300A - OVERVIEW

Section A: Overview	
1. Name of this Investment:	TSA - Passenger Screening Program (PSP)
2. Unique Investment Identifier (UII):	N024-000005612

Section B: Investment Detail	
	Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments. [LIMIT: 2500 char]
1.	The Passenger Screening Program (PSP) is responsible for the identification, procurement, deployment and sustainment of checkpoint security equipment for federalized airports. PSP?s key mission is to provide technologies that assist Transportation Security Officers (TSO) in denying entry to potential threats that may cause injury, death or property damage when directed against the air transportation network. This is accomplished through R&D efforts with the DHS Science and Technology (S&T) Directorate, and through engineering and spiral development efforts conducted by TSA in conjunction with technology vendors. PSP?s technology projects include Advanced Imaging Technology, Shoe Scanner Device, Advanced Technology X-ray, Chemical Analysis Device, Bottled Liquid Scanner, Automated Wait Time, and Credential Authentication Technology/Boarding Pass Scanning System. PSP remains critical to the TSA initiatives to Prevent Terrorist Attacks and Manage Risks to Critical Infrastructure, and the DHS mission of Preventing Terrorism and Enhancing Security. This is achieved by improving threat detection capability for known and emerging threats, reducing passenger processing times to improve throughput, improving equipment reliability, maintainability and availability, and creating an airport-wide linkage of systems to broaden domain awareness and threat identification and minimize threat response time. The resulting system-of-systems architecture will allow TSA to comprehensively address known vulnerabilities and emerging threats, evaluate risks to passenger checkpoints, mitigate threats to aviation infrastructure, protect the traveling public and adapt to evolving threat conditions. PSP-managed technologies screen over two million passengers per day, along with their carry-on items, for the presence of weapons, explosives, and prohibited items at over 450 airports. The main beneficiaries of this investment are airport authorities, the TSOs that operate the equipment, and the traveling public. PSP depends on the Security Technology Integrated Program (STIP) to manage the information technology elements for PSP technology projects, the Office of Security Operations for requirements definition, and DHS S&T for scientific research and development. PSP is meeting and will continue to meet the future business needs of TSA through continued focus on improving operational effectiveness and suitability, while also promoting higher levels of passenger satisfaction.
	How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded. [LIMIT: 2500 char]
2.	The gap PSP helps to close is the move from a technology driven screening system to a passenger, risk based screening security system. The move would allow the focus of the program to be more proactive and help to neutralize or minimize threats by long range assessment before they became immediate issues. This will be accomplished through the application of threat intelligence directly to checkpoint operations, ability to assign risk to specific individuals, improved data retrieval and information handling for informed management decision-making that will help to broaden domain awareness, centralize performance monitoring and operational data gathering, improved threat detection capability across the range of known and emergent threats, while encompassing all airport security into a network centric operation that links process efficiency to security effectiveness. The ever changing threat environment and ability of terrorists to exploit vulnerabilities in the passenger inspection process demand investments in new technologies to improve the range of threats detected, enhance awareness provide predictive intelligence and reduce the overall costs of maintaining equipment and resources/staffing. The potential impact of not funding the investment is substantial, the technologies that TSA relies on will not be able to stay abreast of the expanding and evolving scope of threats and the investment would not be able to integrate sensors and behavioral techniques into the airport security model as planned. Overall, it will limit the ability to take the current aviation security system to the next level of effectiveness or to evolve to an integrated network-centric system-of-

	systems of equipment, services, and applications that further increase air travel passenger safety.
3.	*For this investment's technical features, please identify where any specific technical solutions are required by legislation, in response to audit findings, or to meet requirements from other sources. Where "Yes" is indicated, provide a brief description of the technical features required, and any citations regarding specific mandates for these requirements.*

	Yes/No	Description [LIMIT: 1000 char]
Legislative Mandate	Yes	Aviation and Transportation Security Act; Public Law 107-071: Oversee the implementation, and ensure the adequacy of security measures at airports and other transportation facilities.
Audit Finding Resolution	No	
Published Agency Strategic Plan	No	
Other Requirements	No	

Accomplishments

	Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved. [LIMIT: 1000 char]
4.	Finalized deployment of first phase of Advanced Imaging Technology, began deployment of Advanced Technology-2, added Automated Target Recognition functionality to Advanced Imaging Technology, expanded the use of NextGen Explosives Trace Detectors, Bottled Liquid Scanners, and Chemical Analysis Devices, while adding Credential Authentication Technology to the checkpoints.
	Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY). [LIMIT: 2500 char]
5.	This investment will finalize deployment of the second phase of the Advanced Imaging Technology, it will expand the use of NextGen Explosives Trace Detectors, expand testing of Shoe Scanners Devices, expand the use of Advanced Technology – 2 systems, it will begin the large scale deployment of the Credential Authentication Technology, and will add the Automated Wait Time functionality to the checkpoints.
6.	*Provide brief descriptions of out year (BY+1, BY+2, BY+3, BY+4 and beyond as necessary) budget requests for this investment. Briefly describe planned projects and/or useful components proposed, Your justification should address new functionality, systems integration, technology refreshes, efficeiencies obtained, and any other enhancements to existing assets/systems performance or agency operations.*

Fiscal Year	Description [LIMIT: 500 char]
BY+1	Reach FOC for Advanced Technology Systems, expand use of Advanced Imaging Technology, and Shoe Scanning Devices, and NextGen ETD
BY+2	Reach FOC for Advanced Imaging Technology, expand use of Shoe Scanning Devices, and NextGen ETD
BY+3	Expand use of Shoe Scanning Devices, begin recapitalization of technologies as needed
BY+4 and beyond	Expand use of Shoe Scanning Devices, and continue recapitalization of technologies as needed

