Company, White Shadow, Inc. and SYS**	8-K	2/21/08	
3.1	Amended and Restated Certificate of Incorporation	10-Q	09/30/01	
3.2	Certificate of Ownership and Merger of Kratos Defense & Security Solutions, Inc. into Wireless Facilities, Inc.	8-K	9/12/07	
3.3	Amended and Restated Bylaws	10K/A	4/29/08	
3.4	Certificate of Designations, Preferences and Rights of Series A Preferred Stock	10-Q	09/30/01	
3.5	Certificate of Designations, Preferences and Rights of Series B Preferred Stock	8-K/A	06/05/02	
3.6	Certificate of Designation of Series C Preferred Stock	8-K	12/17/04	
4.1	Reference is made to Exhibits 3.1 and 3.2			
4.2	Specimen Stock Certificate.	S-1	08/18/99	
4.3	Rights Agreement, dated as of December 16, 2004, between the Company and Wells Fargo, N.A.	8-K	12/17/04	
10.1	Second Amendment to First Lien Credit Agreement, dated as of June 26, 2008, among Kratos Defense & Security Solutions, Inc., KeyBank National Association, as Administrative Agent and Lender and the other financial institutions parties thereto and KeyBanc Capital Markets as lead arranger and book runner.	8-K	6/28/2008	

Edgar Filing: KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY SOLUTIONS, INC. - Form 10-Q

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Description	Incorporated by Reference		Filed Furnished Herewith
		Form	Filing Date/ Period End Date	
10.2	Second Amendment to Second Lien Credit Agreement, dated as of June 26, 2008, among Kratos Defense & Security Solutions, Inc., KeyBank National Association, as Administrative Agent and Lender, the other financial institutions parties thereto and KeyBanc Capital Markets as lead arranger and book runner.	8-K	6/28/2008	
10.3	Executive Employment Agreement Amended and Restated as of August 4, 2008 Eric DeMarco			*
10.4	Executive Employment Agreement Amended and Restated as of August 4, 2008 Deanna Lund			*
10.5	Executive Employment Agreement Amended and Restated as of August 4, 2008 Laura Siegal			*
31.1	Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes Oxley Act of 2002			*
31.2	Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes Oxley Act of 2002			*
32.1	Certification pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002			*
32.2	Certification pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002			*

*

Filed-Furnished Herewith

**

Certain schedules and exhibits referenced in the merger agreement have been omitted in accordance with Item 601(b)(2) of Regulation S-K. A copy of any omitted schedules and/or exhibits will be furnished supplementally to the SEC upon request.

SIGNATURE

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Act of 1934, as amended, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

KRATOS DEFENSE & SECURITY
SOLUTIONS, INC.

By: /s/ ERIC M. DEMARCO

Eric M. DeMarco
Chief Executive Officer, President

By: /s/ DEANNA H. LUND

Deanna H. Lund
*Senior Vice President, Chief Financial
Officer*

By: /s/ LAURA L. SIEGAL

Laura L. Siegal
*Vice President, Corporate Controller and
Principal Accounting Officer*

Date: August 6, 2008

QuickLinks

PART I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Item 1. Financial Statements

Item 2. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations

Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk

Item 4. Controls and Procedures

PART II. OTHER INFORMATION

Item 1. Legal Proceedings

Item 1A. Risk Factors

Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Uses of Proceeds

Item 4. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders

Item 6. Exhibits

SIGNATURE