
**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549**

**FORM 10-Q
(Amendment No. 1)**

Quarterly Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

For the quarterly period ended: **September 30, 2007**

Transition Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Commission file number: **1-8443**

TELOS CORPORATION

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Maryland
(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)

19886 Ashburn Road, Ashburn, Virginia
(Address of principal executive offices)

52-0880974
(I.R.S. Employer
Identification No.)

20147-2358
(Zip Code)

(703) 724-3800
(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

N/A
(Former name, former address and former fiscal year, if changed since last report)

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, or a non-accelerated filer. See definition of "accelerated filer and large accelerated filer" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large Accelerated Filer Accelerated Filer Non-Accelerated Filer

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 November 8, 2007, the registrant had outstanding 21,171,202 shares of Class A Common Stock, no par value; and 4,037,628 shares of Class B Common Stock, no par value.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

This amended Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q of Telos Corporation for the quarter ended September 30, 2007 (the "Form 10-Q/A") is being filed as a result of an inadvertent transmission error that caused the omission of Note 8 in Item 1 of Part I. While the Form 10-Q filed on November 19, 2007 included Exhibit 10.17 relating to Note 8, the exhibit is hereby attached accompanying Note 8 in Item 1 of Part I. This Amendment No. 1 to the Form 10-Q sets forth the complete text of Part I, Item 1, as corrected, and updates the signature page and Exhibits 31.1, 31.2, and 32.

Except for the matter described above, all other information in the Original Report, including the financial statements, is unchanged. This amendment does not modify or update disclosures to reflect developments since the filing date of the Original Report.

As required by Rule 12b-15 promulgated under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, this Form 10-Q/A includes currently dated certifications from the Company's Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer as required by Sections 302 and 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.

TELOS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
<u>PART I—FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u>	
Item 1. Financial Statements	
Condensed Consolidated Statements of Operations for the Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2007 and 2006 (unaudited)	4
Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets as of September 30, 2007 (unaudited) and December 31, 2006	5-6
Condensed Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the Nine Months Ended September 30, 2007 and 2006 (unaudited)	7
Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements (unaudited)	7-19
<u>PART II—OTHER INFORMATION</u>	
Item 6. Exhibits	20
SIGNATURES	21

PART I—FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Item 1. Financial Statements

TELOS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS
(Unaudited)
(amounts in thousands)

	Three Months Ended September 30,		Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2007	2006	2007	2006
Revenue				
Products	\$39,715	\$22,712	\$ 98,572	\$ 48,434
Services	21,278	12,381	64,031	47,646
	<u>60,993</u>	<u>35,093</u>	<u>162,603</u>	<u>96,080</u>
Costs and expenses				
Cost of sales—Products	36,449	21,689	84,413	45,939
Cost of sales—Services	15,559	9,817	44,921	35,098
Selling, general and administrative expenses	6,076	7,212	22,439	24,571
	<u>2,909</u>	<u>(3,625)</u>	<u>10,830</u>	<u>(9,528)</u>
Operating income (loss)				
Other income (expenses)				
Other income	35	14	39	29
Gain on sale of TIMS LLC membership interest (Note 2)	—	—	5,803	—
Losses from affiliates	—	—	—	(92)
Interest expense	(2,146)	(2,270)	(6,271)	(18,309)
	<u>798</u>	<u>(5,881)</u>	<u>10,401</u>	<u>(27,900)</u>
Income (loss) before minority interest and income taxes				
Minority interest	461	—	529	—
	<u>337</u>	<u>(5,881)</u>	<u>9,872</u>	<u>(27,900)</u>
Income (loss) before income taxes				
Provision for income taxes	—	—	—	—
	<u>\$ 337</u>	<u>\$ (5,881)</u>	<u>\$ 9,872</u>	<u>\$ (27,900)</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these condensed consolidated financial statements.

TELOS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

(amounts in thousands)

	September 30, 2007 <u>(Unaudited)</u>	December 31, 2006
ASSETS		
Current assets		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 24	\$ 235
Accounts receivable, net of reserve of \$792 and \$407, respectively	57,021	25,710
Inventories, net of obsolescence reserve of \$207 and \$212, respectively	9,829	7,078
Other current assets	3,909	6,635
Total current assets	<u>70,783</u>	<u>39,658</u>
Property and equipment, net of accumulated depreciation of \$16,064 and \$15,162, respectively	7,738	8,534
Other assets	96	268
Total assets	<u>\$ 78,617</u>	<u>\$ 48,460</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these condensed consolidated financial statements.

TELOS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

(amounts in thousands)

	September 30, 2007 (Unaudited)	December 31, 2006
LIABILITIES, REDEEMABLE PREFERRED STOCK AND STOCKHOLDERS' DEFICIT		
Current liabilities		
Accounts payable	\$ 52,363	\$ 34,597
Accrued compensation and benefits	6,751	4,798
Deferred revenue	6,013	8,144
Capital lease obligations – short-term	597	594
Other current liabilities	5,693	3,630
Total current liabilities	71,417	51,763
Senior credit facility (Note 4)	9,545	12,568
Senior subordinated notes (Note 4)	5,179	5,179
Capital lease obligations	8,292	8,722
Senior redeemable preferred stock (Note 5)	9,340	9,023
Public preferred stock (Note 5)	91,658	87,987
Total liabilities	195,431	175,242
Minority interest	96	—
Stockholders' deficit		
Common stock	78	78
Additional paid-in capital	103	103
Accumulated deficit	(117,091)	(126,963)
Total stockholders' deficit	(116,910)	(126,782)
Total liabilities and stockholders' deficit	\$ 78,617	\$ 48,460

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these condensed consolidated financial statements.

TELOS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS
(Unaudited)
(amounts in thousands)

	<u>Nine Months Ended September 30,</u>	
	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>
Operating activities:		
Income (loss) from operations	\$ 9,872	\$ (27,900)
Adjustments to reconcile income (loss) from continuing operations to cash provided by operating activities:		
Gain on sale of TIMS LLC membership interest	(5,803)	—
Dividends and accretion of preferred stock as interest expense	3,988	15,989
Minority interest	96	—
Stock-based compensation	—	103
Depreciation and amortization	1,612	1,593
Other noncash items	385	(78)
Changes in other operating assets and liabilities	(14,859)	9,740
Cash used in operating activities	<u>(4,709)</u>	<u>(553)</u>
Investing activities:		
Net proceeds from sale of TIMS LLC membership interest	5,803	—
Purchase of property and equipment	(339)	(726)
Cash provided by (used in) investing activities	<u>5,464</u>	<u>(726)</u>
Financing activities:		
Repayment of borrowings under senior credit facility, net	(3,023)	(1,390)
Increase in book overdrafts	2,484	2,938
Payments under capital leases	(427)	(318)
Cash (used in) provided by financing activities	<u>(966)</u>	<u>1,230</u>
Decrease in cash and cash equivalents	(211)	(49)
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period	235	62
Cash and cash equivalents at end of period	<u>\$ 24</u>	<u>\$ 13</u>
Supplemental disclosures of cash flow information:		
Cash paid during the period for:		
Interest	<u>\$ 2,285</u>	<u>\$ 2,278</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these condensed consolidated financial statements.

TELOS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)

Note 1. General and Basis of Presentation

The accompanying consolidated financial statements include the accounts of Telos Corporation and its subsidiaries, including Ubiquity.com, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary, Xacta Corporation and Telos Delaware, Inc., all of whose issued and outstanding share capital is owned by Ubiquity.com, Inc. (collectively, the “Company”). The Company has applied the equity method of accounting for its investment in Enterworks, Inc. (“Enterworks”). The Company has a 60% ownership interest in Telos Identity Management Solutions, LLC and has consolidated its results of operations (see Note 2 – Sale of Assets). The Company also has a 60% ownership interest in Teloworks, Inc. (“Teloworks,” formerly Enterworks International, Inc.), and has consolidated its results of operations (see Note 3 – Investment in Enterworks). Significant intercompany transactions have been eliminated.

