

Date Rec.	Question #	Source Document	Paragraph	Question	Answer
11/25/2020	239	RFS-TSS-TMT-Draft-Final-11.16.2020-Distro-A.pdf	7.6	Can the Government provide access to OWT server and/or data for use in the demonstration?	The Government will not be able to provide an OWT server. The Government is currently coordinating the availability of OWT data to be provided as part of the technical data package. The Government is working this request but the release may be post the release of the final RFS.
11/25/2020	240	RFS-TSS-TMT-Draft-Final-11.16.2020-Distro-A.pdf	7.6	For use in demonstrations, can the Government provide representative or sample data for Authoritative Data Sources including Digital Training Management System (DTMS) and Army Organization Server (AOS).	Due to the issues obtaining data source/owner organization approvals for these 3rd party data sets, the Government will not be able to redistribute these data sets prior to a TSS/TMT OTA being awarded.
11/25/2020	241	RFS_Attach-1-TSS-TMT-PWS-DRAFT-FINAL-V1.1-11.16.2020-Distro.pdf	1.3.1	The Government indicated a BDE and below constructive training capability is desired in the TSS. The TDP document under 1.7.1.2 (Constructive) suggests the requirements are simply to integrate through LVC-IA to support JLCCTC constructive capabilities. Can the Government explain upon the desired capabilities of the BDE and below constructive in their TDP and PWS?	The Government requires the capability to either host within the TSS the large (up to 2 million) entity count to support Bde level exercises or connect to LVC-IA where the Bde level entity count is modeled or portrayed by JLCCTC. The main difference is that JLCCTC provides a more robust constructive capability to train command and staff for all Warfighting Functions (WfF) whereas STE will initially support robust capability in the only Movement and Maneuver, Fires, and Mission Command WfFs, with a lesser degree of capability in the Intel, Protection and Sustainment WfFs." Thus if a Bde wants to train their intel section they may chose to employ LVC-IA to connect to JLCCTC for the constructive play versus utilize the STE TSS constructive capability.
11/30/2020	242	RFS-TSS-TMT-Draft-Final-11.16.2020-Distro-A.pdf	Para 8.1	Is it still the Government 's intention to make more than one OTA award to meet MVP1 milestone?	If more than one vendor is selected, the Government reserves the right to extend the competition through MVP1, at which point a final down-select will be made to a single vendor. The decision to award more than one OTA is dependent on evaluation of the vendors solution and whether the Government desires to pursue more than one solution.
11/30/2020	243	PWS TSS-TMT Draft	Para 3.12.2.1	3.12.2.1 states that there is a 60 month period for ICS. Should this be changed to 48 months to align with the POP depicted on Attachment 3 - Cost Template, tab titled, "CLIN over POP"?	Paragraph 3.12.2.1 will be updated to reflect that ICS shall be provided starting with the first delivery to the Government and continue for at least 24 months after final release of capability in accordance with contract options. Attachment 3 provides a notional CLIN schedule and sequencing and should be shaped in accordance with the vendor's technical approach.
11/30/2020	244	PWS TSS-TMT Draft	3.10.5.18	When will the Platform One, MagicDraw and other environment/ tool licenses be available for use by vendors?	The requirement to only use Platform One will be removed with the posting of the final RFS. Platform One will still be available if a vendor choses to utilize the Government provided enterprise services. Access to Platform One will be made available shortly after the award of the OTA. Access to the Digital Engineering Experience Platform (DEEP) [hosts Magic Draw, DOORS, others tools] will also be made available upon agreement award. Vendors will not be required to utilize the tools available via the DEEP, but vendor will need to utilize tools that export files that can be ingested into Magic Draw and DOORS.
11/30/2020	245	General: Demo Day planning	General	What are the Government's expectations for Q&A during the Demo Day? Will questions associated with each presentation/demonstration be discussed as they arise, or at the end of each presentation, or will all questions be held until the end of the day?	The Government seeks to employ an interactive exchange during the conduct of demonstrations that will allow for questions before, during, and immediately after the demonstrations.
11/30/2020	246	NA		Can the government make available the STE CFT study on use of fbx and gltf in the evolution of the STE program?	We are not aware of a STE CFT study on the use of fbx and gltf but if there is a specific question, please submit at your earliest convenience.
11/30/2020	247	NA		Can the government provide the 3D Terrain Pack to vendors as Distribution A or C? The STE Architectures are insufficient to understand the OWT interdependency.	The Government is working this request but the release may be post the release of the final RFS.

