

Current as of 30 Jul 2021

Question #	Source Referenc	Question	Answer
1	TReX TRASYS ITE RFS rev 0 Page 8, Paragraph 1	The RFS states on page 8/para 1, "The ITE systems will also be required to support certain performance criteria further identified in the Technical Supplement, Attachment 01." Per the update on 19 July 20201, Attachment 01 is the Technology Readiness Level (TRL) Distro A. Is the TRL Distro A equivalent to the referenced Technical Supplement, or does the Government intend to publish a separate Technical Supplement?	The Technical Supplement reference was intended to be deleted in with the release of the RFS. The amended RFS will remove any instance of the Technical Supplement.
2	RFS 5.3.5	Does a scenario consist of a single virtual avatar, or does the scenario have to support several virtual avatars and it understands which one you are interacting with?	The first developmental increment shall be a single virtual entity for a scenario. The objective is to reach multiple entities for a scenario.
3	RFS 5.3.5	Is the system meant to be portable or be in a fixed installation?	The ITE is intended to be used at any deployment site.
4	RFS 5.3.5	Is the sound requirement for each scenario controlled by the existing system at the IIT or independent of the current system?	Either option can be considered dependent on the ease of integration of the existing system. New systems would be accepted if proven to benefit the Government. The Government believes the RFS is clear with regard to the sound requirements referenced in Section 5.3.5.
5	RFS 5.3.5	Please provide Technical Supplement Attachment 01 as referenced, "The ITE system will also be required to support certain performance criteria further identified in the Technical Supplement, Attachment 01. PM TRASYS is open to additional ideas and approaches." The Attachment 01 provided is a definition of TRLs.	The Technical Supplement reference was intended to be deleted in with the release of the RFS. The amended RFS will remove any instance of the Technical Supplement.
6	RFS 5.3.5	Do you have a current list of kinetic / non-kinetic responses you want supported? Referencing this statement, "Adaptable to support application of kinetic and non-kinetic responses in combat simulation."	The Government does not have a current predetermined list of kinetic / non-kinetic responses. The Government identifies Kinetic as typical motions (raising hands, weapons, etc, and non-kinetic as verbal or other non-verbal gestures.
7	RFS 5.3.5	Is an example of non-kinetic responses a questioning approach?	The Government identifies Kinetic as typical motions (raising hands, weapons, etc, and non-kinetic as verbal or other non-verbal gestures. This includes questioning approaches.
8	RFS 5.3.5	We imagine the basis of interactions with role player include both voice and location tracking. Are there any other details on what free play means ("Respond based on "free-play" with the use of artificial intelligence")?	Government will consider solutions that can provide improvisation on behalf of the CGF and trainees. The Government identifies free play as meaning the training unit has less restriction of movement based on the training scenario (i.e. opportunity to branch off the training script).
9	RFS 5.3.7	Please define the AAR data points and metrics surrounding the events within the training scenario that are desired/required.	Example AAR data points may include: Speed in which the scenario was completed, rounds fired / misses, and where the tactics, techniques and procedures that are being trained correctly followed.
10	RFS 5.3.7	Please define the individual and collective feedback, such as video and sound capture and playback, that is desired/required	The Government is interested in innovative solutions that support the actionable feedback, which may include video and sound capture and playback. The Government is not defining or limiting a specific solution to this requirements and is rather seeking innovative and technologically advanced approaches.
11	RFS 5.3.6	What specific countries of origin or languages must be associated with the virtual avatars? What level of cultural understanding should they have? Should they recognize non-verbal gestures to facilitate communication understanding and compliance by virtual avatar? Will there be use of translation device to understand foreign languages?	The successful implementation of the initial developmental increment should consist of historically non descript regions, languages and ethnicities. Future follow-on increments may include current real world operations.
12	RFS 5.3.5	When generating CGFs, are varying physiological characteristics required?	Yes, varying physiological characteristics are required.