In the opinion of the Company, the accompanying consolidated financial statements reflect all adjustments (which include normal recurring adjustments) and reclassifications necessary for their fair presentation in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The presented interim results are not necessarily indicative of fiscal year performance for a variety of reasons including, but not limited to, the impact of seasonal and short-term variations. The Company has continued to follow the accounting policies (including its critical accounting policies) set forth in the consolidated financial statements included in its 2006 Annual Report on Form 10-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”). These financial statements should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and notes thereto included in the Company’s Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006.

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared assuming that the Company will continue as a going concern. Additionally, as more fully described in Note 7 – Contingencies and Subsequent Events, the Company is involved in an outstanding legal matter and an unfavorable outcome from this matter could result in a material adverse effect upon the Company’s financial position and results of operations. Management’s plans with respect to this matter, as well as other matters, are also disclosed in Note 7. These financial statements do not include any adjustments that might result from the outcome of this uncertainty.

Recent Accounting Pronouncements

In February 2007, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (“FASB”) issued Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (“SFAS”) No. 159, “The Fair Value Option for Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities.” SFAS No. 159 allows an entity the irrevocable option to elect fair value for the initial and subsequent measurement for certain financial assets and liabilities on a contract-by-contract basis. Subsequent changes in fair value of these financial assets and liabilities would be recognized in earnings when they occur. SFAS No. 159 is effective for the Company’s financial statements for the year beginning January 1, 2008, with earlier adoption permitted. The Company is currently evaluating the effect and timing that adoption of this statement will have on its consolidated financial position and results of operations.

In September 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 157 – “Fair Value Measurements,” which defines fair value, establishes a framework for consistently measuring fair value under GAAP, and expands disclosures about fair value measurements. SFAS No. 157 defines fair value as the exchange price that would be received for an asset or paid to transfer a liability (an exit price) in the principal or most advantageous market for the asset or liability in an orderly transaction between market participants on the measurement date. On November 14, 2007, the FASB reaffirmed its vote against a blanket deferral of SFAS No. 157. For fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007, the Company will be required to implement the standard for financial assets and liabilities, as well as for any other assets and liabilities that are carried at fair value on a recurring basis in financial statements. As a result, SFAS No. 157 becomes effective as originally scheduled in accounting for the financial assets and liabilities of financial institutions. The Board did, however, provide a one year deferral for the implementation of SFAS No. 157 for other nonfinancial assets and liabilities. The Company is currently evaluating the effect that adoption of this statement will have on its consolidated financial position or results of operations.

In September 2006, the SEC released Staff Accounting Bulletin (“SAB”) No. 108, which provides guidance in the quantification and correction of financial statement misstatements. SAB No. 108 specifies that companies should apply a combination of the “rollover” and “iron curtain” methodologies when making determinations of materiality. The rollover method quantifies a misstatement based on the amount of the error originating in the current year income statement. The iron curtain approach quantifies misstatements based on the effects of correcting the misstatement existing in the balance sheet at the end of the current year, regardless of the year(s) of origination. SAB No. 108 instructs companies to quantify the misstatement under both methodologies and, if either method results in the determination of a material error, the Company must adjust its financial statements to correct the error. SAB No. 108 also reminds preparers that a change from an accounting principle that is not generally accepted to a principle that is generally accepted is a correction of an error. The Bulletin is effective for annual financial statements covering the first fiscal year ending after November 15, 2006. The adoption of this Bulletin did not have a material effect on the Company’s results of operations or financial condition.

[Table of Contents](#)

In July 2006, the FASB issued FASB Interpretation No. (“FIN”) 48, “Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes – an interpretation of FASB Statement 109.” FIN 48 prescribes a comprehensive model for recognizing, measuring, presenting and disclosing in the financial statements tax positions taken or expected to be taken on a tax return, including a decision whether to file or not to file in a particular jurisdiction. FIN 48 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2006. If there are changes in net assets as a result of application of FIN 48, these will be accounted for as an adjustment to retained earnings. The adoption of this FIN did not have a material effect on the Company’s financial position or results of operations.

In February 2006, The FASB issued SFAS No. 155, “Accounting for Certain Hybrid Financial Instruments—an amendment of FASB Statements No. 133 and 140.” This statement amends SFASs No. 133 and 140 by permitting fair value remeasurement for any hybrid financial instrument with an embedded derivative that otherwise would require bifurcation; clarifying which interest-only strips and principal-only strips are not subject to the requirements of SFAS No. 133; establishing a requirement to evaluate interests in securitized financial assets to identify interests that are freestanding derivatives or that are hybrid financial instruments that contain an embedded derivative requiring bifurcation; clarifying that concentrations of credit risk in the form of subordination are not embedded derivatives; and amending SFAS No. 140 to eliminate the prohibition on a qualifying special-purpose entity from holding a derivative financial instrument that pertains to a beneficial interest other than another derivative financial instrument. The statement is effective for fiscal years beginning after September 15, 2006. The adoption of this standard did not have a material impact on the Company’s financial position and results of operations.

Revenue Recognition

Substantially all of the Company’s contracts are contracts with the U.S. Government. Revenues are recognized in accordance with SAB No. 101, “Revenue Recognition in Financial Statements” as amended by SAB No. 104, “Revenue Recognition.” The Company considers amounts earned upon evidence that an arrangement has been obtained, services are delivered, fees are fixed or determinable, and collectibility is reasonably assured. Additionally, revenues on arrangements requiring the delivery of more than one product or service are recognized in accordance with Emerging Issues Task Force (“EITF”) 00-21, “Accounting for Revenue Arrangements with Multiple Deliverables” except as the pronouncement states, on contracts where higher-level GAAP (such as Statement of Position (“SOP”) 97-2 as described below) prevails. Certain of the Company’s contracts involve the complex delivery of technology products and services. Accordingly, such contracts fall within the scope of SOP 81-1. To the extent contracts are incomplete at the end of an accounting period; revenue is recognized on the percentage-of-completion method, on a proportional performance basis.

The Company recognizes revenues for software arrangements upon persuasive evidence of an arrangement, delivery of the software, and determination that collection of a fixed or determinable license fee is probable. Revenues for software licenses sold on a subscription basis are recognized ratably over the related license terms. For arrangements where the sale of software licenses are bundled with other products, including software products, upgrades and enhancements, post-contract customer support (“PCS”), and installation, the relative fair value of each element is determined based on vendor-specific objective evidence (“VSOE”). VSOE is defined by SOP 97-2, “Software Revenue Recognition,” and SOP 98-9, “Modification of SOP 97-2, Software Revenue Recognition With Respect to Certain Transactions,” and is limited to the price charged when the element is sold separately or if the element is not yet sold separately, the fair value assigned under the residual method or the price set by management having the relevant authority. If VSOE does not exist for the allocation of revenue to the various elements of the arrangement, all revenue from the arrangement is deferred until the earlier of the point at which (1) such VSOE does exist or (2) all elements of the arrangement are delivered. PCS revenues, upon being unbundled from a software license fee, are recognized ratably over the PCS period.

Stock-Based Compensation

Effective January 1, 2006, the Company adopted the fair value recognition provisions of SFAS No. 123(R), using the modified prospective transition method. Under this transition method, stock-based compensation costs recognized in the income statement as of September 30, 2006 in the amount of \$103,000, include compensation costs for all unvested stock options that were granted prior to December 31, 2005, based on the grant date fair value estimated in accordance with the original provisions of SFAS No. 123. There were no share-based payments granted on or after December 31, 2005. Results for prior periods have not been restated.