Program Management

	Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this

	program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.
7.	Aug 19, 2011
8.	*Provide the following 5 required IPT members. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government employees.*

IPT Contact Information	Name	Phone Number	Extension	Email
	[LIMIT: 250 char]	**[10 digits, 0-9 only]**	**[Optional: 6 digits, 0-9 only]**	**[LIMIT: one email only]**
IT Program Manager	Domenic Bianchini	(571) 227-1482		domenic.bianchini@tsa.dhs.gov
Business Process Owner	Domenic Bianchini	(571) 227-1482		Domenic.Bianchini@tsa.dhs.gov
Contract Specialist	Holly Bolger	(571) 227-3036		Holly.Bolger@tsa.dhs.gov
Information Technology Specialist	Jason Hull	(571) 227-1175		jason.hull@tsa.dhs.gov
Security Specialist	Bruce Shim	(571) 227-5092		Yong.shim@tsa.dhs.gov

300A - SUMMARY OF FUNDING

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets) (In Millions)	
1.	*Provide the funding summary for this investment by completing the following table. Include funding authority from all sources in millions, and round to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the rows designated "DME Govt. FTE Costs" and "Operations Govt. FTE Costs" and should be excluded where indicated for DME Costs and Operations Costs. Cost levels should be consistent with funding levels in Exhibit 53. For multi-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing and partner agency contributions).*
	For years beyond BY+1, please provide your best estimates for planning purposes, understanding that estimates for out-year spending will be less certain than estimates for BY+1 or closer.
	For lines in the table that ask for changes in your current submission compared to your most recent previous submission, please use the President's Budget as your previous submission. When making comparisons, please ensure that you compare same-year-to-same-year (e.g., 2011 v. 2011).
	Significant changes from the previous submission should be reflected in a the Investment level Alternatives Analysis and is subject to OMB request as discussed in section 300.5.

	PY-1 & Earlier	PY	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4 & Beyond	Total
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017 +	
Planning Costs:	28.600	17.297	15.447	14.000	14.000	13.000	13.000	182.000	297.344
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	854.267	300.791	166.971	83.914	86.572	87.572	87.572	1,226.008	2,893.667
DME Govt. FTEs:	11.021	8.838	7.688	8.608	8.651	8.695	8.738	127.016	189.255
SUBTOTAL DME:	893.888	326.926	190.106	106.522	109.223	109.267	109.310	1,535.024	3,380.266
O&M-Excluding Govt FTE Costs:	283.097	76.000	61.230	73.151	73.151	73.151	73.151	1,024.114	1,737.045
O&M Govt. FTEs:	0.580	0.465	0.405	0.453	0.455	0.458	0.460	6.685	9.961
SUBTOTAL O&M Costs:	283.677	76.465	61.635	73.604	73.606	73.609	73.611	1,030.799	1,747.006
TOTAL COST:	1,177.565	403.391	251.741	180.126	182.829	182.876	182.921	2,565.823	5,127.272
Total Govt. FTE Costs:	11.601	9.303	8.093	9.061	9.106	9.153	9.198	133.701	199.216
# of FTEs rep by Costs:	76.00	53.00	51.00	58.00	58.00	58.00	58.00	812.00	1,224.00
Total from prior yr final Pres. Budget ($)*		316.798	318.434						

Total chg from prior yr final Pres. Budget ($)		86.593	-66.693						
Total chg from prior yr final Pres. Budget (%)		27.334	-20.944						

	** Source of funding is based on the Exh 53 June 3rd submission and Exhibit 300 February 28th submission.*
2.	*While some investments are consistent with a defined life cycle model (i.e., an initial period of development followed by a period of primarily operational spending and an identifiable end point), others represent a collection of ongoing activities and operations with no known terminal point. In the following table, identify whether or not this investment uses a defined life cycle model (as defined in OMB Circular A-131) and provide appropriate investment cost information below.*
	Is this investment consistent with a life cycle model defined in OMB Circular A-131(i.e., an initial period of development followed by a period of primarily operational spending and an identifiable end point):
2.a.	No
	Describe why the investment is not consistent with life cycle model management defined in OMB Circular A-131, and explain how you adapted your alternatives analysis for this investment? (Where an agency uses a cost model other than the lifecycle cost model, defined by OMB Circular A-131, responses from 2c to 2h below should reflect the alternative concept.) [LIMIT: 1000 char] (Required if 2.a. is N):
2.b.	This investment is authorized by Congress and receives yearly appropriations and currently does not have a scheduled end date. Due to the likelihood that this investment will continue indefinitely the investment is constantly in both DME while trying to find the next emerging technologies to keep a high level of security and O&M maintaining current operations at our Nation's airports.
	Provide information on what cost model this investment is using and how costs are captured for what years [LIMIT: 1000 char] (Required if 2.a. is N):
2.c.	This investment uses a Life Cycle Cost Estimate. The LCCE for the investment discounts sunk costs for the years prior to FY10 and it includes requirements driven costs for the procurement of the technology and needed operations to test, procure, and field those systems. The LCCE covers costs until FY2029.
	What year did this investment start (use year—i.e., PY-1=2010) (Required if 2.a. is Y):
2.d.	
	What year will this investment end (use year—i.e., BY+5=2018) (Required if 2.a. is Y):
2.e.	
	Estimated Total DME cost (including planning) for the investment life cycle or other cost model (excluding FTE):
2.f.	3,191.011
	Estimated Total O&M cost the investment life cycle or other cost model (excluding FTE):
2.g.	1,737.045
	Estimated total Govt. FTE Cost for the investment life cycle or other cost model:
2.h.	199.216
	If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes [LIMIT: 500 char]:
3a.	No change from 2012 President's Budget request.