11/30/2020	248	NA		Can the government provide the ICD's for RVCT and IVAS to vendors as Distribution A or C? The STE Architectures are insufficient to understand the RVCT and IVAS interdependencies.	The Government is working this request but the release may be post the release of the final RFS.
11/30/2020	249	RFS Attach 1 TSMT PWS DRAFT FINAL V1.1 DISTRO A	Section 6. Para 1 and Section 7.2	Will the government consider removing the requirement to have a FOCI Mitigation + FCL SECRET in place at the time of the Demonstration Plan submission and demonstration to government for those vendors who wish to submit a partial solution that would result in playing a subcontractor's role? Example: TSS solution only as a COTS SW provider and software developer.	The Government cannot remove this requirement as lack of approval can result in untimely delays. If a vendor intended to prime and is unable to as a result of this requirement, please notify the Government immediately. The demonstration should focus on integrated solutions from a team (Prime + subs).
11/30/2020	250	Training Support Management Tool PWS	Section 3.9.1.2.4	Can the government please make available to vendors as Distribution A or C an entire list of specific models it would like to see incorporated into the STE TSS/TMT by the end of the PoP?	The Government has made available to vendors, via Distribution C or equivalent CUI marking, a list of specific entities or played items required for STE (MVP Visio Played Items List STE Entity List (STEEL) v0.10). In order to support these entities a 3D model to support visual rendering is required, in addition to physical model representation. 3D models produced by the OWT effort will be provided as GFI to the executing TSS/TMT vendor(s) for subsequent integration with the TSS rendering engine. OWT is providing 325 initial models that are anticipated to be available at TSS/TMT award and then an additional 150 models during TSS/TMT OTA execution. Version 0.10 of the STEEL file did not include a list of 3D models that OWT is planning to deliver. An updated STEEL file (MVP Visio Played Items List STE Entity List (STEEL) v0.11) that adds a tab listing planned OWT 3D models will be added to an updated TSS/TMT Tech Data Package (TDP). For those required entities that do not have a corresponding OWT model, the vendor can provide their own existing model, if available. However, it is not expected that the TSS/TMT vendor will develop any new 3D models, notwithstanding lifeform models which are fully the responsibility and scope of the TSS/TMT OTA.
11/30/2020	251	RFS Attach 3 Cost Template	NA	Can the government explain how it would like to see a breakout of licensing and maintenance as opposed to usage fees once the software is entirely cloud based and no longer requires the traditional model of licenses and maintenance? There is only a CLIN for HW/SW Licenses/SW Maintenance and a CLIN for Cloud Services but no CLIN for the SaaS fees. There are, however, inherently two software pathways required for TSS/TMT - one that reaches back to legacy training devices using modular software / uses communication protocols like DIS/HLA/DDS and interconnects with a game engine for dismantled training....and another pathway that reaches forward to the cloud after the legacy systems have been sunset. This second pathway is entirely cloud based and ceases to use traditional licensing models or communications protocols but both pathways are necessary for TSS/TMT. Perhaps an additional CLIN is needed.	The Government has updated the cost template to reflect a section in the ODC CLIN for SaaS fees.
11/30/2020	252	Draft RFS	1	The desire for an integrated solution across the contract /agreement framework specified by the Government will necessitate the stabilization of incremental requirement sets that enable the dPWS Appendix C CAPSETS for all collaborating organizations -Government and industry. Will the TSS /TMT contractor have the responsibility, with Government coordination, to establish these incremental requirement sets consistent with the contractor proposed capability roadmap?	The Government requests that the vendor proposes a capability roadmap that details the proposed solution to meet the requirements detailed in the PWS, inclusive of the CAPSETS. The Government seeks a collaborative environment whereby coordination with the vendor will be consistent throughout the execution of this OTA to include the incremental buildup of capabilities detailed in CAPSETS.
11/30/2020	253	Draft RFS	1	If the Government will establish these incremental requirement sets, when will they be delivered to the TSS /TMT contractor in relation to other events as specified in the dRFS?	Per prior response, it is incumbent upon the vendor to identify the capability roadmap.
11/30/2020	254	Draft RFS	2	As the STE must have the capability to change with technology, and as the advancement of technology is not highly predictable, would the Government please share the range of acceptable schedule and cost variances to integrate changes in technology?	The Government will release budgetary information in conjunction with the release of the final RFS. Additionally, the period of performance is specified in the CLIN structure and the end state capability required (i.e. brigade-level) is specified in the PWS. These two data points serve as cost and schedule constraints respectively.