Note 2. Sale of Assets

On April 11, 2007, Telos Identity Management Solutions, LLC (“TIMS LLC”) was formed as a limited liability company under the Delaware Limited Liability Company Act. The Company contributed substantially all of the assets of its Identity Management

[Table of Contents](#)

business line and assigned its rights to perform under its U.S Government contract with the Defense Manpower Data Center (“DMDC”) to TIMS LLC. The net book value of assets contributed by the Company totaled \$17,000. The Company owned 99.999% of the membership interests of TIMS LLC and certain private equity investors (“Investors”) owned 0.001% of the membership interests of TIMS LLC. On April 20, 2007, the Company sold an additional 39.999% of the membership interests to the Investors in exchange for \$6 million in cash consideration. Legal and investment banking expenses directly associated with the transaction amounted to approximately \$190,000. As a participant of certain private equity investors, the brother of John B. Wood, the Company’s Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, indirectly holds a 2% effective ownership interest in TIMS LLC.

The parties have signed an Amended and Restated Operating Agreement (“Operating Agreement”) which provides for a Board of Directors comprised of five (5) members. The Operating Agreement also provides for two subclasses of membership units, Classes A (the Company) and B (the Investors). The Class A membership unit owns 60% of TIMS LLC, and as such is entitled to receive 60% of the profits, and to appoint three (3) members of the Board of Directors. The Class B membership unit owns 40% of TIMS LLC, and as such is entitled to receive 40% of the profits, and to appoint two (2) members of the Board of Directors.

As indicated in the Operating Agreement, one of the Class A members will be designated the Chairman of the Board. John B. Wood, Chairman and CEO of the Company is to be designated as the Chairman of the Board of TIMS LLC. The Company has entered into a corporate services agreement with TIMS LLC whereby the Company provides certain administrative support services to TIMS LLC, including but not limited to finance, accounting and human resources services.

During the quarter ended September 30, 2007, in accordance with the Operating Agreement, a quarterly cash distribution in the amount of \$450,000 was made to Class B Member. No distribution was made to Class A Member.

And as indicated above, the Company owns 60% of TIMS LLC, therefore continues to account for the contributed assets using the consolidation method.

Note 3. Investment in Enterworks

Enterworks, Inc.

As of September 30, 2007, the Company owns 671,301 shares of common stock, 729,732 shares of Series A-1 Preferred Stock, 1,793,903 shares of Series B-1 Preferred Stock, and 8,571,429 shares of Series D Preferred Stock of Enterworks, Inc. (“Enterworks”), representing a fully diluted ownership percentage of 10.6%. Since its initial investment in Enterworks, the Company has accounted for such investment as prescribed by APB Opinion No. 18, “The Equity Method of Accounting for Investments in Common Stock,” and continues to do so due to the Company’s continued significant influence through its representation on the Board of Directors of Enterworks.

Effective January 1, 2007, Enterworks agreed to provide the Company with maintenance and OEM technical product support associated with the worldwide, non-exclusive, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, fully paid-up license for the EPX software purchased in December 2003. In accordance with SFAS No. 142, “Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets,” intangible assets acquired shall be initially recognized and measured at fair value. As such, the Company has capitalized \$850,000 in consideration paid for EPX software (\$100,000 in 2003 and \$750,000 in 2004), and has reflected this asset on the balance sheet in “Other Assets.” The net carrying value of the asset is \$62,500 as of September 30, 2007. Scheduled amortization expense is \$62,500 for the remainder of 2007.

Teloworks, Inc. (formerly Enterworks International, Inc.)

Pursuant to the Teloworks Agreements, the Company and Enterworks are required to fund the operations of Teloworks according to a funding schedule set forth in the Teloworks Agreements. The Company has expensed approximately \$780,000 for the first nine months of 2007, which represents approximately \$600,000 of its proportionate share of Teloworks operating expenses, as well as additional funding pursuant to the March 2007 Enterworks private financing, as disclosed in the Company’s 2006 Form 10-K and March 2007 Form 10-Q. The Company expensed approximately \$707,000 for 2006.

As a result of the Enterworks private financing transaction as disclosed in the Company’s 2006 Form 10-K and June 2007 Form 10-Q, the Company currently owns 60% of Teloworks.

Note 4. Debt Obligations*Senior Revolving Credit Facility*

The Company has a \$15 million revolving credit facility (the "Facility") with Wells Fargo Foothill, Inc. ("Wells Fargo Foothill") that is scheduled to mature on October 21, 2008. As of September 30, 2007, the interest rate on the Facility was 8.75%. The Facility has various covenants that may, among other things, affect the ability of the Company to merge with another entity, sell or transfer certain assets, pay dividends and make other distributions beyond certain limitations. The Facility also requires the Company to meet certain financial covenants, including Earnings before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation and Amortization (EBITDA), as defined in the Facility. As of September 30, 2007, the Company was in compliance with the Facility's financial and EBITDA covenants. Based on the Company's current projection of EBITDA, the Company expects that it will remain in compliance with its EBITDA covenants, and accordingly, the Facility is classified as noncurrent as of September 30, 2007.

At September 30, 2007, the Company had outstanding borrowings of \$9.5 million and unused borrowing availability of \$5.5 million on the Facility. As of November 13, 2007, the Company has availability under its current arrangement of approximately \$2.1 million. The effective weighted average interest rates (including various fees charged pursuant to the Facility agreement and related amendments) on the outstanding borrowings under the Facility were 10.6% and 12.4% for the nine months ended September 30, 2007 and 2006, respectively.

Senior Subordinated Notes

In 1995, the Company issued Senior Subordinated Notes ("Notes") to certain shareholders. Such Notes are classified as either Series B or Series C. The Series B Notes are secured by the Company's property and equipment, but subordinate to the security interests of Wells Fargo Foothill. The Series C Notes are unsecured. The maturity date of such Notes has been extended to October 31, 2008, with interest rates ranging from 14% to 17%, and paid quarterly on January 1, April 1, July 1, and October 1 of each year. The Notes can be prepaid at the Company's option; however, the Notes contain a cumulative prepayment premium of 13.5% per annum payable upon certain circumstances, which include, but are not limited to, an initial public offering of the Company's common stock or a significant refinancing ("qualifying triggering event"), to the extent that sufficient net proceeds from either of the above events are received to pay such cumulative prepayment premium. Due to the contingent nature of the cumulative prepayment premium, any associated premium expense can only be quantified and recorded subsequent to the occurrence of such a qualifying triggering event. At September 30, 2007, if such a qualifying triggering event had occurred, the cumulative prepayment premium would have been approximately \$19.7 million.

The balances of the Series B and C Notes were \$2.5 million and \$2.7 million, respectively, each at September 30, 2007 and 2006.

The carrying value of the Notes as of September 30, 2007 and 2006 is consistent with the fair value as determined by an independent valuation performed by Navigant Consulting, Inc.

The following are maturities of obligations presented by year (in thousands):

	<u>Year</u>	<u>Obligation Due</u>
Senior Subordinated Debt	2008	\$ 5,179 ¹
Senior Credit Facility	2008	\$ 9,545 ²

¹ Pursuant to Section 17 of a Subordination Agreement entered into in conjunction with the Facility, the senior subordinated note holders and the Company have extended the maturity date of the Notes to October 31, 2008.

² Balance due represents balance as of September 30, 2007, however, the Senior Credit Facility is a revolving credit facility with fluctuating balances based on working capital requirements of the Company.

Note 5. Redeemable Preferred Stock*Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock*

The components of the authorized, issued and outstanding senior redeemable preferred stock ("Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock") are 1,250 Series A-1 and 1,750 Series A-2 senior redeemable preferred shares, respectively, each with \$.01 par value.