300A - ACQUISITION/CONTRACT STRATEGY

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

1. Complete or update the table to display all prime contracts (or task orders) awarded or open solicitations for this investment (sub-award details is not required). Contracts and/or task orders that have "Ended" should not be included in the table. Contracts in open solicitation should provide estimated data for all fields (for "Total Contract Value" the estimated base contract costs and all anticipated option years). Data definitions can be found at www.usaspending.gov/learn#a2.

For specifics, please see notes 1 and 2 below the table.

#	Active?	Contract Status	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier [LIMIT: 250 char]	IAA Contract/Exemption?	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) PIID (required if part of an IDV)	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID
1	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS02-06-D-DEP222	No			
2	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-07-D-DEP346	No			
3	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-07-D-DEP347	No			HSTS04-07-R-DEP085
4	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-08-F-CT8600	No			HSTS04-09-F-REC401
5	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-A-ST2194	No	GS07F0173M	4730	N/A
6	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-C-CT3101	No			N/A
7	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-D-CT2040	No			N/A
8	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-D-CT2041	No			N/A
9	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-D-CT2077	No			N/A
10	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-D-CT2078	No			N/A
11	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-C-CT8507	No			N/A
12	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-D-ST2003	No			HSTS04-08-R-CT2056
13	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS01-09-J-OPP254	No	HSTS01-09-D-OSO900	7013	N/A
14	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-C-CT3173	No			N/A
15	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-F-REC212	No	GS07F9148S	4730	N/A
16	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-D-ST2233	No			N/A
17	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-D-CT7006	No			N/A
18	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-D-CT2077	No			N/A

19	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-Q-CT3006	No			HSTS04-10-Q-CT3006
20	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-D-ST2022	No			N/A
21	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-D-ST3066	No			N/A
22	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-D-ST2019	No			N/A
23	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-A-ST2015	No			N/A
24	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-D-CT2116	No			N/A
25	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-D-CT2118	No			N/A
26	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-C-CT2017	No			N/A
27	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-D-CT2117	No			N/A
28	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-F-CT8539	No	GS23F0008K	4730	N/A
29	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS05-11-P-CT2001	No			N/A
30	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-07-D-DEP345	No			N/A
31	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-09-A-ST1292	No	GS07F0223N	4730	N/A
32	Active	Awarded	7013	HSTS04-10-J-CT2067	No	HSHQDC09-D-00016	7001	N/A

#	Alternate Financing	EVM Required	Ultimate Contract Value ($M)	Type of Contract/Task Order (Pricing)	Is the contract a Performance Based Service Acquisition (PBSA)?	Effective date	Actual or expected End Date of Contract/Task Order	Extent Competed	Short description of services or product to be acquired	Contractor Na
1	NA	No	8.500	Firm Fixed Price	No	Nov 27, 2006	Aug 24, 2011	Full and Open Competition	Tables and cabinets for ETDs	KLN Steel Produc Company
2	NA	No	77.991	Time and Materials	No	Jun 29, 2008	Jun 28, 2011	Full and Open Competition	AT X-ray devices and services	Rapiscan Security Products
3	NA	No	164.065	Firm Fixed Price	No	Jun 29, 2007	Jun 28, 2011	Full and Open Competition	AT X-ray devices and services	Smith's Detectior Inc
4	NA	No	47.484	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 22, 2013	Full and Open Competition	Program Management Support	Deloitte Consultir
5	NA	No	5.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Aug 10, 2009	Aug 8, 2014	Competed under SAP	Ancillary equipment (belt posts)	Lavi Industries/L Communications
6	NA	No	3.500	Firm Fixed Price	No	Nov 14, 2008	Nov 13, 2011	Competed under SAP	Acquire technical services to assist the TSA Office of	Logical Essence

									Security Technology (OST) to independently validate and verify the performance of maintenance support contractors who perform preventative and corrective maintenance of Transportation Security Equipment (TSE)	
7	NA	No	556.495	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 11, 2009	Sep 10, 2014	Full and Open Competition	ETD equipment	GE Homeland Protection/Morph Detection Inc
8	NA	No	767.287	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 18, 2009	Sep 29, 2014	Full and Open Competition	ETD equipment	Smiths Detection
9	NA	No	173.491	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 28, 2009	Sep 26, 2014	Full and Open Competition	AIT units (Secure 1000)	Rapiscan System Incorporated
10	NA	No	55.340	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 29, 2009	Sep 28, 2014	Full and Open Competition	BLS devices and services	Smith's Detectior
11	NA	No	3.275	Firm Fixed Price	No	Mar 1, 2010	Feb 28, 2012	Not Available for Competition	Provide warehouse operations services for Government property at TSA leased warehouses in Texas	Logistics Systems Incorporated
12	NA	No	173.604	Firm Fixed Price	No	Jan 12, 2010	Dec 30, 2014	Full and Open Competition	AIT Contract Award for Whole Body Imager (WBI)	L3 Communicatic Corporation
13	NA	No	700.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Aug 17, 2009	Aug 16, 2014	Full and Open Competition	Specialized Security Training (SST) services	Lockheed Martin Services, Inc
14	NA	No	239.934	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 30, 2009	Jan 31, 2014	Full and Open Competition	Maintenance repair of miscellaneous equipment	Siemens Government Serv
15	NA	No	0.055	Firm Fixed Price	No	Mar 22, 2010	Apr 1, 2012	Full and Open Competition	Chemical Analysis Device (CAD)	Alluviam
16	NA	No	800.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Aug 20, 2009	Aug 20, 2014	Full and Open Competition	Systems Engineerin & Integration Services	(SEIS) Boeing (#ST2232)/Rayth (#ST2233)/SAIC (#ST2235)/Lockh Martin (#ST2234
17	NA	No	100.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Apr 15,	Apr 14, 2015	Full and	Professional	Global Systems