13	RFS 5.3.6	Who is generating the scenarios? Will those scenarios be provided or will the team devise them? How much control will we have in the specifics of the scenario development?	The training SME's generate the scenarios. After award, the scenarios will be provided through SOW development.

14	RFS 2, 5.3.5	When talking about replacing live actors, how general do the synthetic characters need to be? Is generating a unique synthetic character per each role in each specific scenario be the target? Or do they need to be more general?	The synthetic characters should be representative of individuals and counter/experience in the operational environment that the scenario intends to represent. Please keep in mind that the Government is seeking innovative technological solutions in satisfying the ITE prototype effort. CGF could be both: in one scenario the CGF is a general bystander type entity; in a different scenario the CGF is a character that the trainees interact with to achieve the learning objectives.
15	RFS 5.3.6	We understand the design should support the requirements of the USMC Infantry team Leader, Skill Level 2. Will the requirement need to be a graduated (scalable) level of training scenarios that build from individual USMC rifleman (entry position) to team leader?	Yes. However prototype developmental increments should be able to engage and interact with units at the squad level.
16	RFS 5.3.6	What environmental weather conditions should the scenario be developed against (day, night, rain, etc.)?	The Government confirms that the CGF-related displayed entities require to be operated in day/night and an array of weather conditions.
17	RFS 5.3.6	Is there a requirement for Marines to use individual issued equipment such as assigned weapon un-tethered to the system that would facilitate individual movement that supports scenarios?	There is no requirement for the system to be tethered to Marines' individual equipment, however, the system should be able to detect when equipment is being engaged.
18	RFS 5.3.5	The text says training needs to cover room navigation and clearing. Is it correct to infer that the system must be able to track the position and orientation of the trainees?	Yes, it is correct to infer that the system must be able to track the position and orientation of the trainees.
19	RFS 5.4.5	The prior Q&A stated that the IMS requirement would be replaced with a POAM instead. Please confirm whether an IMS or POAM is required.	With the release of the RFS, the Government's intent was to remove all instances of the IMS requirement and replace it with the Plan of Action and Milestones (POAM) requirement. The Government will issue an amendment to remove any remaining instances of the IMS.
20	RFS Para. 5.1 & 5	The table in para. 5.1 and the list in para. 5.3 indicate that the response should have separate "Solution Paper" and "Technical Approach" sections. However, para. 5.3.4 states "Solution Paper responses shall include the vendor's proposed technical solution clearly describing the approach ..." This indicates that the two sections are one and the same. What is the Government's desire?	The Government is requesting Solution Papers. The amended RFS will remove the "Technical Approach" from Sections 5.1 and 5.3 to avoid confusion.
21	RFS Para. 5.1, 5.3, 5.3.7, 5.3.8, 5.4.4, 5.4.5, 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, & 7.6.1	These paragraphs reference an Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and/or Delivery Schedule. The Government's Answers to Questions stated that these requirements would be replaced by a Plan of Actions and Milestones (POA&M). Does the Government desire an IMS and a Delivery Schedule or a POA&M?	With the release of the RFS, the Government's intent was to remove all instances of the IMS requirement and replace it with the Plan of Action and Milestones (POAM) requirement. The Government will issue an amendment to remove any remaining instances of the IMS.
22	RFS Para. 5.3.5	The phrases "must be able to project onto solid surfaces" and "Display 3D CGF images on walls of artificial mock village" still appear. The Government's Answers to Questions stated that these phrases would be removed. Does the government intend to mandate this solution?	The amended RFS will, (1) remove phrase "must be able to project onto solid surfaces" and replace with "must be able to represent realistic entities. (i.e. projections, augmented or virtual reality, holograms, etc)" from the last sentence of the first paragraph of 5.3.5 (2) remove the "Display 3D CGF images on walls of artificial mock village" bullet from Functional Systems Objectives.
