

QUESTIONS RECEIVED BY 10-23-2020

107 N/A	N/A	<p>We would like to encourage the Government to publish the available funding profile for this effort so that teams can more appropriately provide the most technically feasible solution within the accelerated time-frame that is being requested. This also would provide the Government a better opportunity to compare the best in breed technical solutions within the known parameter of funding availability. By operating within a competitive environment, the Government is still ensuring fair and reasonable pricing.</p>	<p>The Government is considering the request and will notify industry in conjunction with the release of the final RFS.</p>
108 PWS	Paragraph 3.2	<p>Line 386-388: Recommend removal of the bullet stating "the vendor shall not be relieved of any requirements.... Because of a failure to resolve a disagreement with an associate vendor." While the intent is clearly, and rightfully so, to hold the TSMT vendor as the lead for integration efforts and empowered to provide decisions when a requirement is unclear or unstated, this statement as written puts undue risk on the TSMT vendor for requirements that may be clearly stated in the individual OTA of RVCT, OWT, etc.</p>	<p>The Government has revised the PWS. Please refer to column F.</p> <p>Changed from: "The vendor shall not be relieved of any requirements or entitled to any adjustments to the agreements terms because of a failure to resolve a disagreement with an associate vendor"</p> <p>to: "The vendor shall notify the Government of another vendor's inability to agree to terms that impact the TSMT vendor's ability to meet requirements."</p>
110 PWS	PWS, Paragraph 3.8.2 and 3.8.3	<p>If multiple vendors are selected and carried through FY21 up to/or near the MVCR, the Government should strongly consider delaying the start of their deliverables and documentation until an ultimate downselect has been made. Carrying two vendors through this process will result in a significant amount of redundant deliverables for the vendor not chosen, as well as Government review/cycle time.</p>	<p>The Government is pursuing an acquisition strategy whereby there will potentially be multiple vendors selected through the first MVP. Additionally, the capabilities and timing of the MVP hinge on each vendor's solution. Accordingly, the resulting deliverables, inclusive of the timing, will vary with each vendor. The Government is pursuing this strategy to make an informed decision during the selection process.</p>
116 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.3.26	<p>The Contractor Device Performance Report, which will capture training during the limited ICS period, should consider having the initial submission 30 days prior to MVCR - with the option for this deliverable to be accomplished through real-time automation tools, vice a paper deliverable.</p>	<p>The Government concurs. Electronic/automated delivery is acceptable.</p>
117 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.5	<p>While it is fully understood that the STE-IS is a projected ACAT-1 program, which triggers the requirement for cost data reporting requirements - including in most non-FAR agreements, these requirements still run contrary to the full intent behind the statutory authority of 10 USC 2371(b). We would like to encourage the Government to consider delaying the timeline of these requirements until after the initial MVCR and work collaboratively with the selected vendor to identify ways to provide the appropriate data to allow for realistic estimates of future program costs across the life-cycle.</p>	<p>The Government appreciates the flexibility that 10 USC 2371(b) brings to the department. These non-FAR based contracting mechanisms allow for more and different contractors to execute efforts with less -- but not zero -- oversight and reporting. The Government requires that cost data be collected on all programs with an acquisition amount in excess of \$100M, such as STE-IS. Fortunately, recent revisions to the CSDR reporting formats allow for considerable flexibility and tailoring of a CSDR requirement in order to leverage a contractor's native accounting system with little or no change to the contractor's data collection process.</p> <p>The contractor and Government can review, and mutually agree to, CSDR reporting requirements prior to executing the agreement in order to ensure data is collected and reported in a compliant manner without undue burden being placed on the contractor. Both very large and very small contractors have been able to comply with CSDR requirements on contracts of all sizes and in all acquisition pathways. Since the current CSDR reporting formats are very accommodating to contractor's current practices, combined with this history of successful data collection, the Government does not believe CSDR waivers (or delays) are either necessary or beneficial for a program like STE-IS.</p>

118 PWS	PWS, Paragraph 3.8.4.2.1	<p>The restriction on the TSMT system shall avoid using any individual item whose unit purchase cost is no greater than \$25,000 will limit the performer from providing the most capable choice to coincide with their individual deployment architecture - and could force a vendor to break down individual purchase (e.g. servers with additional drives in them). Will the Government consider removing this requirement as written? Or potentially increase the individual unit cost restriction to a less restrictive amount?</p>	<p>The cost restriction refers to lowest replaceable unit (LRU) items. If the vendor plans on buying a single component that costs over \$25K, this will need to be discussed with the Government.</p>
