

Question	Answer
<p>Is a solution that allows for the screening of shoes without removing them of interest under solicitation 70RSAT20RB00000002? The technology may be implemented as a standalone or integrated scanner.</p>	<p>If a system that can screen shoes without removing them can support the capability objectives listed in solicitation section 1.2 it could be of interest.</p>
<p>Is it recommended for companies who wants to respond to TTA#1 as well as TTA#2 to submit two separate whitepapers, or preferably a combined single whitepaper?</p>	<p>Please submit one white paper per TTA. They will be evaluated independently.</p>
<p>Can we submit to more than one TTA? If yes, should we submit a separate white paper for each or by combining them?</p>	<p>Yes, offerors may submit to more than one TTA. Please submit a separate white paper for each. They will be evaluated independently.</p>
<p>What is the anticipated time for starting funding? Is a start date in 2020 possible, or rather early 2021?</p>	<p>It is anticipated that contracts would be awarded in FY2021</p>
<p>Can you please confirm that it is the intent to award “cost reimbursement” type contracts for this call ?</p>	<p>It is anticipated awards made for each Call issued against this BAA will be in the form of cost reimbursement type contracts. However, the Government reserves the right to award firm-fixed price contracts, cooperative agreements, Other Transactions (OTs) (if authorized by law at time of award), or interagency agreements to appropriate parties should the situation warrant.</p>
<p>The BAA mainly references X-Ray type equipment. Is there also interest in explosive trace detection self screening technologies?</p>	<p>There is interest in any technology that can support the capability objectives listed in solicitation section 1.2</p>
<p>Can a device be stand alone or does it need to be integrated into a complete system?</p>	<p>TTA #1 is focused on concept design for an integrated solution. TTA #2 and TTA #3 can be standalone at this time, but should include a pathway for future integration into a combined solution. Note: a combined solution does not necessarily need to be a single integrated system.</p>
<p>It is documented that the final screening will be performed as it currently is, making this an additional physical footprint for pre-screening only. Are there footprint restrictions for the entire pre-screening process such as width and / or length restrictions? To further the question, are there requirements for minimum widths for passengers to walk through?</p>	<p>This concept is not a pre-screener. There are no footprint restrictions on the design, but overall footprint and passenger throughput should be considered as part of the concept. For reference, TSA's current Checkpoint Requirements and Planning Guide (CRPG) can be found on beta.sam.gov here: https://beta.sam.gov/opp/44099b735e494ef48cd27a9589c3c8ba/view</p>

<p>Is an OEM allowed to subcontract with multiple parties under multiple responses? For example, can an OEM subcontract with a System Integrator for TTA #1 as well as a Third Party Algorithm Provider for TTA #3, while still proposing an Accessible Property Screening solution under TTA #2 that both TTA #1 and TTA #3 Primes would depend upon for their solution??</p>	<p>Offerors are welcome to form teams if they believe it will best help them achieve the objectives listed in the solicitation. However, each TTA will be evaluated independently and, recognizing the technical risk associated with the efforts requested under TTA #2 and TTA #3, TTA #1 offerors should not make assumptions regarding TTA #2 and TTA #3 solutions being available and viable when developing TTA #1 system design concepts.</p>
<p>Section 1.2, page 1 Will self-screening be totally autonomous or will there be TSA agents there to monitor passengers as they go through the process to ensure that they follow all of the procedures correctly?</p>	<p>One objective of this solution is to minimize the number of Transportation Security Officers (TSOs) necessary to manage the self-screening process. Proposed solutions may require TSO monitoring to ensure passenger compliance, but should seek to minimize the staffing required for operations and oversight.</p>
<p>Section 1.2, page 1 Understanding that you want to enable “self-resolution of alarms” what happens when that just isn’t possible? What are the alarm resolution procedures for people/bags etc. that raise a flag during the self-screening process? - Is it to send them for a pat down? - Is it to send them to an ETD screening station? - Could it be both?</p>	<p>The alarm resolution procedures are within the design scope under TTA #1 and could vary based on the type of alarm. This could include a pat down, the use of explosives trace detection (ETD) technology, or other alarm resolution techniques.</p>
<p>Section 1.2, page 1 On page 1 of the BAA Call document, while the reference of weapons is more self-explanatory, there is mention of “organic threat items hidden on passengers,” what are these threat items referring to and do they need to be identified in the pre-screening process?</p>	<p>Organic threat items refer to other prohibited materials that may not explicitly be a weapon, e.g. explosive materials</p>
<p>Section 2, Page 2 In the project description / scope – what is the definition of hardware and software subsystems?</p>	<p>A hardware subsystem would be a technology, eventually integrated into a larger self-screening solution, that has a physical embodiment like a sensor system. A software subsystem would be a technology, eventually integrated into a larger self-screening solution, that consists of purely algorithms or technologies that rely on data provided by other subsystems. For the purposes of this solicitation, a software subsystem may still include its own general computing hardware with associated inputs and outputs to accomplish its objectives.</p>