Table of Contents

The Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock carries a cumulative per annum dividend rate of 14.125% of its liquidation value of \$1,000 per share. The dividends are payable semiannually on June 30 and December 31 of each year. The liquidation preference of the Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock is the face amount of the Series A-1 and A-2 (\$1,000 per share), plus all accrued and unpaid dividends. The Company was required to redeem all shares and accrued dividends outstanding on October 31, 2005. However, on April 14, 2005, Toxford Corporation, the holder of 72.6% of the Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock, extended the maturity of its instruments to October 31, 2008. Subject to limitations set forth below, the Company was scheduled to redeem 27.4% of the outstanding shares and accrued dividends outstanding on October 31, 2005. Among the limitations with regard to the scheduled redemptions of the Senior Redeemable Public Preferred Stock is the legal availability of funds, pursuant to Maryland law. Maryland law also prohibits distributions (including redemptions and dividends) if, after the distribution is made, liabilities exceed assets. Accordingly, due to the Company's current financial position and the terms of the Wells Fargo Foothill agreement, it is precluded by Maryland law from making the scheduled payment. As the Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock is not due on demand, or callable, within twelve months from September 30, 2007, the remaining 27.4% is also classified as noncurrent.

The Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock is senior to all other present equity of the Company, including the 12% Cumulative Exchangeable Redeemable Preferred Stock. The Series A-1 ranks on a parity with the Series A-2. The Company has not declared dividends on its Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock since its issuance. At September 30, 2007 and 2006, cumulative undeclared, unpaid dividends relating to Senior Redeemable Preferred stock totaled \$6.3 million and \$5.9 million, respectively.

12% Cumulative Exchangeable Redeemable Preferred Stock

A maximum of 6,000,000 shares of 12% Cumulative Exchangeable Redeemable Preferred Stock (the "Public Preferred Stock"), par value \$.01 per share, has been authorized for issuance. The Company initially issued 2,858,723 shares of the Public Preferred Stock pursuant to the acquisition of the Company during fiscal year 1990. The Public Preferred Stock was recorded at fair value on the date of original issue, November 21, 1989, and the Company makes periodic accretions under the interest method of the excess of the redemption value over the recorded value. The Company adjusted its estimate of accrued accretion in the amount of \$1.5 million in the second quarter of 2006. Such accretion for the three months ended September 30, 2007 and 2006 was \$268,000 and \$395,000, respectively, and for the nine months ended September 30, 2007 and 2006 was \$803,000 and \$2,607,000, respectively. The Company declared stock dividends totaling 736,863 shares in 1990 and 1991. Since 1991, no other dividends, in stock or cash, have been declared. In November 1998, the Company retired 410,000 shares of the Public Preferred Stock. The total number of shares issued and outstanding at September 30, 2007 was 3,185,586. The stock is now quoted as TLSRP in the Pink Sheets. The aggregate fair value of the public preferred stock at September 30, 2007 was \$73.3 million.

Since 1991, the Company has not declared or paid any dividends on its Public Preferred Stock, based upon its interpretation of restrictions in its Articles of Amendment and Restatement, limitations in the terms of the Public Preferred Stock instrument, specific dividend payment restrictions in the Facility entered into with Wells Fargo Foothill, to which the Public Preferred Stock is subject, and other senior obligations, and limitations pursuant to Maryland law (as discussed above). Pursuant to their terms, the Company is scheduled to redeem the Public Preferred Stock in five annual tranches during the period 2005 through 2009. However, due to its substantial senior obligations, limitations set forth in the covenants in the Facility, foreseeable capital and operational requirements, restrictions and prohibitions of its Articles of Amendment and Restatement, and provisions of Maryland law (as discussed above), the Company did not make the first two scheduled redemption payments, and assuming insufficient liquidity to undertake any stock redemption (which is presently unquantifiable), the Company believes that the likelihood is that it will not be able to make the remaining three scheduled redemption payments as set forth in the terms of the Public Preferred Stock. Accordingly, the Public Preferred Stock is not payable on demand, nor callable, for failure to redeem the Public Preferred Stock in accordance with the redemption schedule set forth in the instrument. The Company has therefore classified these securities as noncurrent liabilities on the balance sheet as of September 30, 2007 and 2006.

The Company and certain of its subsidiaries are parties to the Facility agreement with Wells Fargo Foothill, whose term expires on October 21, 2008. Under the Facility, the Company agreed that, so long as any credit under the Facility is available and until full and final payment of the obligations under the Facility, it would not make any distribution or declare or pay any dividends (other than common stock) on its stock, or purchase, acquire, or redeem any stock, or exchange any stock for indebtedness, or retire any stock. The Company continues to actively rely upon the Facility and expects to continue to do so until the Facility agreement expires on October 21, 2008.

Accordingly, as stated above, the Company will continue to classify the entirety of its obligation to redeem the Public Preferred Stock as a long-term obligation. The Wells Fargo Foothill Facility prohibits, among other things, the redemption of any stock, common or preferred, until October 21, 2008. The Public Preferred Stock by its terms cannot be redeemed if doing so would violate the terms of an agreement regarding the borrowing of funds or the extension of credit which is binding upon the Company or any subsidiary of the Company, and it does not include any other provisions that would otherwise require any acceleration of the redemption of or amortization payments with respect to the Public Preferred Stock. Thus, the Public Preferred Stock is not and will not be due on demand, nor callable, within twelve months from September 30, 2007. This classification is consistent with ARB No. 43 and SFAS No. 78, "Classification of Obligations that are Callable by the Creditor."

[Table of Contents](#)

Paragraph 7 of Chapter 3A of ARB No. 43 defines a current liability, as follows:

“The term current liabilities is used principally to designate obligations whose liquidation is reasonably expected to require the use of existing resources properly classifiable as current assets, or the creation of other current liabilities. As a balance sheet category, the classification is intended to include obligations for items that have entered into the operating cycle, such as payables incurred in the acquisition of materials and supplies to be used in the production of goods or in providing services to be offered for sale; collections received in advance of the delivery of goods or performance of services; and debts that arise from operations directly related to the operating cycle, such as accruals for wages, salaries, commissions, rentals, royalties, and income and other taxes. Other liabilities whose regular and ordinary liquidation is expected to occur within a relatively short period of time, usually 12 months, are also intended for inclusion, such as short-term debts arising from the acquisition of capital assets, serial maturities of long-term obligations, amounts required to be expended within 1 year under sinking fund provisions, and agency obligations arising from the collection or acceptance of cash or other assets for the account of third persons.”

Paragraph 5 of SFAS No. 78 provides the following:

“The current liability classification is also intended to include obligations that, by their terms, are due on demand or will be due on demand within one year (or operating cycle, if longer) from the balance sheet date, even though liquidation may not be expected within that period. It is also intended to include long-term obligations that are or will be callable by the creditor either because the debtor’s violation of a provision of the debt agreement at the balance sheet date makes the obligation callable or because the violation, if not cured within a specified grace period, will make the obligation callable...”

If, pursuant to the terms of the Public Preferred Stock, the Company does not redeem the Public Preferred Stock in accordance with the scheduled redemptions described above, the terms of the Public Preferred Stock require the Company to discharge its obligation to redeem the Public Preferred Stock as soon as the Company is financially capable and legally permitted to do so.

Dividends on the Public Preferred Stock are paid by the Company, when and if declared by the Board of Directors, and are required to be paid out of legally available funds in accordance with Maryland law. The Public Preferred Stock accrues a semi-annual dividend at the annual rate of 12% (\$1.20) per share, based on the liquidation preference of \$10 per share and is fully cumulative. Dividends in additional shares of the Public Preferred Stock for 1990 and 1991 were paid at the rate of 6% of a share for each \$.60 of such dividends not paid in cash. Dividends on the Public Preferred Stock are paid by the Company, when and if declared by the Board of Directors, and are required to be paid out of legally available funds in accordance with Maryland law. Maryland law also prohibits distributions (including redemptions and dividends) if, after the distribution is made, liabilities exceed assets. For the cash dividends payable since December 1, 1995, the Company has accrued \$60.5 million and \$56.7 million as of September 30, 2007 and 2006, respectively.