						2010		Open Competition after exclusion of sources	engineering and logistics support services	Technologies, Inc
18	NA	No	42.500	Firm Fixed Price	No	Dec 7, 2009	Sep 26, 2014	Full and Open Competition	AIT Contract Award for Whole Body Imager (WBI)	Rapiscan Security Products
19	NA	No	0.957	Firm Fixed Price	No	Feb 19, 2010	Feb 18, 2012	Full and Open Competition	Warehouse space	Primera Coppell Properties
20	NA	No	57.170	Firm Fixed Price	No	Aug 27, 2010	Aug 26, 2015	Full and Open Competition	BLS devices and services	Ahura Scientific
21	NA	No	350.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 9, 2010	Sep 9, 2015	Full and Open Competition	T&E support services	Battelle Memorial Institute
22	NA	No	44.765	Firm Fixed Price	No	Aug 27, 2010	Aug 26, 2015	Full and Open Competition	BLS devices and services	CEIA USA, LLC
23	NA	No	5.500	Firm Fixed Price	No	May 24, 2010	May 23, 2012	Full and Open Competition	Glass partition items	Enterprise Furniture Consultants
24	NA	No	325.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 14, 2010	Sep 13, 2015	Full and Open Competition	AT2 X-ray	L-3 Communicati
25	NA	No	325.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 8, 2010	Sep 10, 2014	Full and Open Competition	AT2 Carry-on baggage screening systems	Rapiscan
26	NA	No	3.760	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 9, 2010	Sep 8, 2011	Full and Open Competition	Exit lane breach control systems	Securenet Inc
27	NA	No	325.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Sep 14, 2010	Jul 21, 2014	Full and Open Competition	AT2 System Procurement, Delivery, and Deployment	Smiths Detection
28	NA	No	8.609	Firm Fixed Price	No	Jun 18, 2010	Jun 17, 2011	Full and Open Competition	TESS	TASC
29	NA	No	1.429	Firm Fixed Price	No	Dec 2, 2010	Dec 2, 2011	Full and Open Competition	Manual dual row (MDR) transition tables for AT2 machines	VertiLift, Inc.
30	NA	No	80.721	Firm Fixed Price	No	Jul 29, 2007	Jun 28, 2011	Full and Open Competition	Checkpoint AT systems	L-3 Communicati Security and Detection
31	NA	No	5.000	Firm Fixed Price	No	Aug 18, 2009	Aug 17, 2014	Full and Open Competition	BPA for composure benches	Highland Product Group
32	NA	No	2.290	Labor Hours	No	Sep 16, 2010	Sep 15, 2013	Full and Open Competition	Requirements management advisory group (ReMAG) support services	Savee Consulting Inc.

Note 1: Assuming the PIID or IDV PIID match with USAspending.gov, these data elements will be automatically populated for awarded IT acquisitions
Note 2: Assumingthe PIID, IDV PIID, or Solicitation number match with USAspending.gov or FedBizOpps (fbo.gov) this data will be auto populated for awarded and pre-award, post-solicitation IT acquisitions.

Earned Value Explanation	
	If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why: [LIMIT: 2500 char]
2.	- PSP FFP contracts don't utilize EVM clauses by TSA & DHS policy. TSA MD No. 300.11 states: "The application of EVM to firm-fixed price (FFP) contracts, subcontracts, intra-Government work agreements, and other agreements is discouraged regardless of dollar value." DHS nPRS contract reporting instructions state: "FFP contracts which, by regulation, are intended to impose minimum administrative requirements upon the contracting parties. (FAR, 16.202-1). FFP places upon the contractor the maximum risk and full responsibility for all costs. EVMS not necessary." - EVM is used to mitigate risks associated with cost and schedule overruns and provide a means to forecast final cost and schedule outcomes. PSP contracts have no product developmental lifecycle clauses to create specifications for the equipment items that will be purchased. There are no DME component phases to the PSP FFP contracts. PSP purchases preconfigured COTS products through FFP contracts. Vendors assume risk as part of their development of passenger screening devices, thus this cost is not a direct cost to the government. When OST purchases the product it is ready for shipment. The final cost per product item purchased is predetermined up front in the FFP contract and the delivery schedule is also established. The risk of cost and schedule variance on a FFP contract falls on the contractor. The added resources required for administering and reporting on EVM related data, in accordance with ANSI/EIA 748 for PSP FFP contracts, would negate the benefits of a FFP contract. - In the absence of EVM, PSP utilizes government COTRs, supported by contractors as necessary and appropriate, and established Program Management Support Services contracts within OST to monitor contractor performance. Program management support constitutes schedule, cost and performance management, scheduling, and risk analysis. The support also includes the functional areas of: acquisition, integrated logistics support, business & finance, test & evaluation, communications, deployment, human resources, purchase requests, and COTR support. Technical support includes assessment of OEM technical data, assessment of emerging security technology, and quality assurance. Data analysis support includes data collection, operational use evaluation, and data modeling and simulation to assist in deployment decisions and equipment distribution configurations that maximize system benefit to cost ratios.

300B - PROJECT

1 300B Section B Project Execution Data

Addresses planning, DME and significant maintenance projects for the investment.

1. In the Active Project table, report, at a minimum, all projects with any activities that started in a previous fiscal year (PY and earlier) and have not completed by the beginning of the current year as well as activities that are scheduled to start in the current fiscal year, including planning, DME, and maintenance projects. This information should be updated at least once every month. Include the following data in Table B.1:

A. Project ID: An agency-specified number that uniquely identifies the project within this investment.

B. Project Name: Name used by agency to refer specifically to this project.

C. Project Description: Description of project functionality or purpose.

D. Project Type: (1) DME, (2) Maint

E. Project Start Date: Date of actual start of in-progress projects or planned start of projects which have not yet begun (may be before current fiscal year or activities listed in the Project Activities table).