119 PWS		<p>Is the Government mandating the use of the Platform One DevSecOps toolset, or are vendors able to propose equivalent tools managed by the vendor that provide equivalent transparency to the Government but reduce the vendor's risk of tool availability, selection, and access?</p>	<p>The Government is requiring the utilization of Government provided enterprise services, specifically Platform One. The utilization of a common Government-provided enterprise services facilitates the broad integration required across multiple OTAs.</p>
120 PWS		<p>Is the Government going to provide all developer licenses to the identified tools in the DevSecOps pipeline?</p>	<p>Yes, the licenses associated with Platform One will be procured by the Government.</p>
121 PWS		<p>is the Government going to pay for hosting the DevSecOps pipeline in Platform One?</p>	<p>Yes, Platform One is a Government provided service funded by the Government.</p>
122 N/A		<p>Will the Government consider the application a Cost Plus Incentive Fee based OTA agreement to balance the relative high risk associated with the aggressive technical and schedule constraints described in the PWS? This choice of contract type is less risky to the Government than a standard Cost Plus Fixed Fee and the typical application of a CPIF-contract type is specifically for the use case of the development of a prototype for a major system. This contract type also allows for greater flexibility if the nuance of certain requirements shift, or if there is a desire for the TSMT vendor to take on unforeseen integration or development scope from other STE vendors. This contract type would also allow for the easier collection of cost data to support the overarching estimates of the program life-cycle. The objective is to form a partnership between the Government and industry such that performance is achieved while the Government achieves actual cost, delivery, and performance benchmarks desired.</p>	<p>The Government is still considering all available contract types. However, due to the OTA nature, selecting a cost type contract forces the Government to analyze costs of non-traditional industry partners either through the cost accounting standards or other methods, thereby resulting in schedule impacts and increased prices. As a result, fixed price remains the preferred method.</p>
123 PWS	PWS Paragraph 1.3.1	<p>Can the Government provide details regarding the scope and boundaries for the GFE Avionics Software Emulation [AvSE]? When will this capability become available for each of the required airframes (AH-64E, UH-60M, CH-47F)?</p>	<p>Avionics Software Emulation [AvSE] will be provided as GFI for AH-64E (version 4.0 and 6.0), UH-60M, CH-47F, Shadow and Gray Eagle UAS. Rotorcraft software will include OFP and Army flight Model (AFM). Part of the task for this OTA will be to develop the interface between the TSS/TMT and the AvSE module. UAS AvSE software will include air vehicle models and MUSE software modified to have accurate GUI emulations of Shadow and Gray Eagle ground station software. Full MUM-T LOI 1-4 capability will be enabled in the STANAG interface modules of the modified MUSE AvSE software. In FY22 PM ASE will be funded to provide ASE models as part of AvSE GFI. However, that still needs to be worked out so initial TSMT delivery plans may want to consider reuse/refactoring of GFI AVCATT ASE capability as risk reduction.</p>

124 PWS	PWS Paragraph 2.2	<p>The intent of the integrated STE system is to provide value to the end user with each MVP and MVCR that enables units to conduct their doctrinal collective training. Subsequent STE system releases continue to improve the collective training capability (higher echelon, new functionality, etc.). Program Increments, MVP/MVCR/subsequent software releases continue to build on the capabilities in the previous gate. Has the Government considered that certain echelons, specifically PLT, CO virtual applications will include higher complexity than Bn and BDE Command and Staff requirements? Therefore a straightforward sequencing of higher level based echeloned development will front load the TSMT requirement heavily. Is the Government open to mixed echelon MVPs for Command and Staff vs Collective Virtual based training?</p>	<p>The Government seeks vendor input on the development of the capability roadmap. While the ultimate requirement is to develop a brigade capability at the end of the OTA, the incremental capabilities at each MVP will be vendor-defined. Vendors will be requested to provide this proposed capability roadmap as part of the RFS submission, specifically in conjunction with the white paper. Additional details will be provided in the draft RFS.</p>
125 PWS	Table 3-1	<p>Is the list of Recurring Government Meetings prescribed or notional? We would encourage you to consider allowing flexibility in how this is proposed/managed/executed, as the successful TSMT vendor may have innovative and streamlined approaches to designated meetings.</p>	<p>The list represents a historical capture of recurring meetings. The Government will consider innovative and streamlined approaches that increases confidence that all the multiple/critical coordination points are addressed.</p>