<p>Section 2, Pages 2-3 If a proposed concept involved hardware development and recognition algorithms incorporated into the hardware, should this be bid under task 2 or task 3?</p>	<p>A hardware system with its own algorithms should be proposed under TTA #2</p>
<p>Section 2.3, Page 3 Will there be specific meetings/collaboration sessions set up between TTA awardees during the execution of the projects?</p>	<p>S&T plans to facilitate collaboration amongst awardees and other stakeholders, but there are no mandatory meetings or collaboration sessions included in the representative SOWs.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 3 In TTA #1 the phrase “or in their accessible property” is not included in the first sentence. However, Accessible Property Screening is mentioned under TTA #1, Statement of Work, Subtask 4.1, page 5. Is TTA #1 meant to apply only to “on passenger screening” or only to system integrators providing a complete solution only? Or can Accessible Property Screening focused solutions be proposed under TTA #1?</p>	<p>The intention is that TTA #1 will develop a concept for both passenger and accessible property screening. The relevant language in both the representative SOW and Section 3 TTA #1 have been updated to reflect this.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 4 In TTA # 1 – how does the ICD relate to TSA’s checkpoint IRD for ASLs?</p>	<p>If the concept includes integration with an ASL or ASL-like system, TSA's checkpoint IRD for ASLs could be leveraged to reduce technical risk. It is not mandatory as part of this concept. TTA #1's draft SOW and Section 1.2 have been updated to clarify that ASLs are not mandatory as part of the solution.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 4 What is the minimum requirement for TRL level for TTA#1 prototype?</p>	<p>There is no formal requirement for TRL level for TTA #1 as the task seeks to design a system concept. However, design concepts submitted under TTA #1 should be designed to be able to incorporate mature technology components as well as new capabilities as they become available (e.g. TTA #2, TTA#3 proposed technologies). Technical risk is a component of the evaluation to assess the likelihood that a proposed concept will meet DHS requirements.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 4 Does the concept design have to include both the on-person pre-screening and the pre-screening of their personal property?</p>	<p>The concept should include techniques for screening both passengers and their accessible-property.</p>

<p>Section 3, Page 4 In TTA#1 - If this is only used for TSA precheck population, is there a requirement for the passenger to remove their shoes and/or for the shoes to be scanned?</p>	<p>This initial concept is for the TSA precheck population, so shoes would not have to be removed. S&T would be interested in concepts that could be deployed as a part of a variety of security postures in the future, which may include either divestiture of shoes or shoe scanning</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 4 In TTA #1 If this is for TSA precheck passengers, does the passenger leave all items in their carry on bag, including laptop and liquids?</p>	<p>This initial concept is for the TSA precheck population, so laptops and liquids can remain in their carry-on bag. S&T would be interested in concepts that could be deployed as a part of a variety of security postures in the future, which may include alternative divestiture requirements.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 4 In TTA #1 Does this TTA include hardware component development?</p>	<p>TTA #1 is focused on concept design for an integrated solution. Per the draft SOW, some modeling and technical risk reduction activities are included as part of the system concept design. Efforts that are focused on hardware component development may be better suited for TTA #2.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 4 In TTA #1 Should the self-service solution include screening of (carry-on) baggage and accessible property?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 5 In TTA # 2 – how does the ICD relate to TSA’s checkpoint IRD for ASLs?</p>	<p>The ICD is primarily focused on allowing systems developed under TTA #2 to integrate with their party software developers (e.g. activities included under TTA #3 or other partners). If the system proposed under TTA #2 includes interfaces to automated conveyance, the TSA checkpoint IRD for ASLs could be leveraged to reduce technical risk.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 5 If a people imaging technology is being proposed for a TTA #2 program, can you confirm that ATR algorithms are not required for this submission ? (i.e. the prototype would be an imaging only prototype)</p>	<p>An imaging only prototype is allowed for this submission, however the effort should include the development of an ICD that would be suitable for third party algorithm developers to work with the outputs of the people imaging technology.</p>