F. Project Completion Date: Planned date of completion of in-progress projects or actual completion date of projects which have completed (may be after budget year or of completion date of activities listed in the Project Activities table).

G. Project Lifecycle Cost: Enter the total cost of all activities related to this project as described in OMB Circular No. A-131. (in $ millions)

H. PM Name: Name of project manager responsible for the success of this project.

I. PM Level of Experience: The years of applicable experience or the status of certification.

J. PM Phone: Phone number of project manager responsible for the success of this project.

K. PM Phone Extension: Phone number extension of project manager responsible for the success of this project.

L. PM Email: Email address of project manager responsible for the success of this project.

2 Projects Table

IMPORTANT Note: In order to 'facilitate' the transition from the old 'Milestone table' to the new 'Project/Project Execution Table' format, OMB has made a new requirement that the Project and Project Execution tables be expanded to include all Q4 FY2011 4th quarter projects and activities.

Table B.1 Active Projects:

#	Active?	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Type	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost	PM Name	PM Level of Experience
1	Active	1	People Screening Portfolio	Advanced Imaging Technology (AIT)	DME	Oct 1, 2006	Sep 30, 2015	25.064	Jennifer Orr	FAC-P/PM(DAWIA-2)– Mid-Level
2	Active	2	Carry-on Baggage Screening Portfolio	Advanced Technology X-Ray (AT); Next Generation Explosives Trace Detector (ETD)	DME	Oct 1, 2009	Sep 30, 2015	38.922	Nathan Lefebvre	FAC-P/PM(DAWIA-2)– Mid-Level
3	Active	3	Layered Screening Portfolio	Credential Authentication Technology and Boarding Pass Scanning System (CAT/BPSS); Automated Wait Time (AWT)	DME	Aug 28, 2009	Sep 30, 2015	3.159	Chawanna Carrington	FAC-P/PM(DAWIA-2)– Mid-Level

#	PM Phone	Project Manager Phone Ext	PM Email	Project Last Action Date
1	(571) 227-4215		jennifer.orr@tsa.dhs.gov	Aug 25, 2011

2	(571) 227-4695		Nathan.Lefebvre@tsa.dhs.gov	Aug 25, 2011
3	(571) 227-2958		chawanna.carrington@dhs.gov	Aug 25, 2011

300B - PROJECT EXECUTION

Project Activities

Addresses planning, DME and significant maintenance projects for the investment.

In the Project Activities table, describe, at a minimum, all activities occurring during the current fiscal year. This table should be updated once a month at a minimum. In line with modular development principles, activities should be structured to provide usable functionality in measureable segments that complete at least once every six months or more often, as described in the 25-Point Implementation Plan to Reform Federal IT.

A. Project ID: An agency-specified number that uniquely identifies the project within this investment.

B. Activity Name: A short description consistent with the critical steps within the agency project management methodology.

C. Activity Description: Describe what work is accomplished by this activity

D. Structure ID: Agency-specified identifier which indicates work breakdown structure agency uses to associate this activity with other activities or a project. Please provide this in the format of "x.x.x.x.x" where the first string is the Project ID and each following string (separated by periods) matches the Structure ID of a parent activity. See below for more guidance about parent and child activities expressed through this structure.

E. Key Deliverable / Usable Functionality: Indicate whether the completion of this activity provides a key deliverable or usable functionality. This should only be provided for activities which do not have a child activity. Use this field to demonstrate this investment's alignment with the modular development principles of the 25-Point Implementation Plan to Reform Federal IT.

F. Start Date Planned: The planned start date for this activity.

G. Start Date Projected: When activity has not yet started, enter current planned start date of the activity.

H. Start Date Actual: When activity starts, enter actual start date here.

I. Completion Date Planned: The planned completion date for this activity.

J. Completion Date Projected: When activity has not yet completed, enter current planned completion date of the activity.

K. Completion Date Actual: When activity ends, enter actual completion date here.

L. Total Costs Planned: The planned total cost for this activity. This is the baseline value.

M. Total Costs Projected: When activity has not yet completed, enter current planned total cost of the activity.

N. Total Costs Actual: When activity ends, enter actual total costs for the activity here.

Reporting Parent and Child Activities (WBS Structure)

"Child" activities may be grouped into "Parent" activities to reflect the work breakdown structure (WBS) the agency uses to manage the investment. If a work breakdown structure is not used by the agency, please report the relationship between parent activities and child activities in "Structure ID" using this method.

When reporting an activity, enter the "Structure ID" as a period-delimited string consisting of the "Project ID" and each nested parent child activity between the project level and the child activity. The "Structure ID" to enter will vary depending on the activity's WBS level.

Example: For child activity 3 which is part of parent activity 10, which in turn is part of parent activity 2, which in turn is part of Project A, please enter: A.2.10.3

Project A >>> Parent Activity 2 >>> Parent Activity 10 >>> Child Activity 3

There is no limit to the number of nested "child" and "parent" relationships allowed, and this depth may vary from activity to activity and from project to project.

If any of a parent activity's child activities occurs in the current fiscal year, then all child activities of the parent activity must be reported regardless of their timing. This is to ensure that a complete view of the parent activity is available.

All activities with no child activities must have, at a minimum, Project ID, Activity Name, Activity Description, Structure ID, Start Date Planned, Start Date Projected, Completion Date Planned, Completion Date Projected, Total Costs Planned, and Total Costs Projected. Completed activities must also have Start Date Actual, Completion Date Actual, and Total Costs Actual.

Any parent activities with a child activity must be completely described by the aggregate attributes of its child activities. In the IT Dashboard, the cost and schedule information for parent activities will be based on the cost and schedule information of their most detailed reported child activities. Agency-submitted cost and schedule information is not required for parent activities.

