

Question #	Source Document	Paragraph	Question	Answer
206			Risk Assessment at Demonstration Plan phase: The assessment of the Demonstration Plan describes "The demonstration plan will be given a risk assessment based on proposed intellectual property rights, data rights, and possible software licensing costs." Can Government please articulate what risk is perceived here. Specifically: Q1: What risk is associated with license costs as opposed to any other type of cost (e.g., development cost) related to TSMT delivery? Q1a: Specifically, why the focus on licensing cost as a 'risk' and not on development costs which are obviously significantly more risky by their nature?	<p>The Government is revising the evaluation strategy such that licensing costs will not be needed until the White Paper &amp; TIMs phase.</p> <p>Sufficient licenses are being procured under this OTA to support the first 5 STE sites. Since STE will have many more sites than five future sites, future licensing costs, which are not being locked in as part of this agreement, can present future cost risk. The vendor's software licensing costs will inform the Government of each vendor teams' starting point for development under this OTA which will help to inform the amount of development required to meet RFS requirements. The amount of development required and associated risk will then be factored into the White Paper &amp; TIMs evaluation phase.</p>
207			What is the difference between "intellectual property rights" and "data rights"?	Data rights is a specific subset of IP rights whereas IP can be inclusive of data, source code, patented technologies/techniques and other information for which vendors assert rights.
208			What type of risk is perceived around IP rights/data rights? Q3a: Is the IP/data rights risk, the risk of lack of ability to support "Bde Collective Training capability and beyond (in support of ASCC)"? Q3b: Is there additional perceived risk beyond Q3a risk? If so, please describe	If a system component or module within a solution requires code, data or other IP to operate properly to thus meet current or future TSMT OTA requirements and vendor rights assertions for elements of IP associated with this component or module cause future replacement of that component or module to be unusually or unexpectedly difficult or costly, then there exists risk that the component or module in question does not adhere to, or is not part of, a Modular Open System Approach.
209			Demonstration Plan questions: As part of the Demonstration Plan, Government has asked for "IP/Data Rights considerations and any associated licensing information and anticipated costs" including "Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) cost estimate for which the Government would be required to purchase licenses should the vendor be awarded the TSMT OTA". Q1: How will this information be used by the Government in assessing Demonstration Plans in the absence of a full lifecycle cost ROM? i.e. costs to the Government of TSMT include license costs, development costs, ongoing maintenance costs, government side costs etc. so license costs are only one element of overall costs and so only represent a very partial picture of the "value" of any particular bid. Is there some specific reason to focus on only licensing costs?	The Government is revising the evaluation strategy such that licensing costs will not be needed until the White Paper & TIMs phase. Ongoing maintenance costs are difficult to assess in this environment but will be mitigated by pursuing a solution that adheres to a Modular Open Systems Approach to allow for future competition to help contain costs in this area.
210			Can Government articulate why license costs would not be better deferred to be part of a "value of bid" discussion (along with data rights definition, ROM of development work etc.) as a later part of the Government timeline (but, obviously, before OTA award)?	The Government is revising the evaluation strategy such that licensing costs will not be needed until the White Paper & TIMs phase.
211			Data Rights questions: Government has previously stated that lifecycle license costs should support "Bde Collective Training capability and beyond (in support of ASCC)". If Government has fully flexible source code and object code rights for any US Army usage including fully supporting "Bde Collective Training capability and beyond (in support of ASCC)",	The Government seeks flexibility in potential follow-on contracts that would maximize competition and potential Use Cases for other Services. The vendor is free to propose a solution that leverages COTS and the Government will evaluate the resulting data rights strategy in the context of this aforementioned flexibility.
212			Can Government please confirm that no additional rights beyond this are needed? or if Government does see value in more extensive rights, please explain what additional rights are desired and what is the value logic for these additional rights?	Please refer to the draft RFS for details on the desired data and software rights.