11/30/2020	255	Draft RFS	2	As the STE must enable rapid generation of the OE, and the OE is defined only in general terms through doctrinal references in the dPWS (i.e. ADRP 3-0 and ADRP 6-0), and in relations to existing TADSS (i.e. training role players, IED simulators, MILES, small arms), would the Government please provide a list of the OE element priorities? The risk in not setting these priorities is that human variability in subsequent Soldier Touch Points will have different experiences and biases leading to variation in subjective assessment with respect to OE elements.	The Operational Environment Represents realistic and dynamic PMESII-PT variables with a priority to Military, Information, Infrastructure, Physical Environment, & Time. The final RFS will incorporate an additional attachment, OE Variables Defined (separate document) with further details.
11/30/2020	256	Draft RFS	2	In Draft RFS Section 2, the Government indicates that requirements are linked to other programs and capabilities outside the STE (e.g. embedded within the COE). Would the Government please share the overarching contract /agreement frameworks that will enable the execution of these requirements that are outside of the STE program? These requirements carry significant risk that will have trade off implications that the Government desires to have disclosed in pre-award products and post-award deliverables.	The Government has provided some of the dependencies but is limited in what can be made available prior to executing an agreement. If the RFS and all attachments didn't explicitly describe a requirement for TSS/TMT to integrate with any given program, this will be negotiated post award.
11/30/2020	257	Draft RFS	2	By using the DoD Software Acquisition Pathway, the Government desires to acquire increasing incremental requirement sets and distinct backlog features will require specified constraints in cost, schedule, or requirement risk. Throughout the draft documents, the Government does not place constraints on any of the program management variables. This demands that offerors propose a deterministic solution with specified risk in requirements, schedule, and cost. These conditions fail to account for the probabilistic nature of a proposed solution, which can provide trade space between program management variables. Recommend the Government specify cost and schedule ranges in order to inform industry of what solutions are realistic, and provide the Government with comparable solutions that can be objectively assessed in their innovative elements.	The Government will release budgetary information in conjunction with the release of the final RFS. Additionally, the period of performance is specified in the CLIN structure and the end state capability required (i.e. brigade-level) is specified in the PWS. These two data points serve as cost and schedule constraints respectively.
11/30/2020	258	Draft RFS	3.8	In Draft RFS Section 3.8, the Government references "the companies specified herein" is stated. Can the Government please reference where that list of companies is located in the Draft documents?	The RFS will be updated to identify The Mitre Corporation as the only company that may have access to source selection documents
11/30/2020	259	Draft RFS	4.3	The Government states that Technical Interchange Meetings (TIMs) prior to white paper submission will facilitate requirements shaping. Will the Government publish an updated set of documents between TIM and white paper submission available to all offerors? Without this additional data baseline, the competitive environment is compromised as something in one TIM may drive a requirement change to the advantage of one competitor, and the disadvantage of others.	Updated documents will be posted as amendments to the final RFS package up until the Demonstration Plan submission deadline. Following the Demonstration plan submission, updated documents will ONLY be provided to down-selected vendors/teams moving through the selection phases.
11/30/2020	260	Draft RFS	5	The Government states that the TSS /TMT objective must be at least as proficient as the existing ITE. Can the Government please provide a prioritized list of the ITE capabilities that must be achieved to meet this objective?	TSS / TMT will not be measured against existing ITE capabilities to be successful. To meet the objective of STE, the TSS/TMT must meet the requirements within the RFS, inclusive of the SRD. The RFS has been updated.
11/30/2020	261	Draft RFS	2.5	The Government states in several places the need for collective training from Soldier/Squad level. By using the term Soldier and specifying individual behaviors in the CAPSET appendix, there is an inference that individual training, not just collective, is desired. Would the Government please confirm that individual training is desired?	Most of the applications and training that the TSS/TMT facilitate collective training. This includes the first person gaming application, RVCT Air and Ground as well as the constructive capability. However, TSS/TMT will also be used as the simulation driver and training management overlay for the Soldier Virtual Trainer (SVT) which is an individual soldier trainer. Please also refer to TDP, Appendix C and D for examples on Training Task Sets and Training Tasks.
11/30/2020	262	Draft RFS	2.5	If the Government desires individual Soldier training, it is widely understood that the fidelity of individual training is significantly higher than fidelity of collective training. Would the Government please provide the acceptable trade space in individual training?	Given that SVT is intended to be an individual soldier training capability, the TSS/TMT requirements for this application are different in a number of ways from those of the soldier collective training applications such as RVCT Soldier and SiVT. The specific fidelity of modeling and training management for SVT and associated trade space will be defined in conjunction with program increment planning and Sprint planning by the government team and vendor. Trade space will be available, relative to individual training as well as collective training requirements, as a result of engaging in Soldier Touch Points, i.e. when the end user sees and uses initial prototypes and helps the STE team zero in on what is most critical for training. An initial capture of the SVT-specific requirements is found in TDP Appendix F, TSS/TMT System Requirements Document (SRD).