Project Execution (Activities) Table

All financials are in millions ($M).

IMPORTANT Note: In order to 'facilitate' the transition from the old 'Milestone table' to the new 'Project/Project Execution Table' format, OMB has made a new requirement that the Project and Project Execution tables be expanded to include all Q4 FY2011 4th quarter projects and activities.

#	Active?	Project ID	Activity Name	Activity Description	Structure ID	Key Deliverable/Usable	Start Date	Start Date	Start Date	Completion Date

						Functionality	Planned	Projected	Actual	Planned
1	Active	1	PSP Equipment Testing, Q4 FY11	Q4 FY11 PSP Equipment Testing	1.1	Key Deliverable	Jul 1, 2011	Jul 1, 2011	Jul 1, 2011	Sep 30, 2011
2	Active	1	PSP Equipment Testing Phase I	Phase I, systems testing	1.2	Key Deliverable	Oct 1, 2011	Oct 1, 2011		Mar 30, 2012
3	Active	1	PSP Equipment Testing Phase II	Phase II, systems testing	1.3	Key Deliverable	Apr 1, 2012	Apr 1, 2012		Sep 1, 2012
4	Active	1	Phase II AIT Deployment	Deployment of purchased units to airports	1.4	Usable Functionality	Oct 1, 2011	Oct 1, 2011		Mar 31, 2012
5	Active	1	Phase III AIT Deployment	Deployment of purchased units to airports	1.5	Usable Functionality	Apr 1, 2012	Apr 1, 2012		Sep 30, 2012
6	Active	1	Phase IV AIT Deployment	Deployment of purchased units to airports	1.6	Usable Functionality	Oct 1, 2012	Oct 1, 2012		Mar 31, 2013
7	Active	1	Phase V AIT Deployment	Deployment of purchased units to airports	1.7	Usable Functionality	Apr 1, 2013	Apr 1, 2013		Sep 30, 2013
8	Active	2	AT2 Deployment I	Deployment of purchased units to airports	2.1	Usable Functionality	Jul 1, 2011	Jul 1, 2011	Jul 1, 2011	Dec 31, 2011
9	Active	2	AT2 Deployment II	Deployment of purchased units to airports	2.2	Usable Functionality	Jan 1, 2012	Jan 1, 2012		Jun 30, 2012
10	Active	2	AT2 Deployment III	Deployment of purchased units to airports	2.3	Usable Functionality	Jul 1, 2012	Jul 1, 2012		Dec 31, 2012
11	Active	2	AT2 Deployment IV	Deployment of purchased units to airports	2.4	Usable Functionality	Jan 1, 2013	Jan 1, 2013		Jun 30, 2013
12	Active	2	AT2 Deployment V	Deployment of purchased units to airports	2.5	Usable Functionality	Jul 1, 2013	Jul 1, 2013		Dec 31, 2013
13	Active	2	PETD Deployment	Deployment of purchased units to airports	2.6	Usable Functionality	Jul 1, 2012	Jul 1, 2012		Dec 31, 2012
14	Active	3	AWT Deployment I	Deployment of purchased units to airports	3.1	Usable Functionality	Jan 1, 2012	Jan 1, 2012		Jun 30, 2012
15	Active	3	AWT Deployment II	Deployment of purchased units to	3.2	Usable Functionality	Jul 1, 2012	Jul 1, 2012		Dec 31, 2012

				airports						
16	Active	3	CAT/BPSS Deployment I	Deployment of purchased units to airports	3.3	Usable Functionality	Jan 1, 2012	Jan 1, 2012		Jun 30, 2012
17	Active	3	CAT/BPSS Deployment II	Deployment of purchased units to airports	3.4	Usable Functionality	Jul 1, 2012	Jul 1, 2012		Dec 31, 2012

#	Completion Date Projected	Completion Date Actual	Total Costs Planned	Total Cost Projected	Total Costs Actual	Activities Last Action Date
1	Sep 30, 2011	Sep 30, 2011	3.398	3.398	0.001	Feb 21, 2012
2	Mar 31, 2012		7.575	7.575		Feb 16, 2012
3	Sep 30, 2012		7.564	7.564		Feb 16, 2012
4	Mar 31, 2012		56.250	56.250		Feb 16, 2012
5	Sep 30, 2012		56.250	56.250		Feb 16, 2012
6	Mar 31, 2013		62.500	62.500		Feb 16, 2012
7	Sep 30, 2013		11.125	11.125		Feb 16, 2012
8	Dec 31, 2011	Dec 31, 2011	62.000	62.000	36.600	Feb 21, 2012
9	Jun 30, 2012		62.000	62.000		Feb 16, 2012
10	Dec 31, 2012		43.000	43.000		Feb 16, 2012
11	Jun 30, 2013		43.000	43.000		Feb 16, 2012
12	Dec 31, 2013		24.000	24.000		Feb 16, 2012
13	Dec 31, 2012		49.880	49.880		Feb 16, 2012
14	Jun 30, 2012		18.005	18.005		Feb 16, 2012
15	Dec 31, 2012		18.005	18.005		Feb 16, 2012
16	Jun 30, 2012		26.775	26.775		Feb 16, 2012
17	Dec 31, 2012		26.775	26.775		Feb 16, 2012

300B - PROJECT RISK

Project Risk

Project Execution Data addresses planning, DME, and significant maintenance projects for the investment.

Risk assessments should include risk information from all stakeholders and should be performed at the initial concept stage and then monitored and controlled throughout the life-cycle of the investment.

In the Project Risk table, list all significant project related risks for the investment that are currently open and provide risk assessment information. (It is not necessary to address all 19 OMB Risk Categories).

A. Project ID: An agency-specified number that uniquely identifies a project within this investment. For each identified risk, lists the associated Project ID.