<p>Section 3, Page 6 In TTA # 3 – please expand on what is anomalous passenger behavior? Are these signs of malicious intent similar to Behavior Detection Analysis techniques used by TSA BDOs? Is DHS interested in multiple technologies for automated detection of bad intentions(e.g. voice stress analysis, gait analysis, facial thermography, skin conductivity (sweat), other biomarkers indicative of malicious intent)?</p>	<p>No, the intention is not similar to Behavior Detection Analysis. The intention is to detect activities such as trying to circumvent the self-screening process, probe the self-screening process for vulnerabilities, or similar activities. A hypothetical example would be to identify a passenger throwing a handgun over the side of a self-screening "pod" so an adversary could complete the process and retrieve the handgun on the sterile side of the process.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 6 “The ATR and video analytics algorithm technologies developed under this TTA may be required to be integrated into an operationally viable platform/environment.” For TTA #3, will the evaluation process give greater consideration to vendors who propose not just an ATR or video analytics algorithm, but also an accompanying open architecture platform capable of integrating and evaluating the data and algorithms from many different vendors, both OEM and non-OEM?</p>	<p>Evaluation environments are not considered under this solicitation. If the solution proposed includes an open architecture to facilitate system integration, that would be of interest.</p>
<p>Section 3, Page 6 Is TSA interested in proposals for TTA #3 that propose an open architecture platform capable of integrating data across vendors and serving as a central place to test, evaluate, compare, and deploy algorithms and models (but that do not themselves propose an ATR or video analytics algorithm?)</p>	<p>Evaluation environments are not considered under this solicitation. Solutions under TTA #1 should include the interfaces to support integration of third party software components including automatic threat recognition algorithms and video analytics.</p>
<p>Section 6, Page 10 Does the listed funding ceiling in section 6, page 10, include the hardware prototype full costs essential to realize the deliverables of Subtask 3.1 under TTA#2 SOW? Or is higher costs can be accepted after the prototype design review?</p>	<p>The funding ceiling in section 6, page 10, includes the base period plus both option periods. Note, the prototype specified under section 3.1 does not need to meet final form, fit, and function but should be suitable for evaluation and data collection.</p>
<p>TTA 1 SOW, Section 1.1, Page 28 "The solution would be deployed <u>in conjunction with</u> an X-ray system and an Automated Screening Lane (ASL) so that a passenger may screen themselves while they complete the divestiture process for inspection of their accessible property. " Please clarify. Will X-ray system and ASLs be in place for integration with proposed solution?</p>	<p>The concept proposed under TTA #1 may include integration with an ASL and X-ray system. It is not mandatory as part of this concept and S&T is interested in more compact, integrated solutions that would not require an ASL. TTA #1's draft SOW and Section 1.2 have been updated to clarify that ASLs are not mandatory as part of the solution. However, if the proposed concept includes an X-ray system and an ASL, it can be assumed that an X-ray System and ASL will be in place for integration.</p>