In accordance with SFAS No. 150, both the Senior Redeemable Preferred Stock and the Public Preferred Stock have been reclassified from equity to liability. Consequently, for the nine months ended September 30, 2007 and 2006, accretion and dividends totaling \$4.0 and \$16.0 million were accrued and reported as interest expense in the respective periods. Prior to the effective date of SFAS No. 150 on July 1, 2003, such dividends were charged to stockholders’ accumulated deficit.

The carrying value of the accrued Paid-in-Kind (“PIK”) dividends on the Public Preferred Stock for the period 1992 through June 1995 was \$4.0 million. Had the Company accrued such dividends on a cash basis for this time period, the total amount accrued would have been \$15.1 million. However, as a result of the redemption of the 410,000 shares of the Public Preferred Stock in November 1998, such amounts were reduced and adjusted to \$3.5 million and \$13.4 million, respectively. The Company’s Charter, Section 2(a) states, “Any dividends payable with respect to the Exchangeable Preferred Stock (“Public Preferred Stock”) during the first six years after the Effective Date (November 20, 1989) may be paid (subject to restrictions under applicable state law), in the sole discretion of the Board of Directors, in cash or by issuing additional full paid and nonassessable shares of Exchangeable Preferred Stock ...”. Accordingly, the Board had the discretion to pay the dividends for the referenced period in cash or by the issuance of additional shares of Public Preferred Stock. During the period in which the Company stated its intent to pay PIK dividends, the Company stated its intention to amend its charter to permit such payment by the issuance of additional shares of Public Preferred Stock. In consequence, as required by applicable accounting requirements, the accrual for these dividends was recorded at the estimated fair value (as the average of the ask and bid prices) on the dividend date of the shares of Public Preferred Stock that would have been (but were not) issued. This accrual was \$9.9 million lower than the accrual would be if the intent was only to pay the dividends in cash, at that date or any later date.

In May 2006, the Board concluded that the accrual of PIK dividends for the period 1992 through June 1995 was no longer appropriate. Since 1995, the Company has disclosed in the footnotes to its audited financial statements the carrying value of the accrued PIK dividends on the Public Preferred Stock for the period 1992 through June 1995 was \$4.0 million, and that had the Company accrued cash dividends during this time period, the total amount accrued would have been \$15.1 million. As stated above, such amounts were reduced and adjusted to \$3.5 million and \$13.4 million, respectively, due to the redemption of 410,000 shares of the Public Preferred Stock in November 1998. On May 12, 2006, the Board of Directors voted to confirm that the Company’s intent

[Table of Contents](#)

with respect to the payment of dividends on the Public Preferred Stock for this period changed from its previously stated intent to pay PIK dividends to that of an intent to pay cash dividends. The Company therefore changed the accrual from \$3.5 million to \$13.4 million, the result of which was to increase the Company's negative shareholder equity by the \$9.9 million difference between those two amounts, by recording an additional \$9.9 million charge to interest expense for the second quarter of 2006, resulting in a balance of \$91.7 million for the principal amount and all accrued dividends on the Public Preferred Stock as of September 30, 2007. This action is a change in accounting estimate as defined in SFAS No. 154, "Accounting Changes and Error Corrections" which replaces APB No. 20, "Accounting Changes" and SFAS No. 3, "Reporting Accounting Changes in Interim Financial Statements."

Note 6. Reportable Segments

As of September 30, 2007, the Company's operations are comprised of two operating segments, Managed Solutions and Xacta. Descriptions for each of these operating segments are as follows:

Managed Solutions: Develops, markets and sells integration services that address a wide range of government information technology (IT) requirements. Offerings consist of innovative IT solutions that consist of industry leading IT products from OEMs with complimentary integration and managed support services provided by Telos. Managed Solutions also provides general IT consulting and integration services in support of various U.S. Government customers.

Xacta: Develops, markets and sells government-validated secure enterprise solutions to the U.S. Government and financial institutions, to address the growing demand for information security solutions. Xacta provides Secure Wireless LAN solutions, Enterprise Messaging solutions, Identity Management solutions, Information Security Consulting services and IT Security Management software solutions.

The accounting policies of the reportable segments are the same as those referred to in Note 1 – General and Basis of Presentation. The Company evaluates the performance of its operating segments based on revenue, gross profit and segment profit (loss) before income taxes and interest income or expense.

Summarized financial information concerning the Company's reportable segments for the three and nine months ended September 30, 2007 and 2006 is set forth in the following table (in thousands). The "other" column includes corporate related items.

[Table of Contents](#)

	Three Months Ended				Nine Months Ended			
	Managed Solutions	Xacta	Other (1)	Total	Managed Solutions	Xacta	Other (1)	Total
September 30, 2007								
External revenues	\$37,034	\$23,959	\$ —	\$60,993	\$84,631	\$77,972	\$ —	\$162,603
Gross margin	213	8,772	—	8,985	1,967	31,302	—	33,269
Segment (loss) profit (2)	(1,944)	4,853	—	2,909	(4,584)	15,414	—	10,830
Total assets	46,149	21,249	11,219	78,617	46,149	21,249	11,219	78,617
Capital expenditures	(3)	28	112	137	1	102	236	339
Depreciation and amortization (3)	77	277	188	542	215	835	562	1,612
September 30, 2006								
External revenues	\$18,832	\$16,261	\$ —	\$35,093	\$39,759	\$56,321	\$ —	\$ 96,080
Gross margin	479	3,108	—	3,587	1,051	13,992	—	15,043
Segment loss (2)	(1,396)	(2,229)	—	(3,625)	(4,398)	(5,130)	—	(9,528)
Total assets	20,139	15,397	9,563	45,099	20,139	15,397	9,563	45,099
Capital expenditures	—	25	121	146	13	160	553	726
Depreciation and amortization (3)	65	166	307	538	200	494	899	1,593

(1) Corporate assets are property and equipment, cash and other assets.

(2) Segment profit (loss) represents operating income (loss).

(3) Depreciation and amortization include amounts relating to property and equipment, capital leases and spare parts inventory.

Table of Contents

The Company maintains a facility in Germany; however, the Company does not have material international revenues, profit (loss), assets or capital expenditures. The Company's business is not concentrated in a specific geographical area within the United States, as it has 5 separate facilities located in various states and the District of Columbia.

Note 7. Contingencies and Subsequent Events

Financial Condition and Liquidity

The consolidated financial statements for the quarter ended September 30, 2007 that are included in this Form 10-Q have been prepared on a going concern basis, which contemplates the realization of assets and the satisfaction of liabilities in the normal course of business. The Company's working capital deficit was \$634,000 as of September 30, 2007, primarily due to amounts resulting from unreimbursed litigation-related and other legal expenses. Total expenses related to litigation and other legal costs were \$3.1 million (net of \$3.4 million in reimbursements by the Company's insurers) for the first nine months of 2007, \$5.7 million (net of \$3.1 million in reimbursements by the Company's insurers) for 2006, and \$4.1 million for 2005. Such unreimbursed litigation-related and other legal expenses continue to adversely affect working capital, and \$5.1 million of such expenses are unpaid as of September 30, 2007. While the Company is actively working with its vendors, including law firms, partners, subcontractors, and Wells Fargo Foothill to mitigate the effect of these working capital constraints during this period, there can be no assurances as to the continuing ability of the Company to successfully work with such parties to mitigate these current working capital constraints. See Note 4 – Debt Obligations. Although no assurances can be given, the Company expects that it will be in compliance throughout the term of the amended credit facility with respect to the financial and other covenants.