213			Given the provided draft use case and requirements, has a VBS3/4 terrain been developed for use by government for the purposes of testing STE/OWT applications and if so is that distributable to vendors for their own demo applications?	VBS3/4 terrain is specific to a single vendor solution and is thus not being provided.
214			How widely does Government envisage TSMT will be fielded beyond the fielding locations identified in the TSMT Work Statement? Is there some other timeline for roll out of TSMT technology depending on maturity and other factors? Is there a specific timeline target for full roll out (e.g. previous FOC concept) of TSMT?	Sufficient licenses are being procured under this OTA to support the first 5 STE sites. Fieldings locations, over an above the sites identified in the TSMT Work Statement, will be disclosed in the follow-on Production requirements.
215	Draft Vendor Instructions - 23Oct		Paragraph 7.4 - This paragraph cites the printing of volumes. Can you verify if hard copies of any submissions are anticipated to be required?	The Government does not anticipate requiring hard copies of proposals. This will be clarified in the draft/final RFS.
216	Draft Vendor Instructions - 23Oct		Paragraph 7.5 - For those offerors who are providing a comprehensive solution set and to ensure that the Government receives the data that will best allow for evaluation, what level of specificity is desired for each section of the demonstration plan?	It is suggested that vendors provide the maximum amount of detail available regarding their planned solution and associated demonstrated while staying within the prescribed page limitation.
217	Draft Vendor Instructions - 23Oct		Paragraph 7.5 - Would the Government consider withholding any deeper discussions on licensing and ROM costs until the TIM phase? This would potentially streamline the initial downselect and also allow industry to provide better data for evaluation once the Government use case for licensing has a deeper, mutual understanding related to specific tools and how they will be utilized.	The Government is revising the evaluation strategy such that licensing costs will not be needed until the White Paper & TIMs phase.
218	Draft Vendor Instructions - 23Oct		Paragraph 7.7 - Would the Government consider holding virtual or in-person 1-on-1 sessions with interested prime vendors prior to the RFS/Request for Demo Plans vice after demos have already taken place?	The Government will engage in interactive dialogue during the demonstration, however there is no plan to hold any 1-on-1 prior to the demonstration.
219	Draft Vendor Instructions - 23Oct		Paragraph 7.8.1 - At the Industry Day, the Government indicated that the release schedule for MVP/MVCRs is aggressive. How does the Government anticipate assessing risk associated with vendor proposed schedules? Separately, what specific constraints are the Government under that are inflexible? For example, could there be more MVCRs than shown on the notional schedule.	The Government will evaluate the feasibility of the vendor's proposed approach, e.g. the proposed capability roadmap inclusive of each MVP. The requirement is to deliver a brigade capability by the end of the OTA but it is incumbent upon the offer to propose a capability roadmap that will achieve that end-state. While there is only one MVCR, there are subsequent annual releases thereafter, e.g. R1, R2.
220	Draft Eval Criteria - 23Oct		Evaluation and Selection Process, Paragraph 7.1 - "The Government also reserves the right to make award to the most qualified vendor following any Phase without entering into the next Phase." Would the Government please clarify the intent?	The evaluation strategy consists of multiple phases, i.e. Demo Plan Submission, Demonstration, White Paper & TIMs, and Final Solution Submittal. The Government reserves the right to make award following any of these phases without entering the subsequent phase.
221	Draft Eval Criteria - 23Oct		Demonstration Plan Evaluation, Paragraph 7.2.1 - The final statement regarding risk assessment implies that risk will only be evaluated on IP, data rights, and licensing. Is this the Government's sole intent? The risk assessment would be prudent to also consider integration and execution risk across the greater STE portfolio, as well the collective risk to ground-up development. Is the intent to keep risk isolated from technical merit? Or are these two separate assessments of risk?	The Government is revising the evaluation strategy such that licensing costs will not be needed until the White Paper & TIMs phase. The additional contributors to risk identified in this question will also be considered during the White Paper & TIM's phase.
222	Draft Eval Criteria - 23Oct		Paragraph 7.2.2 - The final sentence in this paragraph states, "The Government will <i>evaluate</i> the degree to which the vendor's solution is innovative and provides leap ahead technology. Would the Government consider the use of the word "consider" in place of "evaluate"? How does the Government intend to consider or evaluate "leap ahead technology"?	The Government maintains that an evaluation of the degree to which the vendor's solution is innovative and provides lead-ahead technology is in the best interest of the Government. The Government seeks to maximize best-of-breed technologies available in industry to meet TSMT requirements.

223	Draft Vendor Instructions - 23Oct	ROM costs are being sought for licensing, but not for development from ground up? How is risk being considered within this tradeoff?	The Government is revising the evaluation strategy such that licensing costs will not be needed until the White Paper & TIMs phase.
224	Draft Vendor Instructions - 23Oct	Will the Government have the same, specific evaluation criteria for each demonstration or will they be treated as demonstration/solutions presentations with interactive questions and dialogue?	The Government will apply the same evaluation criteria for each vendor demonstration. The Government defers to vendors on whether or not a presentation should accompany the demonstration. The Government does intend to conduct an interactive dialogue with the vendor during the demonstration.