126 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.1.2	<p>DoD Risk Management Framework (RMF) Package initial submission 30 days from award appears to be out of phase. The Government will not have had the opportunity to review designs, receive feedback from Soldier touchpoints, etc that may impact the architecture of the TSMT solution; thus altering the RMF package. Suggest the Government re-evaluate the timeline for the need of this package and look for opportunities to tailor the RMF process to meet accelerated schedule constraints.</p>	<p>The Government has revised the PWS. Please refer to column F. The Government understands that the initial RMF deliverable likely will not capture the final vendor solution. Subsequent RMF submissions should account for the emerging capabilities and resulting architectural changes. The final submission prior to MVCR should capture the final architecture/vendor solution.</p> <p>Changed from: "Initial submission required 30 days after award to support Government IATT development." to: "Initial submission required 60 days after award to support Government IATT development."</p>
127 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.1.3	<p>WRT to the IMS deliverable; with the prescribed implementation of agile methods, what change mechanisms are the Government considering regarding the month to month submission of the IMS to evaluate status (e.g. Product Owners change task priority within sprint cycles that effectively alters the status of a planned IMS task from the submitted IMS)?</p>	<p>The IMS should identify the major capabilities with associated timelines. The execution of an agile methodology is to incorporate routine feedback that may or may not impact the IMS depending upon the level of change. These proposed changes can be initiated via program increment planning sessions for new tasks and sprint demonstrations for existing tasks. Additionally, per Table 3-1 in the PWS, there will be multiple teams for the various functional areas. These teams serve to establish a collaborative environment between the Government and the vendor that could result in changes to planned tasks. These proposed changes should flow up to the Product Owner/Requirements Manager meeting to adjudicate these changes and determine the resulting impact to the holistic STE system. These changes could in turn result in changes to the IMS.</p>
131 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.2.6	<p>The deliverable states "The vendor shall use the Government provided system requirements in the DOORS tool and shall update/annotate the requirements repository to indicate system model parts that satisfy requirements." Will the Government consider alternative tools to DOORS that enhance the ability of the TSMT vendor to demonstrate requirements management for the effort?</p>	<p>STRI and CFT have standardized on DOORS so it is strongly recommended that DOORS be utilized. If, however, there is a compelling reason to consider an alternative that can also be linked to Cameo MagicDraw so requirements information can be efficiently included in the MBSE model diagrams/views then it is suggested that this be brought to the Governments attention as part of draft RFS feedback.</p>
132 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.2.13	<p>The TSMT vendor can provide data and information IAW with the SAR as prescribed with the DID: DI-NDTI-80603A. However, the Government has to perform the safety release IAW with Army regulations. How does the Government envision the Army regulation impact the MVCR releases from the TSMT vendor?</p>	<p>Each event that requires soldier feedback, inclusive of MVCR, requires a safety release that will be written by the Government. The vendor's self-assessment informs the process for developing the safety release. These activities precede the release to the field and therefore must be successfully completed before MVCR.</p>

133 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.3.11	WRT to the Software Sustainability Package; will the Government accept deviations for components of TSMT that are COTS, commercially based (no source can be provided), or licenses products where source code, design details, models, algorithms, processes, flow charts, etc. may not be made available? This deliverable requirement may rule out commercial or COTS based items as a part of the solution set for TSMT (e.g. commercial game engines).	The Government will consider deviations for COTS but continued licensing for sustainment of capabilities will need to be approved and covered in the package.	
134 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.3.18	The Trainer Facilities Report (TFR) would appear to be non-applicable to the TSMT requirement. Can the Government clarify what facilities are planned for the deployment of the TSMT as a basis for understanding the TFR requirement?	The Government seeks vendor input on specifications of the vendor's solution that impact training facilities. The TFR will identify the facility limitations/requirements, such as power, lighting, HVAC, SQ footage, etc. Possible facilities include but may not be limited to: MTCs, NECs, RTCs, Ranges, Hangars, Motor Pools, Admin Buildings, Institutions, and portable environmentally controlled set ups (e.g. tents with generators and HVAC).	