Additionally, the Company has recently experienced a slow down in payments from one of the Company's significant government payment offices due to complications arising from that office's payment system conversion. As a result, anticipated payments from this government payment office have been received significantly later than the anticipated payment dates. The Company has been able to utilize its existing Facility to mitigate the effect of these payment delays. This slow down in payment is expected to be temporary.

Additionally, subsequent to the date of the accompanying financial statements, in accordance with the terms of one the Company's government contracts for services, the Company was required to provide a performance bond and a payment bond for a system installation at a customer site. The amount of such bond is approximately \$4.1 million and the Company has been required to collateralize the entire amount of the bond. The Company provided such collateral on or about October 31, 2007. The terms of the bond requirement allow for a release of a significant amount of the collateral pending satisfactory performance in the March 2008 time frame. While the bond requirement may adversely affect the Company's liquidity during this time frame, the Company currently believes that the impact of the bond requirement will be mitigated by the Company's ability to utilize the existing Facility.

The Company has previously disclosed the effect of the cyclicity of the U.S. Government buying season has historically had on revenues, specifically that the Company has experienced higher revenue in the third and fourth quarters than in the first and second quarters. While the Company has experienced significant revenue growth for the three and nine month periods ended September 30, 2007 over the prior year, there can be no assurances that such growth will continue for the remainder of the year or that revenue for the remainder of the year will exceed the revenue to date.

The Company believes that available cash and borrowings under the Facility will be sufficient to generate adequate amounts of cash to meet the Company's needs for operating expenses, debt service requirements, and projected capital expenditures for 2007. The Company anticipates the need for continued reliance on a credit facility upon terms and conditions substantially similar to the existing Facility in order to meet the Company's long term needs for operating expenses, debt service requirements, and projected capital expenditures.

Legal Proceedings

Costa Brava Partnership III, L.P.

As previously reported, Costa Brava Partnership III, L.P. ("Costa Brava"), a holder of the Company's 12% Cumulative Exchangeable Redeemable Preferred Stock ("Public Preferred Stock"), filed a lawsuit on October 17, 2005 in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City in the State of Maryland ("Complaint") against the Company, its directors, and certain of its officers. According to Amendment No. 23 to Schedule 13D filed by Costa Brava on October 25, 2007, Costa Brava owns 16.4% of the outstanding Public Preferred Stock as of September 30, 2007.

The Complaint alleges that the Company and its officers and directors have engaged in tactics to avoid paying mandatory dividends on the Public Preferred Stock, and asserts that the Public Preferred Stock has characteristics of debt instruments even though issued by the Company in the form of stock. Costa Brava alleges, among other things, that the Company and an independent committee of the Board of Directors have done nothing to improve what they claim to be the Company's insolvency, or its ability to redeem the Public Preferred Stock and pay accrued dividends. They also challenge the bonus payments to the Company's officers and directors, and consulting fees paid to the holder of a majority of the Company's common stock.

[Table of Contents](#)

On December 22, 2005, the Company's Board of Directors established a special litigation committee ("Special Litigation Committee") comprised of independent directors to review and evaluate the matters raised in the derivative suit filed against the Company by Costa Brava relating to the Company's Public Preferred Stock.

On January 9, 2006, the Company filed a motion to dismiss the Complaint or, in the alternative, to stay the action until the Special Litigation Committee had sufficient time to properly investigate and respond to Costa Brava's demands. On March 30, 2006, Judge Albert J. Matricciani granted the motions in part and denied them in part, but also denied the alternative request for a stay.

On February 8, 2006, Wynnefield Small Cap Value, L.P. ("Wynnefield") filed a motion to intervene. An order was entered on May 25, 2006 by Judge Matricciani, designating Wynnefield Partners as the plaintiff with Costa Brava in the lawsuit. Costa Brava and Wynnefield are hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiffs."

On April 28, 2006, the Company filed its answer to the Complaint.

On May 26, 2006, Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction to prevent the sale or disposal of Xacta Corporation or any of its assets until the lawsuit is resolved on the merits. Subsequently, an order was issued dismissing the motion without prejudice on October 26, 2006. However, the Plaintiffs objected to the wording of the order, insisting that the Company give Plaintiffs at least 30-day prior notice of any pending transaction. Nevertheless, on January 29, 2007, the Court reissued the order, dismissing the Plaintiff's motion without the notice requirement.

On August 30, 2006, Plaintiffs filed a motion for receivership following the resignations of six of the nine members of the Board of Directors on August 16, 2006. However, as previously reported on August 22, 2006, within a week of the resignations, three new independent board members were added. Then the announcement of two additional independent board members was made on October 31, 2006, bringing the total board membership to eight. Thus, the board and all board committees, including the Special Litigation Committee and the Transaction Committee have been fully reconstituted.

The hearing on the motion for receivership was held on October 18, 2006 in Baltimore, Maryland. As previously reported, the Plaintiffs' motion for receivership was denied on November 29, 2006.

On February 15, 2007, the Plaintiffs filed their second motion for preliminary injunction to prevent the sale or disposal of any corporate assets outside the ordinary course until such time that two new Class D directors have been elected. This followed the Plaintiff's February 7, 2007 letter to the corporate secretary requesting a special meeting to elect new Class D directors to replace the two board seats left vacant by the resignations in August 2006. The special meeting took place on May 31, 2007 and continued on June 18, 2007. Two Class D directors were elected at the June 18, 2007 meeting by the holders of Public Preferred Stock. The hearing on the motion was held on April 16, 2007. On April 19, 2007, Judge Matricciani issued an opinion denying the Plaintiffs' motion.

On February 27, 2007, the Plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint and added Mr. John R. C. Porter, the Company's majority shareholder, as a defendant. The Company filed its motion to strike/dismiss and motion for summary judgment on March 28, 2007. The motion states that the court should strike or dismiss as a matter of law or on summary judgment certain claims. The hearing on the motion originally scheduled for April 25, 2007 took place on May 8, 2007 before Judge Matricciani.

On May 29, 2007, Telos filed a counterclaim against the Plaintiffs alleging interference with its relationship with Wells Fargo Foothill, and a related motion for a preliminary injunction. On June 4, 2007, the Court entered a consent order in which the Plaintiffs agreed to cease and desist communications with Wells Fargo Foothill regarding a proceeding in England that settled over three years ago. The Plaintiffs filed their opposition to the motion for a preliminary injunction on June 19, 2007. Telos filed its reply on July 9, 2007. The hearing on the motion for preliminary injunction took place on August 27, 2007. On the following day, the Court issued a ruling granting Telos' motion.

On June 6, 2007, although the Court denied the Company's motion to strike the second amended complaint and the motion for partial summary judgment, it granted the motion to dismiss in part and denied it in part. The following counts were dismissed: Count I alleging fraudulent conveyance; Count II requesting a permanent and preliminary injunction related to the fraudulent conveyance allegations; and Count V allegation against Mr. John Porter for shareholder oppression. The following counts were not dismissed: Count III requesting appointment of a receiver; Count IV requesting to dissolve the corporation; Count VI regarding the fiduciary duty of the directors; and Count VII regarding the fiduciary duty of the officers.

[Table of Contents](#)

On July 20, 2007, counsel for the Special Litigation Committee issued its final report and found that there was no evidence to support the derivative claims, and no instance of bad faith, breach of duty or self-interested action or inaction. Further, Special Litigation Committee counsel recommended that the Company take all action necessary and appropriate that is consistent with these findings. Subsequently, on July 27, 2007, the Company filed a motion to stay the litigation pending briefing and hearing on the report of the Special Litigation Committee and also to stay further discovery in the underlying case. Plaintiffs filed their opposition to the motion to stay on August 1, 2007. A copy of the report of the Special Litigation Committee was filed with a motion to file under seal with the Court on August 2, 2007. The Company filed its reply to the Plaintiffs' response on August 3, 2007.