11/30/2020	263	Draft RFS	7.6	The demonstration instructions specify technical and operational merit. While the instructions also state additional areas can be demonstrated, the absence of program areas reinforces an inference to industry that the Government has a component focus which limits the ability to assess system-level capabilities. Recommend that the Government consider including program area requirements (e.g. cost discipline and affordability, scheduling, interoperability, and information management) in the demo plan to provide for an objective comparison of the offeror's capability to deliver a systems-level solution within statutory and critical regulatory acquisition constraints.	The Government seeks to employ an interactive exchange during the conduct of demonstrations that will allow for questions before, during, and immediately after the demonstrations. However, the focus of the demonstrations will be on the technical capabilities that prospective vendors can demonstrate. Accordingly, if vendors have capabilities that speak to technical integration, then the Government welcomes discussion on the technical aspects of the proposed integration. However, discussion on cost discipline/affordability, scheduling, and information management will not be a focus during this part of the evaluation.
11/30/2020	264	Draft RFS	7.6	Recommend that the Government change "Integration of Architecture and Infrastructure Elements" from a sub-area to a primary area, on par with Technical, Operational, and Program Areas to provide for an objective comparison of the offeror's capability to deliver a systems-level solution.	Please note that the focus areas do not identify a relative order of importance but rather are categorized together in groupings of related areas. Accordingly, it should not be inferred that a "sub-area" is of lesser importance.
11/30/2020	265	Draft RFS	7.7	Industry is all in to share risk with the Government to deliver the transformational training capabilities of STE. However, in this paragraph, and repeatedly in multiple questions, the Government is firm in their assertion of fixed price software development. In such an environment, the risk is all on the contractor. Further, when this risk is loaded to industry under an OTA, there is minimal leverage for the Government with the contractor in a dynamic requirements environment. Recommend that the Government consider true risk sharing with industry by making the software development a Time and Materials (T&M) agreement with a Not-To-Exceed (NTE) ceiling. This provides the Government with leverage, and shared risk in the development while maintaining cost controls. It also incentivizes industry-a Government desire that is stated in multiple question responses-to deliver responsive solutions that are systems-focused within the DoD standard for DevSecOps software development efforts. Together, Government and industry manage the backlog within the reality of budget to ensure effective capability for the Army.	The Government is seeking to reach non-traditional vendors through OTAs, thus awarding as anything but FFP may impact vendor participation if they do not have an accounting system capable of identifying the amounts/costs to individual agreements/contracts. Further, as described in the draft RFS, the Government intends to incentivize the vendor through accelerated deliverables and this incentive will not be available if anything but FFP is utilized. Significant changes to the vendors approach in response to Government changes in the requirement during execution will be addressed via modification and will result in pricing adjustments where necessary, thereby reducing the risk to vendors. The Government has considered awarding this as an expenditure-based OTA, but finds that the potential disqualification of NTDCs, as well as additional burden to both the Government and vendor in execution far outweighs the perceived benefit.
11/30/2020	266	Q&As	Answers to questions: 4, 7, 15, 22, 30, 53, 93, 107, 164, 184	Fixed price software development is highly appropriate for well-defined requirements. TSS /TMT requirements are dynamic, making fixed price a huge risk that the Government is asking industry to accept. This is a dis-incentive to take an innovative approach as desired by the Government. It drives industry to take minimal risk in technical approach. The only available tradeoffs of schedule and cost are not being disclosed by the Government. With three independent variables, and no range or limit on any, there is a concern that the Government may not achieve its objective. Recommend that the Government consider a cost type agreement for software development, with incentives for MVP and MVCR. This would open the aperture for innovative solutions, and give the Government options with respect to managing the development in their dynamic requirements environment.	Question number 265 provides a partial response. The Government intends to provide the budget for TSS/TMT as part of the RFS. A notional schedule has been provided as part of the RFS. While the vendor is required to submit a capability roadmap that indicates what set of capabilities would be present at each MVP and at MVCR, the required end state for this OTA is a brigade capability that meets all requirements in the PWS. The aforementioned budget constraint that will be provided and this schedule constraint constitute cost and schedule constraints respectively.