23	RFS Para. 5.3.5	The RFS states "The ITE system will also be required to support certain performance criteria further identified in the Technical Supplement, Attachment 01." Attachment 01 is Technology Readiness Levels. TReX stated "that the GFI, Attachment 01 was no longer relevant nor necessary for this requirement and therefore the decision has been made to remove the reference." Will the Government remove this requirement?	The Technical Supplement reference was intended to be deleted in with the release of the RFS. The amended RFS will remove any instance of the Technical Supplement.
24	RFS Section 5.3.5	Can you please identify the current After Action Review (AAR) system and the operator station interface?	The AAR is not a system but rather a classroom with access to play back video and critique the actions of the trainees. Please note, the Government is seeking innovative technological solutions to support the AAR requirement and is not encouraging or discouraging the use of the current system or operating station.
25	RFS Section 5.3.5	What is the existing interface for the AAR tools?	The AAR is not a system but rather a classroom with access to play back video and critique the actions of the trainees. Please note, the Government is seeking innovative technological solutions to support the AAR requirement and is not encouraging or discouraging the use of the current system or operating station.

26	RFS Section 2	The RFS identifies Computer-Generated Forces (CGF) being one of a Family of Systems to provide realism within the ITE. What other systems are currently being used?	Please note the identification of the other systems currently used to provide realism include set dressings, sound & smell generation, and other battlefield effects. This does not mean that the appropriate solution will not be integrated with other training systems. This current requirement is for the ITE prototype effort.
27	RFS Section 5.3.5	Please describe the Government's expectation of documentation deliverables that will fulfill technical objectives.	At a minimum, the Government seeks all prototype development documentation. These documents are anticipated to be further defined during SOW collaboration between the Government and the selected Industry partner(s).
28	RFS Section 5.3.5 Attachment 1	Comment: The RFS Section 5.3.5 mentions a "Technical Supplement, Attachment 1." The provided Attachment 1 is a table describing program Technology Readiness Level (TRL). Question: Is there a different "Technical Supplement" attachment that can be provided?	The Technical Supplement reference was intended to be deleted in with the release of the RFS. The amended RFS will remove any instance of the Technical Supplement.
29	RFS Section 5.3.5	Comment: The RFS Section 5.3.5 mentions what appears to be a requirement to project CGF onto solid surfaces and was not modified to accommodate revisions annotated in the draft RFS Q&A response. Question: Can the Government clarify whether or not the overall technical objective of the ITE is to project CGF onto solid surfaces? Is the Government willing to accept solutions that use a head-mounted display or a free-floating holographic projection?	The amended RFS will, (1) remove phrase "must be able to project onto solid surfaces" and replace with "must be able to represent realistic entities. (i.e. projections, augmented or virtual reality, holograms, etc)" from the last sentence of the first paragraph of 5.3.5 (2) remove the "Display 3D CGF images on walls of artificial mock village" bullet from Functional Systems Objectives.
30	RFS Section 5.3.5	Is the ITE solution intended to be fixed to specific rooms and buildings within a facility or reconfigurable and deployable?	The ITE is intended to be used at any deployment site.
31	RFS Section 5.3.5	Comment: The RFS section 5.3.5 mentions an objective to "Administer the ability to track, model, and simulate interactive environments for participants." Question: Is the goal to provide live time, space, position, and engagement information of the training; generate a 3D representation of the actions that occurred during the training to be part of the AAR; or both?	Yes, the Government's intended goal is to provide live time, space, position, and engagement information of the training while also generating a 3D representation of the actions that occurred during the training to be part of the AAR.
32	RFS Section 5.3.5	Comment: The RFS Section 5.3.5 mentions an objective to "provide a training environment with realistic battlefield terrain for multidisciplinary user interaction." Question: Is the objective to be able to project CGF along with terrain, structures, and simulated objects (e.g., project a fully finished room) within the physical spaces of any IIT?	The Government is seeking innovative technological solutions, the Government will not drive the solution and has identified the requirement of, "provide a training environment with realistic battlefield terrain for multidisciplinary user interaction." The Government will consider all solutions.