<p>TTA 1 SOW, Section 1.1, Page 28 What version or iteration of personal property screening X-ray/CT system will be available for testing with solutions for this program?</p>	<p>The concept proposed under TTA #1 may include integration with an ASL and X-ray system. It is not mandatory as part of this concept and S&T is interested in more compact, integrated solutions that would not require an ASL. TTA #1's draft SOW has been updated to clarify that ASLs are not mandatory as part of the solution. However, if the proposed concept includes an X-ray system and an ASL, it can be assumed that an X-ray System and ASL will be in place for integration. Specific technologies may be specified during the concept design.</p>
<p>TTA 1 SOW, Section 1.1, Page 28 Are there central server hardware, firmware, and performance specifications/chipset version data available for the in place central servers that may be connected to?</p>	<p>Any hardware requirements should be included in the system concept design</p>
<p>TTA 1 SOW, Section 2.2, Page 31 Will "Precheck" apply to the passenger self screening and will there be another layer or group that has been assigned a risk score to get more or less screening?</p>	<p>This concept is initially targeted towards the TSA PreCheck environment which should be the focus under TTA 1 SOW Task 2.2 (e.g. threshold requirements), but as the capability matures it may be deployed as a part of a variety of security postures and should be considered as part of the overall concept.</p>
<p>TTA 1 SOW, Section 2.2, Page 31 Will the TDC position be replaced by Identity verification stations where the passengers will self screen/verify their BP and ID?</p>	<p>Specifics of the concepts of operations are included in the system concept design under TTA #1. They have not been defined at this time.</p>
<p>TTA 1 SOW, Section 2.2, Page 31 Will ID verification station require ID only, and through the ID the system will verify the passenger's boarding pass?</p>	<p>Specifics of the concepts of operations are included in the system concept design under TTA #1. They have not been defined at this time.</p>
<p>TTA 1 SOW, Section 2.2, Page 31 Are we safe to assume that TSOs can be reassigned to any new or repurposed positions that will arise from the Passenger self-screening model?</p>	<p>Yes, TSOs can be reassigned to any new or repurposed positions.</p>
<p>TTA 1 SOW, Section 2.2, Page 31 Should we assume that we are designing for the general population that can and wants to use Self-Screening?</p>	<p>This is certainly an objective, but not mandatory under this solicitation. S&T recognizes that self-screening may be more difficult for certain portions of the traveling population. The offeror should note any limitations of the proposed concept and the system concept design and whether there is a reasonable pathway to resolving these limitations in the future.</p>

<p>Regarding the PI (Principal Investigator) tab in the cover sheet. Who should be the appropriate person assigned to this role? Does it need to be a US citizen? Can the name be changed later?</p>	<p>The BAA has no restrictions on the nationality of the Principal Investigator and allows foreign companies to submit under the BAA. The Principal Investigator can also be changed at a later date if necessary. Please be advised though that should suitability be required, nationality can impact and extend the timeline for suitability clearance.</p>
<p>We are less than 500 employees and meet the NAICS code, do we need to add it to our SAM.gov company entity classification?</p>	<p>Yes, please add 541712 to your SAM registration.</p>
<p>The TTA #3 is Type III, which is meant for up to 12 months, but it specifically states that the base period is 4 months, then option period 1 for 8 months (in which the development ends) and option Period 2 is additional 6 months for DHS testing and evaluation. Do we need to fill in the project duration as 12 months or 18 months in the cover section of the whitepaper submission in https://baa2.st.dhs.gov/ ?</p>	<p>Either entry is acceptable, 12 months or 18 months.</p>
<p>Can you please confirm that this program/solicitation is not for requirements definition for future solicitations that would create Organization Conflict of Interest (OCI) concerns for participants? Can you please confirm that participation in this program/solicitation will not preclude participation in future solicitations for related or follow on programs?</p>	<p>The intention of this effort is to promote competition to the greatest extent possible both on this solicitation and on future efforts. While information gathered through awards resulting from this solicitation may inform future requirements definition, these awards are not currently anticipated to include any tasks that specifically involve defining the Government's requirements. The Government intends to draft statement of work for individual awards that reduce the likelihood that participants in this RFP would be precluded from participation in future solicitations or efforts directly related to this topic or arising from the performance of efforts under this topic. However, because the statements of work for individual awards are not finalized, the Government cannot at this time definitively confirm that there will never be a future organizational conflict of interest. This is a case by case determination made at the time of an individual contract award.</p>