11/30/2020	267	Q&As	Answer to question 52	The Government states that the Soldier should be able to adapt the user interface. This is an ambiguous requirement that could be met with an ability to change display colors, but may have intent for rapid reconfiguration of all immersion elements. With such a requirement, there is significant risk. Would the Government please clarify intent on this requirement and provide use cases?	The intent is that user interface is simple enough for Soldier to use with minimal training and the components of the interface continue to mature with the changing operational environment. One use case involves a Soldier having cyber proficiency as a training objective. The Soldier would have the ability to provide specific space on the GUI to monitor the cyber-attacks on a training audience. The next iteration, the training objective would focus on tactics for digital defense and success rates. The specific information would be adapted to the GUI for situational awareness and monitoring throughout the exercise.

11/30/2020	268	Q&As	Question 21, 37, 39, 60, 86, et al.	The Government in their answers specifies that a "best of breed" capability will be determined by the vendor and the Government. When and how will this determination be made collaboratively in the current proposal plan?	Determination of "best of breed" is to be made by each prospective vendor team for the purpose of forming their respective technical approaches and solutions. The use or advancement of a capability or tool in a previous OTA (STE or otherwise) will not have bearing on the Government's determination of which vendor proposes the best technical solution or approach. The Government does not intend to narrow the field of potential prospective solutions by encouraging the use or of any specific solution, irrespective of whether or not it was employed as part of a previous OTA. If that message was previously not correctly in those terms or not made clear then please consider this as an overriding clarification.
11/30/2020	269	Q&As	Answer to question 93	The Government requests a realistic value and PoP on a program with a budget under Congressional scrutiny, and a much more complex capability vision that was under the CSE OTA. Using the Defense Software Acquisition Pathway, this may be incrementally achievable if some clarity on either budget, PoP, or requirements. Please consider releasing a cost range and schedule guidance to ensure efficient phasing of a solution.	The Government will release budgetary information in conjunction with the release of the final RFS. Additionally, the period of performance is specified in the CLIN structure and the end state capability required (i.e. brigade-level) is specified in the PWS. These two data points serve as cost and schedule constraints respectively.
11/30/2020	270	Q&As	Answer to question 95	If the Contractor needs to interface through a Government owned architecture, some level of collaboration in that architecture is required. It is with great uncertainty that pricing can be done if the contractor is not included in the change management process of this architecture. Can the Government provide assured inclusion in the change management process to ensure effective risk mitigation?	The architecture is stable at this point in time with only minor updates anticipated between now and award of the TSS/TMT OTA. The Government will track any updates that are made between now and OTA award and consider sharing those updates prior to OTA award to prospective vendors in the unlikely event that they are significant. Once the TSS/TMT OTA is awarded the TSS/TMT vendor will become a full partner with the Government in the architecture change management process.
11/30/2020	271	Q&As	Answer to question 99	By stating that emerging requirements will be included in the solution process, does this mean that the final RFS will be inclusive of all requirements that need to be costed, or will the contractor be expected to bid for the integration of requirements not specified in the final RFS? If there are more requirements to be costed, but these requirements are not specified, with the Government issue a plug number for emerging capabilities to more equitably compare risk across proposed solutions?	The final RFS, PWS and TDP will be inclusive of all the requirements expected to be costed in support of this RFS. Emerging requirements will be considered during the execution and the vendor will have the ability to analyze and provide a recommendation.
11/30/2020	272	Q&As	Answer to question 184, Second Webinar	The Government's desire to avoid vendor lock is not incentivized in the current RFS structure. The specification of products already developed by the Government based on existing capabilities limits the component solutions that are available for a system integrator to bring together in a systems solution. Recommend that the Government consider cost incentives, cost targets, and schedule variance in order to mitigate the risk that is driving a vendor solution that the Government may specify as "best of breed". Additionally recommend that the Government not specify that the current starting point be limited to the products and process presented in the second webinar.	The Government's overarching strategy is to accelerate development of the TSS/TMT capabilities through modern software development approach to enable the rapid creation and delivery of an integrated solution and therefore is looking at incentivizing early delivery of agreed upon capability. The Government will consider whether cost incentives, and cost targets will provide an update to the incentive strategy with the release of the final RFS. The end-state of the TSS/TMT system is the creation and successful implementation of a modular open system approach that delivers the foundational capabilities in support of the holistic STE vision. The Government will consider innovative approaches that align with the guiding design principles of the STE. Products and processes briefed to date were intended to provided vendors with insights of work effort conducted to date as well as for potential reuse rather than a mandate to use these products/processes as a starting point. There is no intent for the Government to direct a "starting point" for vendors.