136 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.4.2.4	Can the Government provide a definition for special or extraordinary handling, disposal, usage rate, or maintenance procedures?	The terms special or extraordinary include items that are expensive, requiring special handling, special certifications outside of the norm, and/or replacement after every use.	
137 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.8.4.2.5	Should the vendor assume that the software baseline will be approved in advance of the requirement for the vendor to deliver production representative hardware to development and user feedback sites no later than 30 days after the Government approves the vendor's hardware concept, hardware quantities, and draft specifications IAW Table 3.2.	The Government's enactment of Software Acquisition Pathway leverages routine feedback, to include soldier feedback, throughout development. This feedback influences the vendor solution, inclusive of software and hardware. Accordingly, the software and hardware will receive routine Government feedback leading up to the delivery of hardware to user feedback locations.	
140 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.9.4.4	"The vendor shall identify the hardware configuration that satisfies the STE requirements (TSMT & OWT services) at the PoN" Does this imply that in a disconnected environment the TMST hardware will need to host the entirety of the OWT services?	No. It is expected that an OWT basic terrain and models load, applicable for the training application(s), objective(s) and scenario(s) using TSS/TMT in a standalone environment be previously downloaded to and stored or cached on local hardware in this use case. This can include a local cache terrain server or storage on the TSS/TMT Edge or Field nodes, or a combination. The RVCT Solider hardware shall have enough storage to hold a training playbox and base globe on its local drive.	
141 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.9.4.5	Assumption is that TAA requirements apply in addition to NIAP and APL component requirements?	Yes, the TAA requires that the U.S. Government requires only U.S. made or designated country end products.	ADD new bullet 3.9.4.6: Supply Chain Risk must be managed by ensuring purchases are Trade Agreement Act (TAA) and Secure Act 2018 compliant.
143 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.10.1.10	"The vendor shall participate in the Government led pre-program increment planning session." Can the Government define what a pre-program increment planning session is?	The Pre-Program Increment Planning Session is a Government hosted session where the Government prioritizes features from the product backlog for the next program increment planning agile ceremony. This session then informs the vendor led program increment planning agile ceremony and subsequent product roadmap updates based on the priorities the Government sets during the Pre-Program Increment Planning Session.	
144 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.10.4.2	"The vendor shall propose their version of the product roadmap in response to this PWS that considers the desires of the Government's draft product roadmap and balances that with the practical sequence and timing of development, integration, test and delivery that it can support." When will the Government draft product roadmap be provided?	Product roadmap was included in the PWS Appendix C	
145 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.11.1.9.9	"All applicable Cyber security requirements have been met (e.g., Interim Authority to Test approved)." What organization is approving authority for the IATT or ATO? PEO STRI, AFC CFT, Other?	Army G6/NETCOM provides a recommendation for IATT/ATO approval. Then the PEO STRI Authorizing Official signs the IATT or ATO.	

146 PWS	PWS Paragraph 3.12.2.1	" The vendor shall provide ICS starting with first hardware delivery to the Government and continue for at least 24 months after the final release of capability in accordance with contract options." Does the Government envision onsite support for all the TSMT first fielded sites specified in PWS Table 3 3. Fielding Locations?	Yes, through Help Desk, Remote Diagnostics, and/or on call FSR. The Government does not expect an FSR stationed at each of the fielded sites. If required, FSRs may be provided via a third party vendor.
147 DRAFT PWS R2	3.8.3.11 3.9.1.1 3.9.1.2 3.9.1.2.1	Can the Government give Offerors 3 examples of what acceptable software licensing structures/models look like, including maintenance/sustainability?	The Government needs to understand the lifecycle license costs impacts to support the Bde Collective Training capability and beyond (in support of ASCC), before the solution/license structure is considered.
149 DRAFT PWS R2	3.9.4	Can the Government share what company is responsible for supplying the Edge Node solution referenced in the PWS?	The vendor that is awarded the TSMT OTA will provide the edge node solution.