The hearing on the motion to stay and the motion to file under seal was held on August 7, 2007. The Court issued an order later that same day, reserving its ruling. On August 29, 2007, after the hearing held the day before, the Court denied the motion to file under seal and the motion to stay the litigation on August 29, 2007 but permitted limited discovery on the Special Litigation Committee report. Subsequently, while the underlying litigation and discovery is still going forward, counsel for the Special Litigation Committee produced numerous documents to the Plaintiffs. In addition, the current and former members of the committee have been deposed.

The Company filed a motion to dismiss as recommended by the Special Litigation Committee and its report on August 24, 2007. Plaintiffs' opposition was filed on November 9, 2007, and the Company's reply was filed on November 19, 2007. The hearing on the motion is scheduled for November 21, 2007.

On September 14, 2007 Plaintiffs filed a motion to challenge the Company's designation of certain highly confidential materials. The Company filed its opposition to Plaintiffs' motion on September 24, 2007 and Plaintiffs filed their reply on October 2, 2007. On November 6, 2007, following a hearing on November 5, 2007, the Court issued a discovery order denying Plaintiffs' request to reclassify the challenged documents as "confidential." Such Court order also applies to any and all documents produced to Plaintiffs in the *Hamot et al. v. Telos Corporation* litigation as well as to documents provided to Messrs. Hamot and Siegel in their capacity as Class D directors of the Company.

At this stage of the litigation, it is impossible to reasonably determine the degree of probability related to Plaintiffs' success in any of their assertions. Although there can be no assurance as to the ultimate outcome of this litigation, the Company and its officers and directors strenuously deny Plaintiffs' claims, will vigorously defend the matter, and will continue to oppose the relief sought.

Hamot et al. v. Telos Corporation

On August 2, 2007, Mr. Seth W. Hamot and Mr. Andrew R. Siegel, principals of Costa Brava Partnership III L.P. and recently elected to the Board as Class D Directors on June 18, 2007, filed a complaint against the Company and a motion for a temporary restraining order with the Maryland Circuit Court for the City of Baltimore. The complaint alleged that certain company documents and records had not been promptly provided to them as requested, and that these documents are necessary to fulfill their fiduciary duty as directors. On the same day, this matter was assigned to Judge Matricciani. The hearing on the motion for a temporary restraining order was held on August 7, 2007. The Court issued an order the following day on August 8, 2007, stating that the Plaintiffs should sign a temporary confidentiality order that would allow them to receive the documents requested. The Court further stated that Telos may redact any such documents provided to Plaintiffs for privilege regarding matters related to the Costa Brava litigation, and temporarily for highly confidential information. The Court reserved on the final determination of the issue of highly confidential information and also on the option for a temporary restraining order until the hearing scheduled for August 27, 2007.

Plaintiffs failed to sign the temporary confidentiality order and as a result were not provided with any documentation for a Board meeting held on August 9, 2007. On August 22, 2007 Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint which alleged that the Company was denying them the ability to effectively review, examine, consider and question future regulatory filings and all other important actions and undertakings of the Company.

On August 28, 2007, following a hearing on August 27, 2007, the Court converted Plaintiffs' motion for temporary restraining order into a preliminary injunction and stated that Plaintiffs were entitled to documents in response to reasonable requests for information pertinent and necessary to perform their duties as members of the Board. In addition, the Court noted that during the pendency of the shareholder litigation, it was not inclined to permit Messrs. Hamot and Siegel, through the guise of their newly acquired director status, to avoid their currently binding commitments under the stipulation and protective order entered on July 7, 2006. Pursuant to the terms of such order the Company is entitled to designate documents produced in discovery or submitted to the Court as "confidential" or "highly confidential" and to withhold from Plaintiffs information protected by the work product doctrine or attorney-client privilege.

On September 24, 2007, Plaintiffs filed a new motion for temporary restraining order as well as a second amended verified complaint with the Circuit Court for Baltimore City in which they requested that the Court "compel Telos to adhere to the Telos

[Table of Contents](#)

Amended and Restated Bylaws” and alleged that provisions concerning the noticing of Board committee meetings and the recording of Board meeting minutes had been violated and that in addition, Mr. Wood’s service as both CEO and Chairman of the Board was improper and impermissible under the Company’s Bylaws. The Company filed its answer to the second amended verified complaint on October 10, 2007. The hearing on this motion for temporary restraining order was held on October 11, 2007. The Court denied the Plaintiffs’ motion on October 12, 2007. On the same day, the Court issued an amended preliminary injunction order stating that Plaintiffs are entitled to receive written responses to requests for board of directors or board committee minutes within 7 days of any such requests and copies of such minutes within 15 days of any such requests, as well as written responses to all other requests for information and/or documents related to Plaintiffs’ duties as directors within 7 days of such requests and all board of directors appropriate information and/or documents within 30 days of any such requests. The Court further stated that in all other respects, the preliminary injunction order of August 28, 2007 shall remain in full force and effect.

As noted above under *Costa Brava Partnership III, L.P.*, the Court issued a discovery order denying Plaintiffs’ request to reclassify the challenged documents as “confidential.” Such Court order also applies to any and all documents produced in the *Hamot et al. v Telos Corporation* litigation as well as documents provided to Messrs. Hamot and Siegel in their capacity as Class D directors of the Company.

At this stage of the litigation, it is impossible to reasonably determine the degree of probability related to Plaintiffs’ success in any of their assertions. Although there can be no assurance as to the ultimate outcome of this litigation, the Company and its officers and directors strenuously deny Plaintiffs’ claims, will vigorously defend the matter, and will continue to oppose the relief sought.

In addition to the above-referenced litigations, the Company is a party to litigation arising in the ordinary course of business. In the opinion of management, while the results of such litigation cannot be predicted with any reasonable degree of certainty, the final outcome of such known matters will not, based upon all available information, have a material adverse effect on the Company’s consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

Note 8. Related Party Transactions

The Company’s policies and practices with respect to related person transactions were adopted on October 25, 2007 and filed with the Proxy Statement on October 26, 2007, which is attached as Exhibit 10.17.

The brother of the Company’s Chairman and CEO has been an employee of the Company since 1996. The amounts paid to this individual as compensation for the three and nine month periods ended September 30, 2007 were \$50,000 and \$152,000, respectively. The amounts paid to this individual as compensation for the three and nine month periods ended September 30, 2006 were \$26,000 and \$96,000, respectively.

PART II—OTHER INFORMATION

Item 6. Exhibits

Exhibit Number	Description of Exhibit
3.1	Articles of Amendment and Restatement of the Company, dated January 14, 1992. (Incorporated by reference to Exhibit 4 to the Company's Form 8-K filed on January 29, 1992)
3.2	Amended and Restated Bylaws of the Company, as amended on October 3, 2007. (Incorporated by reference to Exhibit 3.1 to the Company's Form 8-K filed on October 5, 2007)
10.17*	Policy with Respect to Related Person Transactions
23.1	Consent of Navigant Consulting, Inc. (Incorporated by reference to Exhibit 23.1 to the Company's Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2006)
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*	Certification Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as Adopted Pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002

* filed herewith

SIGNATURES

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

Date: November 20, 2007

TELOS CORPORATION

/s/ John B. Wood

John B. Wood
Chief Executive Officer

/s/ Michele Nakazawa

Michele Nakazawa
Chief Financial Officer

TELOS CORPORATION
POLICY WITH RESPECT TO RELATED PERSON TRANSACTIONS

I. Purpose

This Related Person Transaction Policy was adopted by the Board of Directors of Telos Corporation (the “Company”) to ensure the timely identification, review, approval and ratification of transactions with related persons and to assist the Company in the timely disclosure of such transactions in the Company’s filings with the SEC, as required by the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and related rules and regulations.