11/30/2020	273	Q&As	Answer to questions 30, 42	Will the Government provide a list of physical infrastructure capabilities at all PoN locations in order to provide for risk reduction in technical solution and pricing? Without this information, risk will inflate pricing of proposed solutions and limit the innovation desired, and other elements the Government desires in MVP and MVCR.	Point of Need is defined as the location when and where training is required. The intent is to bring the training to the Soldier and not the Soldier to the training. Additional information for analysis is that the STE-IS requires sheltered, powered, environmentally controlled space for operations. STE-IS shall be transportable for relocation to forward, deployed areas around the world and designed to connect to portable generator and commercial power. STE-IS must be dual voltage capable to enable training, transport, and shipping to OCONUS locations. Power requirements do not exceed 110 Volt/15 Amp/60hz. Implementation of the STE-IS does not require any change to existing Military facilities.
11/30/2020	274	Second Webinar	N/A	In the second webinar, the Government specified process execution, and the products already developed. Does the contractor have the ability to use more modern state-of-the-market processes and execution and use, adapt, pass, or build the best products to support their solution?	Yes, the Government is open to more modern processes. Products and processes briefed to date were intended to provided vendors with insights of work effort conducted to date as well as for potential reuse.
11/30/2020	275	Q&As	Answer to question 124	The Government specified that the draft RFS would provide details on vendor-defined MVP capabilities. Would the Government please provide clarity on budget and PoP? The draft RFS does not provide the clarity needed for industry to provide the Government with solutions that have sufficient trade space for vendor defined MVP capabilities.	The Government will release budgetary information in conjunction with the release of the final RFS. Additionally, the period of performance is specified in the CLIN structure and the end state capability required (i.e. brigade-level) is specified in the PWS. These two data points serve as cost and schedule constraints respectively.
11/30/2020	276	Q&As	Answers to questions 21, 33, 39, 60, 86	Will the Government provide a list of the best of breed capabilities referenced in these answers? If these capabilities are being encouraged, it would be beneficial to the Government and industry for them to be provided in support of solution development.	Please see prior response to question 268.
11/30/2020	277	Q&As	Answer to question 107	The Government intends to have industry provide a solution that leverages game streaming technology requirements on prem hardware that may not be necessary for all PoN locations. 1. Does the Government intend for industry to use Platform One to support game streaming capabilities? 2. If the Government assumes that industry are using Platform One on sites with poor connectivity, does the Government intend for industry to supplement game streaming capabilities with hardware?	The Government is not requiring game streaming as a solution. Please also note that TSS/TMT needs to support both network disconnected and connected operations. Per PWS para 3.9.1.4, the TSS/TMT vendor shall investigate alternatives such as mobile computing technology and streaming. Accordingly, the Government is not discouraging any vendor from proposing a streaming based solution but you must also be able to support disconnected operations for this effort. Game streaming and Platform One are somewhat independent topics as the tools used for DevSecOps does not impact whether streaming is employed and vice versa. Please also note that Platform One is now not being mandated.
11/30/2020	278	Q&As	Answer to question 109	The pricing direction infers that Fort Hood solution will be replicated across other specified locations. In a DevSecOps environment, multiple configuration controlled baselines are possible to provide the Government the dynamic feature delivery inferred from all products. Pricing such a process would be heavily loaded with risk, and may be seen as unaffordable. Alternately, pricing only replication of Fort Hood would limit the intent of the Army, and not provide the emerging technology integration desired. How does the Government want the deployment to multiple locations costed?	The Government has updated to number of fielding sites from 5 to 1. Ft Hood, TX will be utilized as the test and feedback site through the development, delivery of the MVCR, software updates, through delivery of the full Brigade and below Collective Training capability. Pricing should only cover fielding activities at Ft Hood, TX.
11/30/2020	279	dPWS	ii	Recommend re-issuing appendix E Integrated Master Schedule. While the Defense Software Acquisition Approach with a Product Roadmap supplement an IMS, they do not replace it. The statutory requirements for Defense Acquisition, and the critical DoDI specifications necessary for a complete solution approach can only be assessed by the Government with an IMS that shows the elements needed for affordability, sustainability, quality, interoperability, et. al. In addition, 9.1 refers to an assessment of schedule, and dPWS 3.1 requires an IMP which is a complementary product to the IMS.	The vendor is required to deliver its version of the Product Roadmap in response to this RFS 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. Product Roadmap should present a complete solution with all details and assumptions to allow the Government to evaluate and gain confidence in the vendor's approach. Accordingly, an IMS is no longer required.