150 DRAFT PWS R2	3.9	Will access to SiVT integration information be made available as GFI in the Technical Data Package?	No. At least not before the OTA is awarded. Once the OTA is awarded, the vendor shall work with the TSS/TMT Government team to analyze a set of APIs/SDKs to be provided by SiVT to identify an integration strategy and timeline. Further discussions between the TSMT vendor and the Government to firm up SiVT integration plans will likely occur after OTA award.
151 DRAFT PWS R2	3.9	If SiVT integration information will not be made available as part of the Technical Data Package, will the Government provide source code when requested by Offerors, leading up to competitive demonstrations and proposals?	SiVT APIs/SDKs will be provided as soon as practical to facilitate interface with SiVT. The Government will have data rights to the SiVT software but will utilize the SiVT vendor provided APIs/SDKs.
152 NA	NA	When will the IVAS SDK be released for Offerors to evaluate?	The IVAS/SiVT APIs/SDKs will be provided to prospective TSMT vendors as soon as the STRI project office is cleared to release them to
154 DRAFT PWS R2	3.9.1.1 3.9.1.2	What will be the differences between the Customer's Data Rights Strategy and its IP Rights Strategy?	The Government seeks further clarification on this question.
156 DRAFT PWS R2	1.2	Can the Customer explain why IVAS is listed as an interdependency on the PEO STRI website but not in the PWS OV-1?	The OV-1 predated the IVAS development. The OV-1 is abstract enough to include the desired use case without identifying the IVAS solution by name.
157 DRAFT PWS R2	1.2	Should Offerors now understand the IS to be the new term for what was formerly known as CSE?	Yes, STE-IS is the term that refers to the broad infrastructure that ties in all elements of the STE, inclusive of TSMT.
160 DRAFT PWS R2	2.2	Can the Government please list the limitations of the following PoRs referenced: AAVCATT, CCTT, GFT?	The Government is not planning to provide information on current PoRs as part of this solicitation. Upon award, GFI, to include source code from AVCATT and CCTT will be provided.
161 DRAFT PWS R2	2.2	Can the Government please give helpful examples of how an attempt to address a limitation to said PoRs (AAVCATT, CCTT, GFT) could inadvertently create new gaps?	Scalability concerns with DIS (and HLA) have caused the STE to only consider solutions based on a more modern data distribution methodology. Since this has to be developed or procured by the TSMT versus reusing a known and widely accepted DoD standard, then gaps may result. For terrain the STE is moving to a single well formed terrain format versus dozens in use currently but the one-size-fits all content for all training applications across ground and air could represent risk. The requirement for transit case based portability of TSMT hardware and defining the PoN as practically anywhere versus the facility and/or trailer based model for CCTT and AVCATT leads to other limitations or gaps coming into play for standalone operations such as limited power at the PoN. This is why the Government is requesting the exploration of alternatives at the PoN such as mobile gaming based computing hardware.
162 DRAFT PWS R2	2.2	To what extent does the Customer expect to see addressed in a competitive, pre-award demonstration, the ability to integrate with LVC-IA, HITS, JLCCTC, IEWTPT, RVCT, IVAS-SiVT, and operational capabilities in both connected and disconnected modes?	Please refer to the focus areas/evaluation criteria that were posted on 23 October which detail the aspects of the evaluation phase.

163 DRAFT PWS R2	2.2	The comment about evaluation of TSMT's utility by the Government suggests that while STE is approved to move forward, uncertainties remain as to whether TSMT is a viable solution for the foundation of STE. What are the alternatives that the Government has explored?	There may be a misunderstanding. TSMT continues to represent the combined capabilities of the TSS and TMT. These two solutions will work in concert with one another to provide capabilities to the STE. No alternatives are being explored.
164 DRAFT PWS R2	3.2 3.7.1	What is the Government's detailed plan to ensure that AVA's will facilitate collaboration and minimize conflicts, given the limited data rights the Government has as a result of previous STE contracts awarded and executed? What are the consequences for all stakeholders of insufficient data being made available to successfully reach a milestone?	The TSMT vendor shall work with all STE stakeholders and the Government to identify and document integration risks and issues associated with vendor scope, delivery schedule, design misalignments and insufficient data. The vendor will raise these issue to the Government for decision making
166 PWS	Table 3-3	Please clarify the number of users at each release, corresponding to Table 3-3.	Reference Table 3-3 (fielding sites), each site will have 750 users.