B. Risk Name: A short description provides details of a risk, the cause of the risk and the effect that the risk causes to the project.

C. Risk Category: Please select the relevant OMB Risk Category for each risk. Risk categories include: 1) schedule; 2) initial costs; 3) life-cycle costs; 4) technical obsolescence; 5) feasibility; 6) reliability of systems; 7) dependencies and interoperability between this investment and others; 8) surety (asset protection) considerations; 9) risk of creating a monopoly for future procurements; 10) capability of agency to manage the investment; and 11) overall risk of investment failure; 12) organizational and change management; 13) business; 14) data/info; 15) technology; 16) strategic; 17) security; 18) privacy; and 19) project resources.

D. Risk Probability: The likelihood that a risk will occur (Low, Medium, or High)

E. Risk Impact: The impact on the project if the risk occurs (Low, Medium, or High)

F. Mitigation Plan: A short description of the plan or steps to mitigate the identified risk.

Table B.3 - Project Risk Table

#	Active?	Project ID	Risk Name	Risk Category	Risk Probability	Risk Impact	Risk Mitigation Plan	Risk Last Action Date
1	Active	1	If PSP funding levels are lowered it could extend the amount of time required to reach full operating capability for some technologies.	Project resources	Low	Medium	In the event of reduced out year program funding, funding will be realigned to high-priority projects to ensure FOC is reached.	Oct 19, 2011
2	Active	1	Vendor inability to develop more mature technology may delay fielding of technologyequirements for ATR	Feasibility	Medium	Medium	Increase communication with vendors to clarify requirements and build stronger collaboration with vendors through technology forums and industry days.	Oct 19, 2011
3	Active	1	Vendor delays in submitting complete and accurate QDPs could result in schedule delays	Schedule	Medium	Medium	Work closely with vendors to ensure they have all necessary information and resources they need to submit a timely and thorough QDP.	Oct 19, 2011
4	Active	1	As PSP moves to a new developmental acquisition model, contract award may be delayed if stakeholders are not fully aware of the resulting process changes and their associated responsibilities.	Schedule	Low	Low	Work closely with stakeholders to clearly define and document the new process so they have all the necessary information to minimize contract	Oct 19, 2011

#	Active?	Project ID	Risk Name	Risk Category	Risk Probability	Risk Impact	Risk Mitigation Plan	Risk Last Action Date
							coordination time.	
5	Active	2	If PSP funding levels are lowered it could extend the amount of time required to reach full operating capability for some technologies.	Project resources	Low	Medium	In the event of reduced out year program funding, funding will be realigned to high-priority projects to ensure FOC is reached.	Oct 19, 2011
6	Active	2	Vendor inability to develop more mature technology may delay fielding of technologyequirements for ATR	Feasibility	Medium	Medium	Increase communication with vendors to clarify requirements and build stronger collaboration with vendors through technology forums and industry days.	Oct 19, 2011
7	Active	2	Vendor delays in submitting complete and accurate QDPs could result in schedule delays	Schedule	Medium	Medium	Work closely with vendors to ensure they have all necessary information and resources they need to submit a timely and thorough QDP.	Oct 19, 2011
8	Active	2	As PSP moves to a new developmental acquisition model, contract award may be delayed if stakeholders are not fully aware of the resulting process changes and their associated responsibilities.	Schedule	Low	Low	Work closely with stakeholders to clearly define and document the new process so they have all the necessary information to minimize contract coordination time.	Oct 19, 2011
9	Active	3	If PSP funding levels are lowered it could extend the amount of time required to reach full operating capability for some technologies.	Project resources	Low	Medium	In the event of reduced out year program funding, funding will be realigned to high-priority projects to ensure FOC is reached.	Oct 19, 2011
10	Active	3	Vendor inability to develop more mature technology may delay fielding of technologyequirements for ATR	Feasibility	Medium	Medium	Increase communication with vendors to clarify requirements and build stronger collaboration with vendors through technology forums and industry days.	Oct 19, 2011
11	Active	3	Vendor delays in submitting complete and accurate QDPs could result in schedule delays	Schedule	Medium	Medium	Work closely with vendors to ensure they have all necessary information and resources they need to submit a timely and thorough QDP.	Oct 19, 2011

#	Active?	Project ID	Risk Name	Risk Category	Risk Probability	Risk Impact	Risk Mitigation Plan	Risk Last Action Date
12	Active	3	As PSP moves to a new developmental acquisition model, contract award may be delayed if stakeholders are not fully aware of the resulting process changes and their associated responsibilities.	Schedule	Low	Low	Work closely with stakeholders to clearly define and document the new process so they have all the necessary information to minimize contract coordination time.	Oct 19, 2011

300B - OPERATIONAL DATA

Section C: Operational Data (Performance Metrics)

Operational Data addresses operational activities which are not reported as part of a project in the Project Execution Data.

There are two essential types of operations metrics to be reported (see FEA Reference Model Mapping Quick Guide):

1. Results Specific: Provide a minimum of two metrics which measure the effectiveness of the investment in delivering the desired service or support level; if applicable, at least one metric should reflect customer results (e.g.; "Service Quality").

2. Activities and Technology Specific: Provide a minimum of three –metrics which measure the investment against its defined process standards or technical service level agreements (SLAs) (e.g.; "Reliability and Availability"). At least one of these metrics must have a monthly "Reporting Frequency."

Provide results specific metrics which are appropriate to the mission of the investment and its business owner or Customer. Generally these metrics should be provided by the investment's business owner and will reflect performance in the broader business activities and not IT-specific functions. The best results specific metrics will support the business case justification and could be the foundation of a quantitative approach to defining benefits in a cost-benefit analysis. Unlike in private industry where identified benefits accrue to the organization, government benefits may accrue to the public. Therefore, results-specific metrics may demonstrate the value realized external to the Federal Government. The table must include a minimum of two results-specific metrics, one of which should reflect customer results.