11/30/2020	280	Industry Day #2	N/A	Will the Government be releasing the web-enabled architecture file(s)? If so, when?	Yes, the Government will release the web exported file that depicts the architecture in conjunction with the release of the final RFS.

11/30/2020	281	STE Architecture Product-2 -- DoDAF Excerpts from Magic Draw v 6 - 20201123.pdf	N/A	Will the Government release the CAMEO/MagicDraw models in addition to the exported documents? This will ease in the editing of the artifacts.	Yes, the Government will release the models in conjunction with the release of the final RFS.
11/30/2020	282	Master-TSMT-SRD-v0.29.xlsx	1.11.1	Is the TSS/TMT responsible for the RVCT Hardware API? Or is that done on the RVCT program? Or both? If both, how are we to bid it FFP?	The RVCT OTA provides the Hardware API (HAPI) to which the TSS will interface/integrate. This will be provided to the TSS/TMT vendor as GFI. The Government intends to provide a copy of the latest HAPI and associated ICD as part of an expanded TDP as part of RFS release or shortly thereafter.
11/30/2020	283	Draft PWS	2.2	The draft PWS states that the Government's intent is to close ITE limitations without creating new gaps. While there are narratives in several places about elements of the ITE, and the ITE itself, there is not a specific list of ITE limitations. (1) Can the Government please provide a specific list of ITE limitations? (2) Since "new gaps" are unknown unknowns in this context, will this list of ITE limitations be inclusive of all gaps to make the "new gaps" unknown knowns?	A partial list of gaps that exist in the ITE that STE intends to close on this effort include: Lack of single Training Management Tool for virtual, gaming and constructive training enablers, Lack of native interface with MCIS, i.e. without gateways/translators, lack of cloud hosted capability, lack of collective training capability at the point of need, lack of rapid concurrency in ground and air virtual training enablers, lack of single game engine and rendering engine for virtual and gaming training enablers, lack of automation or assistive technologies to aid soldiers in the exercise Plan, Prepare, Execute, Assess (PPEA) process, lack of collective training enablers that are easy for soldiers to operate and maintain, lack of DevSecOps process and automated testing to facilitate rapid capability delivery to the field, lack of use of authoritative data sources. While this is a partial list only, it should be noted that the existing ITE gaps informed the generation of STE requirements. Therefore, meeting the TSS/TMT requirements will in effect close existing ITE gaps.
11/30/2020	284	Draft PWS	3.6.2	How will the Government ensure that the contractors have visibility of the change management process for all required non-STE program interfaces?	The TSS/TMT vendor can attend the weekly IPT meetings for the RVCT and OWT OTAs where information pertinent to development, integration and baseline management of deliverables from RVCT efforts are shared with the Government and other vendor partners. The Government will also track and facilitate information regarding change management for other OTAs.
11/30/2020	285	Draft PWS/Industry Day 1/2	PWS 1, 2.	Government Industry Days sought to leverage industry best practice for developing the STE using the Software Acquisition Pathway (SAP), agile techniques and DevSecOps development environment, and a Modular Open Systems Approach (MOSA) to architecture development. Would the Government consider other more modern methods and techniques that are considered industry best practice today?	The Government is open to approaches that achieve the same ends as the processes referenced in the question such as achieving rapid capability delivery to the warfighter that is based on frequent soldier feedback and is secure, reliable, accredited and maximizes the use of automation in the build, test and delivery/deployment processes. The Government, however, must adhere to the SAP, achieve a continuous ATO and pursue a Modular Open Systems Approach.
11/30/2020	286	Draft PWS	PWS 7.7.3, 7.7.5, 7.7.7, 7.7.10.	Can the Government better define the desired simulation engine required to support the STE project or provide any prioritization to the trade-off of capabilities when selecting the desired simulation engine?	Simulation or game engine selection is part of the vendor specific approach. The Sim or game engine must employ state of the art physics modeling capability, render realistic animations, scenes and effects such as advanced particle engines at high frame rates, support advanced artificial intelligence for non player controlled entities and provide WGS- 84 ellipsoid, 64 bit, geocentric coordinates within the core engine.
11/30/2020	287	Draft PWS	3.10.5.18	Is the required use of Platform One the Party Bus (shared) or Big Bang (contractor's own instance)?	The Government will be offering Platform One as an enterprise hosted service. Alternatively, the Government will consider vendor solutions, hosted by vendors that achieve the desired ends of DevSecOps.