167 PWS	Table 3-4	Please confirm that SECRET clearance is required and nothing higher for the MVP or other releases within scope of the OTA	The highest security classification for this OTA is SECRET.
168 PWS	Table B-1	Please confirm that the Objective Values listed in Table B-1 are considered out of scope under this OTA	Confirmed, the Objectives values are beyond this contract but wanted to give potential vendors consideration towards upcoming requirements.
169 PWS	Table B-2	Please clarify the desired learning strategy for increasing proficiency through repetition and if emotional resilience and muscle memory are included in the strategy.	The desired learning strategy for this OTA is to provide a relevant instruction based on defined training objectives during the Plan and Prepare stages of the PPEA process. The learning strategy includes providing relevant practical exercises or scenario elements in simulation based on training objectives, retrieving data from the trainee during execution, providing both real time and after action feedback to the trainee, and reporting scored results to accurately assess a readiness rating for the unit. The TSS will provide the trainees an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge in a multimodal environment. The assumption is more data will be available from the TSS than a human instructor can manage in real time, we are looking to industry to assist with the determination of how much automation can be introduced into the instructional design. We must collect the correct type and volume of information from the TSS to be able to determine if a trainee has demonstrated knowledge or proficiency sufficiently to be assigned a "proficient" or "trained" status. (See Standards of Training Proficiency and Objective-T guidance). The instructional design and the scenario design guidance for using the TSS effectively must be provided by the vendor.
170 PWS	3.14.2	Please indicate if the vendor is required to perform the health assessments noted, or if the deliverables must only conform to the health assessment requirements.	The vendor(s) should be identifying any potential health hazards from their product. The vendor(s) should be performing health assessments throughout development of their product.
171 PWS	3.8.4.9	Does the government have a preferred cross domain solution?	The Government has a list of enterprise CDS that must be given priority consideration. If the TSMT requirement and accompanying vendor solution cannot accommodate one of the enterprise CDS, then an exception can be granted. This determination cannot be made until a vendor solution is identified, inclusive of the architecture.
172 TReX Portal	N/a	The timeline for the OTA is a little confusing. The timeline shows release of RFS in November-when is the response to the RFS due?	The acquisition strategy will be a multi-award approach that eventually leads to a single/multi vendor award. The award strategy consists of a multi-phased evaluation, i.e. demonstration plan, demonstration of capabilities, white paper submission, and technical interchanges. The demonstration plan will be first deliverable after the final RFS is posted. Additional details will be provided in the RFS.

173 TReX Portal	N/a	Are we responding to a demo or the entire solution?	The initial response will be the Demo Plan only, then if selected, the vendor will continue to the Demo Phase. Only vendors selected to continue to the White Paper Phase will be requested to respond to the entire solution. Additional details will be provided in the RFS.
174 TReX Portal	N/a	Will the \$50K Agreements be awarded prior to demonstrations, or following the demonstrations to only cover the TIMS?	The Agreement award will be awarded post the demonstrations to only those vendors/teams that receive an invitation to submit a solution. The scope for this Agreement is to cover ongoing discussions, TIMS, and demonstrations
175 Draft PWS	Appendix C	SPARTAN CAPSET - Does or will OWT already incorporate Hi-Res Drone, SE Core, Bing and Vricon data in a common OWT data format readily ingestible by TSMT?	Yes, OWT already incorporates multi-source 3D and fuses into a single well-formed format content dataset (3D Tiles + GGDM). It is up to the TSMT to ingest this format.
176 Draft PWS	Appendix C	SPARTAN CAPSET - If so, which standard is being adopted to define all terrain features?	The standard is 3DTiles + GGDM.
177 Draft PWS	Appendix C	SPARTAN CAPSET - Does or will OWT already impliment a specified set of battle damage effects on terrain?	There are a few example predetermined damage states (and assets) for certain models/features, but it is the responsibility of the TSMT to produce dynamic effects on terrain and buildings using the physics engine.
178 Draft PWS	Appendix C	SPARTAN CAPSET - If so, which standard is being adopted to define all battle damage effects?	Battle damage effects should be calculated procedurally and dynamically by the TSMT engine. The source OWT will provide the foundation dataset. There is no expectation that dynamic damage states be passed back into the OWT foundation.
179 Draft PWS	Appendix C	SPARTAN CAPSET - Will the OWT provide a defined API which TSMT can select different Levels of Detail?	OWT will provide the multi-LOD source (3DTiles + GGDM). There is no specific API to retrieve specific LODs at this time.
