Question #	Source Document	Paragraph	Question	Answer
1	Draft RFS		Will PADM interact with SABER?	Yes - PADM deliverables will support workflow exchange with SABER for enhanced model development
2	Draft RFS		Does NAVSEA 03 intend on fusing SharkCage, INOCCS, and future data into PADM?	At this time this is not part of the requirement for this project.
3	Draft RFS		What function will Commander, Operational Test & Evaluation Force (COTF) have in PADM?	A model should be capable of being VV&A'd such that it can support Developmental Testing and Operational Testing.
4	Draft RFS		What Security Operations Centers (SOCs) are fully mission ready?	At this time this is not part of the requirement for this project.
5	Draft RFS		Does PADM align to any NAVAIR or NAVWAR cyber threat detection platform(s) or effort(s)?	At this time this is not part of the requirement for this project.
6	Draft RFS		What reference is being used to define the following terms: Cyber Attack Domain, Cyber Vulnerability Domain, Platform Architecture Domain, Mitigations Domain, and Mission Area?	The Domains identified in RFS Section 5.3.5 are defined by the Government.
7	Draft RFS		How will PADM "support both proactive (Cyber Hunt, Defensive, Situational Awareness, etc.) and reactive (Disconnect Strategies, Out-of-Band Network Maneuver, etc.) strategies"?	An accurate digital model aligned with SA tools and intel. PADM will inform proactive and reactive strategies.
8	Draft RFS	6.1	The RFS indicates the intent for a single award but the option to select multiple. If a small business has a relevant valuable niche contribution, could the OTA process be used to encourage a subcontractor arrangement to include the specialized portion of the solution?	NAVSEA is looking for the best overall solution and reserves the right to award to multiple parties if there is a compelling reason. NSTXL is available and able to provide assistance in teaming arrangements
9	Draft RFS	5.3.5	To what extent are other objectives (e.g., obsolescence) important compared to primary RMF-type considerations?	Per RFS Section 7.5.1, All objectives will be evaluated with no specific order of importance
10	Draft RFS		Understanding the criticality of automated data pipelines, to what degree are machine-readable models valued?	Machine readable models are a requirement
11	Draft RFS		Was a distinction intended between platform architectures and product architectures?	There is no distinction; these are considered the synonyms
12	Draft RFS	5.3.5	To what extent should domains (e.g., Mitigations) be considered in addition to the Platform Architecture domain?	Per RFS Section 5.3.5, in order to meet future requirements, PADM must be compatible with the other platform domains for integration purposes.
13	Draft RFS	2.	Will SOCs be the primary users of this solution?	At this time this is not part of the requirement for this project.
14	Draft RFS	2.	Table 1.0 identifies classes of ships, but the request states "not to exceed the number of prototype models necessary to successfully demonstrate and validate the PADM prototype modeling capabilities". Was this meant to suggest that not all systems on all classes need to be modeled?	Per RFS Section 5.3.5, the Phases determine of which systems / classes will be modeled are part of the process.
15	Draft RFS		What is the intended granularity of systems/components on the ships to be modeled?	Per RFS Section 5.3.5, this will be determined at the Phase decision points
16	Draft RFS	4.	What types of GFI (e.g., data structures, sets, comm protocols, system documentation, access to SMEs) will be made available?	The GFI consists of diagrams, powerpoints, documentation, wiring diagrams, Interface Control Documents, CONOPS, etc…, if available, can be made available. Per RFS Section 4.5, we are seeking input on what vendors believe is critical to enable development and demonstration of the prototype(s).

17	Draft RFS		Are solutions that leverage open source and GPR software valued over solutions that depend on proprietary systems?	Per RFS Section 7.5.1, All objectives will be evaluated with no specific order of importance. Additionally, per RFS Section 5.3.6, "the Government requires Unlimited Data Rights in all technical data.... "for any technical data (including computer software documentation) or computer software in which the vendor asserts the Government will have less than unlimited rights, the vendor shall provide the open source, commercial, or other license it asserts is applicable."	
18	Draft RFS	5.4.2	What is an average/typical resolution level for the estimated 200 models?	Per RFS Section 5.3.5, this will be determined at the Phase decision points	
19	Draft RFS	2.	What are the relative priorities of the models for the various classes of ships?	Per RFS Section 7.5.1, All objectives will be evaluated with no specific order of importance. Prioritization of specific classes / systems will be determined upon completion of PADM effort	
20	Draft RFS	4.5	Will existing cyber sensors or analogs be made available?	Per the RFS, Section 4.5, we are seeking input on what vendors believe is critical GFI to enable development and demonstration of prototype	
21	Draft RFS	4.5	Should the solution include the creation of new cyber sensors or detectors?	Per the RFS, Section 4.5, we are seeking input on what vendors believe is critical GFI to enable development and demonstration of prototype	
22	Draft RFS	2.	To what extent can new prototype tools increase the workloads of users (marginal, intermittent, temporary)?	At this time, this is not part of the requirement for this project.	
23	Draft RFS	5.3.5	to what degree must outputs from prototypes be interpretable or traceable to human operators?	Per RFS Section 5.3.5, this will be determined at the Phase decision points	
24	RFS Amendment 1	Page 10, Phase 1	Is it required that spiral development be utilized or is an Agile methodology such as Scrum acceptable?	Agile methodology is acceptable	
25	RFS Amendment 1	Page 11, Phase 3	""The Phase 3 outcomes are expected to be model validation shows at least 95% completeness and accuracy as built/installed with model alignment when ingested for analysis of 85% or greater." Can NAVSEA provide additional explanation or guidance regarding potential evaluation of meeting these percentage based objectives?	At this time, no further explanation will be provided and may be further defined during SOW collaboration with the selected vendor.	
26	RFS Amendment 1	Paragraph 5.4.1 / Pricing	Would the Government consider revising the pricing structure, such as potentially the use of option CLINs or cost reimbursable CLINs, during Phase 2 and Phase 3 to allow for prototype unknowns related to the expectation of "multiple iterations" across differnt platforms, as well as the desire to structure the OT in a way that allows for development for additional DoD customers?	At this time it is the Government's desire to execute the agreement as a FFP CLIN structure and Payment Milestones.	
27	RFS Amendment 1	Paragraph 5.1	"Solution Paper response shall consist of one volume to include an Administrative, Technical, and Price section." Can you confirm that you would like the Excel pricing breakout to be included with the technical writeup? Should this file be also included separately in a editable actual Excel file?	Yes, per RFS Section 5.1, the Administrative, Technical, and Pricing sections are in one volume and the pricing section should be in excel format that is editable	
28	RFS		Can the government please specify if models require their own Authority to Operate (ATO)?	A model does not need an ATO	

29	RFS		Can the government specify if the solution can be hosted either on-prem or in a cloud environment?	It may be hosted in either environment however the classification may dictate
30	RFS		If the solution can be hosted in a Cloud environment, will it be on an Operational or Excepted network?	The Government is open to solutions. Classification, data storage, and high speed compute considerations should be taken into account.
31	RFS		Will the vendor/contractor be able to gain access to government hosted repository of available and vetted machine learning frameworks and libraries (e.g., Tensorflow, Sklearn, Scikit, etc.) to develop and prototype models?	Per the RFS, Section 4.5, we are seeking input on what vendors believe is critical GFI to enable development and demonstration of prototype
32	RFS		Will the GFI data define the model or be used to create the systems that are used in modeling the simulations?	The GFI data does not define the model nor is it used to create the system that are used in the modeling the simulations.