33	RFS Section 5.3.5	Comment: The RFS Section 5.3.5 mentions an objective that is "flexible in rendering three-dimensional (3D) computer generated images in accordance to program mission." Question: Is this meant to provide CGF images that can easily be changed and adapted for the mission, or is this intended to allow the ITE solution to quickly change between the projection devices (e.g., transition from projected CGF to a head-mounted display)?	The successful implementation of the initial developmental increment should consist of historically non-descript regions, languages and ethnicities. Future follow-on increments may include current real world operations.
34	RFS Section 5.3.5	Is the objective to be compliant with Military Standard (MIL-STD)-810H and National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) under a future prototype project agreement, or is this compliance intended for a production solution under a future production agreement?	This compliance is intended for any material solution proposed for any increment in the development process for the current ITE prototype effort.
35	RFS Section 5.3.5	Comment: Need clarification on the objective to make the system "Adaptable to support application of kinetic and non-kinetic responses in combat simulations." Question: Can you provide example scenario events of kinetic and non-kinetic responses?	The Government does not have a current predetermined list of kinetic / non-kinetic responses. The Government identifies Kinetic as typical motions (raising hands, weapons, etc, and non-kinetic as verbal or other non-verbal gestures.

<p>36</p> <p>ITE-RFS-17-June-2021-Final-Draft, p.4: "The Technical section is limited to no more than 10 standard size (8 ½" X 11") pages for the total volume count using standard 12-point Arial font."</p>	<p>According to the table following this statement, Vendor Experience, Project Management, Solution Paper, and Technical Approach must all fit within this 10-page section. The draft RFS devotes over 5 pages simply to outlining this requirements. It is likely Attachment 1 will include additional relevant information that needs to be addressed. It will be very difficult for bidders to provide a compelling and compliant narrative regarding a technical solution in so few pages, even with the use of up to three foldouts. Could the page limit for this section be increased to 20 pages to ensure a more complete response?</p>	<p>Please note, the RFS has been posted as of 19 July 2021 and shall be used for the ITE prototype effort.</p> <p>The RFS will be amended to remove the Technical Approach from the table in Sections 5.1 and 5.3 as the Technical Approach is captured in the solution paper requirement. The Government is satisfied with the 10 page limit for the technical solution.</p>
<p>37</p> <p>ITE-RFS-17-June-2021-Final-Draft, p. 16: 7.3 7.3. Interested vendors are requested to provide proposed solutions outlining their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Operational System Objectives (RFS Section 5.3.6) •Functional System Objectives (RFS Section 5.3.6) •Scenario Generation Objectives (RFS Section 5.3.7) •AAR Objectives (RFS Section 5.3.8) 	<p>Where are vendors requested to provide these proposed solutions? Is this a separate request from the descriptions provided in Sections 5.3.6 through 5.3.8? It is unusual to include this request in the Evaluation and Selection Process section of the RFS as opposed to the Solutions Paper Response section. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Please note, the RFS has been posted as of 19 July 2021 and shall be used for the ITE prototype effort.</p> <p>Section 6. RFS Response Instructions provides RFS response instructions to include Q&A and solution submissions.</p> <p>The Government has noted the section regarding "It is unusual to include this request in the Evaluation and Selection Process section of the RFS as opposed to the Solutions Paper Response section".</p>
<p>38</p> <p>ITE-RFS-17-June-2021-Final-Draft, p. 18: 7.6.1 The Government will review each vendor's submittal against the criteria as described in Sections 7.3 and 7.4, with major consideration given in no specific order of importance to the technical merit (including product line quality factors such as agility and reuse), feasibility of implementation, and total project risk. The proposed project price, delivery schedule, and data rights assertions will also be considered as aspects of the entire response when weighing risk and reward. Further, the Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed concept provides an innovative, unique – yet realistic and sustainable - approach to meeting the ITE Prototype technical capabilities and objectives.