180 Draft PWS	Appendix C	SPARTAN CAPSET - If so, which standard is being adopted to define these Levels of Detail?	Both quad and simple-tree LODs are used.
181 Draft PWS	Appendix C	SPARTAN CAPSET - How many Levels of Detail will OWT support?	That depends on the source. If the source is low-resolution to start (base globe), just 1 LOD is provided. If the source is of high enough resolution, there could be up to 10 LODs.
182 Draft PWS	Line 210	Will Army provide all interface information for existing training systems?	Within 30 days after OTA award a GFI package containing CCTT, AVCATT and OneSAF code and documentation will be provided to the selected TSMT vendor(s).
183 Draft PWS	Line 210	what is the proper process to make a request for the interface data?	It is not planned that interface data will be distributed before TSMT OTA award(s). Within 30 days after OTA award a GFI package containing CCTT, AVCATT and OneSAF code and documentation will be provided to the selected TSMT vendor(s). If specific documentation is believed to be needed prior to this time please send a request to ACC-O Agreement Officer.
184 Draft PWS	Line 230	Why are Integration Services explicitly separate from TMT, OWT, and RVCT?	Integration services are intended to facilitate modularity of TMT, TSS, RVCT and OWT through sseparation of concerns such that TSMT is not tightly coupled to any one vendor solution for OWT or RVCT and vice versa. Same applies for TMT relative to TSS and vice versa.
185 Draft PWS	Line 231	Is the Contractor allowed to provide an alternate cohesive Integrated STE System solution?	The STE TSS and TMT solution must incorporate Government furnished OWT and RVCT solutions being developed on other STE OTAs.
186 Draft PWS	Appendix A	Which vendor/s are providing the full set of RVCT 3D interior platform models?	RVCT 3D platform interior representations, to include the interior and exterior as viewed by RVCT crew trainees occupying RVCT platform crew positions, are provided by RVCT. These "ownership" models are provided to TSMT for integration. The OWT OTA vendor produces the full, integrated interior/exterior models for the semi-immersive (desktop) trainer and provides these models to TSMT for integration.

187 Draft PWS		Does the existing platform abstraction layer define which physical hardware and 3D interior models are providing the appropriate fidelity of the RVCT end user?	The current Hardware API, provided by RVCT, provides abstraction to the RVCT physical hardware. This API includes the appropriate hardware-agnostic and fidelity agnostic, software representation of all I/O signal to/from the RVCT that correspond to the RVCT fidelity requirements. For example, a switch or dial can be set by software emulating hardware or by the physical switch or dial itself. The exception is rendered video, which is generated by TSMT but does not go through an abstraction layer or API. Interior models are rendered by the TSMT software and thus are not abstracted except that they are in FBX format and developed/encoded in accordance with the STE OWT 3D model standard.
190 Contractual Question	N/a	Will there be a set of standard terms and conditions released prior to award to work in tandem with the proposal submittal?	Since this solution is being completed through NSTXL, the vendors will be bound by the Project Agreement between NSTXL and the vendor. The Government will identify additional T&Cs in the RFS.
191 Contractual Question	N/a	Will the awardee be required to sign and comply with pre-existing legal agreements between existing teammates?	See PWS Para 3.2 Associate Vendor Agreements. The selected TSMT vendor will be required to establish agreements with the other OTAs.
192 Contractual Question	Webinar Slide 11	Can the Government further clarify the statement on webinar slide 11, sub-bullet #3, "Prime or subcontractor proprietary software coding or hardware development (to include vendor licensing requirements) shall not be included without prior Government approval."	The Government needs to understand the lifecycle license costs impacts to support the Bde Collective Training capability and beyond (in support of ASCC), before the solution/license structure is considered.
193 Industry Day Slides	slide 10	Please confirm when the FFP proposal will be due to the Government. Same time as the White Paper?	Price Proposal will be due with the White Paper Solution
194 Industry Day Slides	slide 14 STE TSMT Responses 10.16.20 - Answer #5 - Instead, the Government is requesting that interested vendors provide a realistic value and period of performance that support the delivery of all the requirements described in the PWS and SRD. STE TSMT Response 10.16.20 - Answer #8 - Partial solutions are not discouraged but will not be a Government priority.	Please confirm what the Contractor will be required to bid for the FFP content. (Ex. All requirements in the PWS and SRD for the life of the program? Only the scope to the first MVCR?)	Due to the incremental approach, the vendors will be required to provide a demonstration plan initially. If the vendor is selected for the subsequent demonstration, and following that, selected for the white paper portion, a solution to meet the entire PWS will be requested.