11/30/2020	288	Draft PWS	Appendix A	Is it expected that the RVCT-A/G/S will provide anything other than hardware control linkages and a 3D model when being integrated into the TSS single game engine?	Yes. In addition to hardware I/O interfaces through the RVCT provided Hardware API (HAPI), physical video cable interfaces to displays, Electronic Control Loading system interface, and 3D models of the ownship interiors, the RVCT will supply rendering software (Unity based) for a small subset of display panels in certain ground vehicles. This software will run on the same host as the TSS. The RVCT also provides the hardware that the TSS simulation host and rendering engine run on.
11/30/2020	289	Draft PWS	Appendix A	Will the RVCT OTAs select their own game engine for their development and then later integrate into the TSS engine for IOC? If RVCT products are being developed under another OTA, is there a recommendation to ensure compliance during development so they all use the same game engine?	The RVCT OTA is currently integrating with a vendor selected stand-in TSS capability in order to facilitate internal hardware design acceptance in lieu of the TSS to be provided by the TSS/TMT OTA. This stand in or test driver TSS is not intended to be used beyond informing and facilitating the RVCT internal hardware design process. Once the TSS provided by the TSS/TMT OTA is available, this TSS will be integrated and used with all RVCT hardware for all integration, testing and deployment activities.
11/30/2020	290	Draft PWS	General	Will the USG mandate a process or empower an individual who will deliberate and resolve conflicting architecture between RVCT (Cole) and OWT (Vricon)?	Any conflicting architecture between the TSS/TMT and RVCT and/or OWT will be resolved and deconflicted by the PEO STRI program management team.
11/30/2020	291	Architecture Files	General	What version of Magic Draw is required for the architecture? If possible are we able to receive an export of the cameo system model (.mdzip file) as pictured in the .pdf Architecture files.	Yes, the Government will provide the .mdzip file in conjunction with the final RFS release. The version of MagicDraw that the Government utilized to generate the architectures briefed at the recent Project Talks is v19.0.
	292	Draft PWS		<p>Company believes the two biggest challenges for the Army in achieving the STE vision are: the ability to scale and integrate. Company expected to see evaluation criteria focused on a holistic solution, not a an "application" or "product demonstration," as stated in 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 of the evaluation criteria . We would recommend the government consider instructions and evaluation criteria for the demonstration plan and demonstration that focus on the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vendor / provider's approach to integration, • Selection process and criteria used to develop a best of breed software and technology, • Plan to achieve simulation entity requirements, plus proof points on ability to scale, • Approach / solution for high fidelity content creation and delivery, • Strategy for managing data across applications in near real-time, which is critical for a system of systems like TSS/TMT • Approach to provide poly / multi and hybrid cloud management solution, • Approach to meeting cyber security requirements <p>Further, the draft PWS includes extensive requirements for an Agile approach using a DevSecOps framework, but the evaluation criteria do not evaluate the provider's experience and capabilities, which could create significant delivery risks for the government upon OTA award.</p>	<p>The Government's evaluation process is a multi-phased evaluation whereby the initial stages, i.e. demonstration plan and demonstration, have a primary focus the technical and operational merit of the capabilities that vendors can demonstrate. Subsequent stages of the evaluation process, i.e. white paper, offer those vendors who reach that stage to present their holistic approach to meeting TSS/TMT requirements.</p> <p>Per the draft RFS, "The Government will evaluate the technical merit and feasibility of the vendor's technical approach." Additionally, para 7.7.6 of the draft RFS, titled DevSecOps and Integration, include instructions for the vendor in preparing the white paper as it relates to this topic. While the vendor instructions represent the minimum amount required in generation of the white paper, vendors are encouraged to describe their technical approach in sufficient detail that underscores the technical merit in their approach as it applies to TSS/TMT requirements.</p>
	293		Attachment 10 EULA, section 8 iv	Since we provide a commercial software we seek clarification what the Government means with modifying, adapting or combining the software with other computer software in section 8 iv)? Does it include changes in the source code or is it just for integration purposes?	The Government requires that the vendor's software solution, inclusive of any commercial aspects, can meet the depth and breadth of TSS/TMT requirements which has a significant emphasis on integration. Accordingly, the vendor's solution must be adaptable to enable this integration. The Government would like to establish an agreement that commercial software may be "modified, adapted, or combined" for this purpose.
	294	Draft PWS		Would the Government consider adding an Integration CLIN to mitigate risk to both the Government and the vendor?	The Government considered and as a result, a FFP Integration CLIN added to the CLIN structure and RFS will be revised accordingly