</p>	<p>The Selection Process description is vague. There is no information on relative weighting or scoring provided. What sort of scale will be used for evaluation? Will different aspects be assigned points, color ratings, or satisfactory/unsatisfactory ratings? Does the Government seek best value? As written, the Government's priorities and concerns are unclear. Please provide some sort of scoring outline so vendors can self-score their proposals.</p>	<p>In a FAR acquisition, I would expect to identify with scoring. The FAR evaluation requirements are applicable to FAR based contracts. In addition to the FAR requirements, it is common to identify the additional elements you have described.</p> <p>However, the OTA process does not rely on the FAR for guidance, but rather the authority under 10 U.S.C. §2371b and the Other Transitions Guide dated November 2018.</p> <p>Plea note, the RFS does identify relative weightings as noted in Section 7.6.1, "The Government will review each vendor's submittal against the criteria as described in Sections 7.3 and 7.4, with major consideration given in no specific order of importance to the technical merit (including product line quality factors such as agility and reuse), feasibility of implementation, and total project risk."</p> <p>The Government will evaluate and select as described in Section 7 of the RFS. All evaluation considerations are identified. The Government anticipates awarding to the vendor(s) whose response best satisfies the Government's objectives, referenced in Section 5.3.5, and will be most advantageous to the Government with price and other factors considered. This section provides sufficient detail on how "Solution papers will be evaluated with consideration given to the vendor's ability to provide a clear description of the proposed solution, technical merit of the response, feasibility of implementation, vendor's experience, and total project risk. The proposed project price, delivery schedule, and data rights assertions will be considered as aspects of the entire response when weighing risk."</p> <p>The Government's goal is to conduct a streamlined evaluation that is fair and transparent while also supporting industry norms for all prior ACC-Orlando OTA solicitation industry norms.</p> <p>Please note that the TRex membership material located on the membership portal provides additional OTA reference material in support of familiarization on the OTA processes.</p>
<p>39</p> <p>ITE-RFS-17-June-2021-Final-Draft, p. 19: 8.4 8.4B By submitting a response, respondents shall certify whether covered telecommunications equipment or services will or will not be included as a part of its offered products or services to the Government in the performance of this effort.</p> <p>RFS Attachment 09 includes additional detail regarding the representation which must be signed and returned with any submissions.</p>	<p>Where do these items belong in the submittal package?</p>	<p>The Government requests Attachment 09 to be provided at the end of the submitted volumes.</p>

40	5.3.4. Solution Paper	Can the response include a partial solution or is the offerer expected to submit a solution for Live, Virtual, and Constructive?	Yes, the Government is accepting partial solutions. Please reference Sections 3.3 and 7.6.5 of the RFS.
41	The CGF should meet Live, Virtual and Constructive objectives:	LVC objectives are very diverse and complex. Can you define what you mean by 'meeting the objectives'?	The CGF material solution should meet the requirements of the ITE.
42	RFS (5.2.3)	Bagira is a FOCI company and we are currently in our FOCI mitigation process. We understand that we will not be able to participate as Prime in the RFS response, but is it the same for sub-contracting? We believe that Bagira has a number of proven capabilities and technologies that can meet the main part of the system objectives as defined in the "ITE RFS" (5.3). We have some teaming options that are looking into cooperation with us and we would like to know if there is any configuration we could participate in this RFS as Subcontractor (our FOCI mitigation process will not be completed by the RFS response delivery time). We do believe it will be to the benefit of the US Army to have us "on board" and look into the capabilities that are in the use of the IDF and other countries as well for the ITE program.	Please review the guidance provided in Attachment 02, Security Process for Vetting Contractors. The FOCI requirement is addressed in Attachment 02 and is applicable to subcontractors as well. Failure or inability to satisfy the requirements of Step 1 of the attachment will make a vendor ineligible to receive Unclassified//FOUO Export Control data / information. The inclusion of vendor/contractor and/or subcontractor(s) are not foreign owned or USA foreign Controlled or Influenced (USA FOCI) status or Vendor/contractor is not in the process of a merger or other type of transition/ownership discussions with a Foreign Owned company or USA FOCI company will not be able to receive Unclassified/FOUO Export Control data/information.
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