195 STE TSMT Questions Responses 10.16.20	Question # - Instead, the Government is requesting that interested vendors provide a realistic value and period of performance that support the delivery of all the requirements described in the PWS and SRD.	Is the Contractor able to bid only the parts of the RFS they would like to work on? If so, how will the Government evaluate the price and merit of all offerings given the variance in scope bid	Partial solutions are not discouraged but will not be a Government's priority

196	STE TSMT Questions Responses 10.16.20	Answer #66 - The RFS will detail the focus areas, i.e. evaluation criteria, inclusive of the demonstration	The timeline provided at Industry Day projects the RFS to be released in ~ mid Nov 2020 with Demonstrations starting ~ the 2nd week of Jan 2021. Given the current COVID-19 restrictions for many Industry participants, as well as this timeframe covering two major US holidays, will the Government allow more time for the development of the demonstration.	At this time the Government does not intend to provide vendors with more time to prepare for the demonstrations.
198	PWS	Section 3.8.4	For the hardware described in PWS Section 3.8.4, will the Government be responsible for operations and maintenance at all sites other than the Vendor Lab? If the Contractor is responsible, are there Service Life Agreement metrics?	Vendor will be responsible for maintenance, replacement parts, and spares for locations in table 3.3 through the ICS period. Vendor will be responsible for replacement parts and spares for the locations in table 3.2
199	PWS	Section 3.7.3	Please describe the difference in scope happening at the Vendor Lab vs. Government Lab.	The Government envisions that most of the software development and internal integration within TSMT to occur at the vendor lab. However, the broader integration with other STE capabilities (e.g. RVCT) will occur at the TIF, the Government lab. Additionally, the TIF will be leveraged for user/soldier feedback. The PWS has been updated for clarity and will be provided as part of the draft RFS.
200	PWS	Section 3.7.3	Does the Vendor Lab have to be within a certain range of the Government Lab?	There is no requirement for the vendor lab to be in proximity of the Government lab.
201	PWS	Section 3.7.3	Given the requirement to have an existing FCL Secret at Contractor's site, is there a requirement for a SCIF at Vendor site. If so, what are the requirements? If not, what is driving the need for the FCL secret requirement	The need for a SECRET FCL is driven by the need for the prime vendor to access non-public // export controlled data as part of the execution of the agreement. There is no requirement for a SCIF as part of this agreement
202	PWS	Section 3.7.3	Does the FCL have to be at the same location as the Vendor Lab?	Yes, the prime vendor is required to have an approved SECRET FCL, inclusive of their lab.
203	PWS	Section 3.10	Please confirm if SW Development is required to be accomplished only in the Vendor Lab, or will the Government allow for SW Development at distributed sites. If yes to distributed, does each site require FCL?	The Government will not prescribe how/where the software development is accomplished. The prime vendor is required to have a SECRET FCL and is responsible and accountable for release, safe keeping of any and all non-public and export controlled GFE/GFI. Vendor also has the responsibilities to comply with any and all Cyber security requirements associated with GFE/GFI.
205	STE TSMT Questions Responses 10.16.20	Question #55 - The Government will evaluate all technologies that show merit and will assess the feasibility of meeting all the SRD requirement within the period of performance.	How will the government assess the feasibility of meeting the SRD requirements during the demonstration phase? It was our understanding the White Paper phase would describe how the Contractor will progress from the current demonstration capabilities to meeting all the SRD requirements	The intent of the demonstration evaluation phase is to assess industry's existing capabilities and the potential for it to meet STE TSMT requirements. The Government will evaluate the capabilities as they relate to technical and operational areas. Vendors are encouraged to review the recently provided draft vendor instructions and evaluation criteria for additional guidance on the demonstration evaluation phase. The white paper should convey the vendor's solution as it relates to the entire STE TSMT requirement. Please refer to the draft vendor instructions for additional information on what should be provided in the white paper.