This policy is intended to supersede other policies of the Company such as the Code of Conduct and the Corporate Governance Principles that may be applicable to transactions with related persons.

II. Definitions

For purposes of this policy, the following definitions apply:

“**Related Person Transaction**” means any transaction or series of transactions in which (i) the Company or a subsidiary is a participant, (ii) the aggregate amount involved exceeds \$120,000 and (iii) any “Related Person” has a direct or indirect material interest.

“**Related Person**” means:

- Any director or executive officer of the Company;
- Any immediate family member of a director or executive officer of the Company;
- Any nominee for director and the immediate family members of such nominee;
- A 5% beneficial owner of the Company’s voting securities or any immediate family member of such owner; and
- Any firm, corporation or other entity in which any of the foregoing persons is employed or is a partner or principal or in a similar position or in which such person has a 10% or greater beneficial ownership interest.

“**Immediate Family Member**” means any child, stepchild, parent, stepparent, spouse, sibling, mother-in-law, father-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law of a person, and any person (other than a tenant or employee) sharing the household of such person.

III. Review/Report

Related Person Transactions shall be reviewed by the Board of Directors acting through the Audit Committee at regularly scheduled committee meetings, except that the Chairman of the Audit Committee may call a special committee meeting to review a proposed Related Person Transaction. That transaction is subject to the approval and/or ratification of the full Board of Directors. If the proposed Related Person Transaction involves a director, then that director may participate in the deliberations pursuant to the last paragraph of this policy below, but may not vote with respect to such approval or ratification.

Each individual executive officer and director shall be responsible for reporting any potential Related Person Transaction to the General Counsel and/or the Audit Committee. The Company shall take such steps as it deems reasonable and appropriate to inform such executive officers and directors about this Related Person Transactions policy, which shall include:

- Distributing (as soon as reasonably practicable following the completion of each fiscal year) a formal questionnaire to all executive officers and directors requiring these persons to evaluate and disclose whether or not during the preceding fiscal year they were involved in, or aware of, any Related Person Transaction;
- Posting this policy on the Company website and including it in the Company's 2007 proxy statement;
- Periodically distributing this policy to the Company's executive officers and directors; and
- Periodically making internal inquiries regarding Company relationships with known entities that qualify as Related Persons.

Whether the Related Person's interest in a proposed transaction is material or not will depend on all facts and circumstances, including whether a reasonable investor would consider the person's interest in the transaction important, together with all other available information, in deciding whether to buy, sell or hold the Company's securities. In preparing the Company's SEC filings and in determining whether a transaction is subject to this policy, the Company's General Counsel is entitled to make the determinations of whether a particular relationship constitutes a material interest by a Related Person. In administering this policy, the Audit Committee shall be entitled (but not required) to rely upon such determinations of materiality by the Company's General Counsel.

In reviewing a proposed Related Person Transaction, the Committee shall consider all relevant facts and circumstances, including the commercial reasonableness of the terms, the benefit, or lack thereof, to the Company, opportunity costs of alternate transactions, the materiality and character of the Related Person's direct or indirect interest, and the actual or apparent conflict of interest of the Related Person. The Audit Committee shall forward to the full Board of Directors its recommendations in regards to any Related Person Transaction involving a director or an executive officer of the Company, for final determination.

CERTIFICATION

I, John B. Wood, certify that:

1. I have reviewed this quarterly report on Form 10-Q of Telos Corporation;

2. Based on my knowledge, this report does not contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which such statements were made, not misleading with respect to the period covered by this report;

3. Based on my knowledge, the financial statements, and other financial information included in this report, fairly present in all material respects the financial condition, results of operations and cash flows of the registrant as of, and for, the periods presented in this report;

4. The registrant's other certifying officer and I are responsible for establishing and maintaining disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e)) and internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f)) for the registrant and we have:

a) Designed such disclosure controls and procedures, or caused such disclosure controls and procedures to be designed under our supervision, to ensure that material information relating to the registrant, including its consolidated subsidiaries, is made known to us by others within those entities, particularly during the period in which this report is being prepared;

b) Designed such internal control over financial reporting, or caused such internal control over financial reporting to be designed under our supervision, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles;

c) Evaluated the effectiveness of the registrant's disclosure controls and procedures and presented in this report our conclusions about the effectiveness of the disclosure controls and procedures, as of the end of the period covered by this report based on such evaluation; and

d) Disclosed in this report any change in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the registrant's most recent fiscal quarter that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the registrant's internal control over financial reporting; and

5. The registrant's other certifying officer and I have disclosed, based on our most recent evaluation of internal control over financial reporting, to the registrant's auditors and the audit committee of registrant's board of directors:

a) All significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in the design or operation of internal control over financial reporting which are reasonably likely to adversely affect the registrant's ability to record, process, summarize and report financial information; and

b) Any fraud, whether or not material, that involves management or other employees who have a significant role in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting.

Date: November 20, 2007

/s/ John B. Wood

John B. Wood
Chief Executive Officer

CERTIFICATION

I, Michele Nakazawa, certify that:

1. I have reviewed this quarterly report on Form 10-Q of Telos Corporation;

2. Based on my knowledge, this report does not contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which such statements were made, not misleading with respect to the period covered by this report;

3. Based on my knowledge, the financial statements, and other financial information included in this report, fairly present in all material respects the financial condition, results of operations and cash flows of the registrant as of, and for, the periods presented in this report;

4. The registrant's other certifying officer and I are responsible for establishing and maintaining disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e)) and internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Exchange Act Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f)) for the registrant and we have:

a) Designed such disclosure controls and procedures, or caused such disclosure controls and procedures to be designed under our supervision, to ensure that material information relating to the registrant, including its consolidated subsidiaries, is made known to us by others within those entities, particularly during the period in which this report is being prepared;

b) Designed such internal control over financial reporting, or caused such internal control over financial reporting to be designed under our supervision, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles;

c) Evaluated the effectiveness of the registrant's disclosure controls and procedures and presented in this report our conclusions about the effectiveness of the disclosure controls and procedures, as of the end of the period covered by this report based on such evaluation; and

d) Disclosed in this report any change in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the registrant's most recent fiscal quarter that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the registrant's internal control over financial reporting; and

5. The registrant's other certifying officer and I have disclosed, based on our most recent evaluation of internal control over financial reporting, to the registrant's auditors and the audit committee of registrant's board of directors:

a) All significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in the design or operation of internal control over financial reporting which are reasonably likely to adversely affect the registrant's ability to record, process, summarize and report financial information; and

b) Any fraud, whether or not material, that involves management or other employees who have a significant role in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting.

Date: November 20, 2007

/s/ Michele Nakazawa

Michele Nakazawa
Chief Financial Officer

**CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO
18 U.S.C. SECTION 1350,
AS ADOPTED PURSUANT TO
SECTION 906 OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002**

In connection with the Quarterly Report of Telos Corporation (the "Company") on Form 10-Q for the period ending September 30, 2007 as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on the date hereof (the "report"), we, John B. Wood and Michele Nakazawa, Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, respectively, of the Company, certify, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1350, as adopted pursuant to § 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, that to our knowledge:

- (1) The report fully complies with the requirements of section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; and
- (2) The information contained in the report fairly presents, in all material respects, the financial condition and results of operations of the Company.

November 20, 2007

/s/ John B. Wood

John B. Wood
Chief Executive Officer

/s/ Michele Nakazawa

Michele Nakazawa
Chief Financial Officer