Each metric description should help the user understand what is being measured. In this field, describe the units used, any calculation algorithm used, and the definition or limits of the population or "universe" measured.

The unit of measure should be characterized (e.g. number, percentage, dollar value etc) for each metric. If the unit is not on the drop down list, please choose "Other" and provide unit of measure description in the "Metric Description" field. Each metric listed in the table must also indicate how often actual measurements will be reported (monthly, quarterly or semi-annually), as well as baseline, targets and actual results. The "Actual for PY" should be final actual measurement from the previous year or the average actual results from the previous year. Describe whether a successful actual measurement would be "over the target" or be "under the target" in "Measurement Condition." "Comment" field is required for performance metrics where target not expected to be met. All data will be displayed on the IT Dashboard.

Table C.1 - Operational Data Table

#	Active?	Metric Description	Unit of Measure	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY
1	Active	Percent of Checkpoint Lanes with Advanced Imaging Technology (AIT) Coverage	Percent	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Efficiency	23.000	43.000	46.000	59.000
2	Active	Percent of Airports with Bottled Liquids Scanner (BLS) Coverage	Percent	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	6.000	50.000	9.000	100.000
3	Active	Percent of Checkpoint Lanes with Advanced Technology (AT) Coverage	Percent	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Efficiency	44.000	64.000	44.000	84.000
4	Active	Operational Availability for Carry-on Baggage Screening Equipment (Ao)	Percent				96.000	96.000	99.680	96.000
5	Active	Average Rating of Customer Satisfaction based on the program's ACE Survey which uses a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the highest to evaluate Design, Implementation, Communication, Quality of Support,	Average				8.000	8.200	8.200	8.250

#	Active?	Metric Description	Unit of Measure	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY
		Responsiveness & Integration								

#	Measurement Condition	Reporting Frequency	Most Recent Actual Results	Comment	Operational Data Last Action Date
1	Over target	Quarterly	46.000	Actual results represent data as of the 3rd Qtr FY11.	Aug 8, 2011
2	Over target	Quarterly	9.000	TSA continually evaluates its technology deployment strategies to make course corrections as necessary. As a result, projections to cover 100% of airports with Bottle Liquid Scanners (BLS) will not be met and have been revised due to utilization rates, re-deployments and obtaining the level of installers necessary to deploy and install the equipment. The level of installers necessary to deploy and install BLS will not be available until 4th quarter FY 2011. Based on availability of installers, deployments, and re-deployment schedules, 50% 60% of airports will be covered with BLS by the end of FY 2011 with 80% 100% coverage by the end of the calendar year 2011.	Sep 1, 2011
3	Over target	Quarterly	44.000	Actual results represent data as of the 3rd Qtr FY11.TSA continually evaluates its technology deployment strategies to make course corrections as necessary. As a result, projections to cover airports will not be met and have been revised due to the level of installers necessary to deploy and install the equipment. The level of installers necessary to deploy and install will not be available until 4th quarter FY 2011. Based on availability of installers, deployments, and re-deployment schedules, we do not anticipate meeting the target for PY.	Sep 1, 2011
4	Over target	Quarterly	99.680	Actual results represent data as of the 3rd Qtr FY11.	Aug 11, 2011
5	Over target	Monthly	8.200	Actual results represent data as of the 3rd Qtr FY11.	Sep 1, 2011

300B - OPERATIONAL RISK

Operational Risk

Operational Data addresses operational activities which are not reported as a part of a project in Project Execution Data.

Risk assessments should include risk information from all stakeholders and should be performed at the initial concept stage and then monitored and controlled throughout the life-cycle of the investment.

In the Operational Risk table, list all significant operational related risks for the investment that are currently open and provide risk assessment information. (It is not necessary to address all 19 OMB Risk Categories).

A. Risk Name: A short description identifies a risk, the cause of the risk and the effect that the risk causes to the operational activity.

B. Risk Category: Please select the relevant OMB Risk Category for each risk. Risk categories include: 1) schedule; 2) initial costs; 3) life-cycle costs); 4) technical obsolescence; 5) feasibility; 6) reliability of systems; 7) dependencies and interoperability between this investment and others; 8) surety (asset protection) considerations; 9) risk of creating a monopoly for future procurements; 10) capability of agency to manage the investment; and 11) overall risk of investment failure; 12) organizational and change management; 13) business; 14) data/info; 15) technology; 16) strategic; 17) security; 18) privacy; and 19) project resources.

C. Risk Probability: The likelihood that a risk will occur (on scale from Low, Medium to High)

D. Risk Impact: The impact of a risk on the project if the risk occurs (on scale from Low, Medium to High)

E. Mitigation Plan: A short description provides how to mitigate the risk.

Table C.2 - Operational Risk

#	Active?	Risk Name	Risk Category	Risk Probability	Risk Impact	Risk Mitigation Plan	Operational Risk Last Action Date
1	Active	Future budget reductions may lead to escalating maintenance costs as recapitalization of aging equipment will be delayed.	Project resources	Low	Medium	A Recapitalization plan is being developed to level annual recap deployments to a steady-state.	Jul 14, 2011
2	Active	Fielded equipment is incapable of reaching the next higher level evolution of detection requirements.	Technology	Medium	Medium	Moving to the developmental acquisition model which allows for delivery of baseline functionality and delivery of future phases of functionality until full-rate production is reached.	Jul 14, 2011
3	Active	Unqualified vendors may enter into the testing process, diverting testing resources from other OEMs and ultimately delaying testing.	Project resources	Low	Medium	The QRT process evaluates potential vendors and allows for early identification of issues.	Jul 14, 2011