

Question #	Source Document	Question	Answer
1	RFI	In regards to your RFI request, we at SDL are interested in responding, but were unsure about the statement: "Each capability or solution must be at a Technology Readiness Level (TRL) 4 or higher. Solutions must support a clear path to demonstrate the prototype in a live training environment no later than FY26." By definition TRL 4 is: "Component and/or breadboard validation in laboratory environment." So the phrase above means that we need to have implemented a basic "proof of concept" of the capability or solution to be able to submit to the RFI? If this is the case we would likely not be able to submit on our ideas yet. Please let us know if this is correct, and we will comply with your response.	Yes, our threshold is set at TRL 4 at contract award to ensure STE-LTS meets its required timelines for the 12 engagements and 5 enablers for modernized live training. We're looking for feasible solutions that can be matured within a dedicated STE-LTS testbed. However, at this stage (RFI), we are not opposed to receiving your ideas and welcome any potential concept supporting modernized live training.
2	RFI	Are solutions that provide live 3D position and orientation of humans (soldiers) using multiple sensors of interest to this RFI?	Yes, solutions capable of providing live 3D position and orientation of humans (Soldiers) using multiple sensors as it pertains to geo-pairing engagements and +5 Enablers (sensors) is of interest with this RFI. (see RFI para 5.1.1)
3	RFI	Should we assume there will be a demo between the RFS due date and the award date if our solution is down selected?	The Government is still finalizing the strategy for this effort, but is actively evaluating a method to enable demonstrations while considering COVID protocols. The forthcoming RFS will provide specifics
4	RFI	Hello, Do we have to be a member of NSTXL to submit a response to the TRex – STE LTS Tier 2 RFI? Thanks!	You must be a member of NSTXL to submit a response to the TRex - STE LTS Tier 2 Request for Solution, but you are not required to be a member to respond to this RFI.
5	RFI	Question 1: 1. Given that STE IS is eventually headed toward a replacement of DIS/HLA/CTIA protocols in the future, by virtue of migrating to the cloud, how does the Government plan to reconcile the use of pre-existing protocols with those that have yet to be implemented for the purpose of LVC multi-domain operations training?	No Response; Not Relevant to the RFI
6	RFI	Question 2: 2. Approximately three years ago, the vision for STE was to replace LVC-IA. Given that LVC-IA is an integral part of live training and the LVC-IA is also up for a re-compete, what is the Government's current plan for replacing LVC-IA in the synthetic training environment of the future?	No Response; Not Relevant to the RFI
7	RFI	Question 3: 3. Given the Government's interest in terrain as one of the "Plus 5 Enabling Technologies," how does the end user community for LTS define "dynamic terrain" – a key feature of Placed, Thrown and Dropped object engagements?	The Government does not intend to provide a definition, rather OWT will be provided as the terrain representation of the live training range.
8	RFI	Question 4: 4. Is the Government able to explain which features from STE OWT will be leveraged to support dynamic terrain in a live training exercise?	OWT is actively being developed and as features become available to LTS, additional information will be provided.
9	RFI	Question 5: 5. Does the current STE IS have a dynamic terrain solution? If so, does it plug into the STE OWT solution or will a new capability be developed under the LTS Tier 2 effort to support such integration?	STE LTS intends to leverage STE-IS dynamic terrain solution once available. As indicated in RFI section 3, the Government is open to vendor developed terrain to support Tier1/2 engagements
10	RFI	In reference to the Figure in Section 3 of the RFI; Can the Government provide definitions and/or examples of the "Plus 5" enabling technologies? For example, what is meant by "Transmitters" versus "Networks"?	Transmitters: Individual Player Units/Player Unit Radios (IPUs/PURs); Radio/communications devices needed to pass adjudication data. Networks: Infrastructure that facilitates the linking of multiple radios or computing devices to exchange live training information via data connections. Wireless cellular networks e.g. 4G LTE, 5G, etc.
11	RFI 5.2.1.(d), (e), (i), (l) 5.2.2.(d),(f),(j) 5.2.3	Does the STE-LTS Use Cases define a TES System - only (e.g. no Network, no EXCON) mode or are all future Use Cases envisaged within a Combat Training Centre (e.g. with Network, with EXCON)?	The Government is seeking solutions that function without backhaul network connectivity to an EXCON.
12	RFI 5.2.1.(d), (e), (i), (l) 5.2.2.(d),(f),(j) 5.2.3	It appears there are two real focus areas the Force on Force and Force on Target for geo-pairing and then the introduction on Placed, Thrown, Dropped Objects. The constraint of communication through the LT2 infrastructure for Geo-Pairing will limit its effectiveness as the network is critical in this implementation. Will the government consider other communications methods to support this network or are you accepting the latency issues with the current network?	Down-selected solutions from this RFI will be evaluated at the STE-LTS Ft. Hood testbed utilizing a 5G communications network that mitigates current latency issues with existing networks.

13	RFI 5.2.1.(d), (e), (i), (l) 5.2.2.(d),(f),(j) 5.2.3	Does Government have a protocol to be used, noting recent introduction to service of LPAN (albeit pre-STE era)?	Yes, the Government has an established standard for short range wireless protocol (LPAN). The Government is interested in vendor proposals to extend it to support STE LTS FoF Tier 1/2 engagements.
14	RFI 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3	Is it correct to assume that PDT solutions should be interoperable with international TESS capabilities?	No Placed, Dropped, Thrown (PDT) solutions do not have to be interoperable with international TESS capabilities. Desire is for solutions to ultimately be integrated within the STE-IS.
15	RFI 5.1.1	Does the government expect the vendor to provide the necessary network setups if the existing network infrastructure is unable to support Geo-pairing?	The intent is to evolve the current infrastructure and standards to account for modernized solutions in support of future live training. The Government is actively pursuing network infrastructure upgrades [e.g. 5G] in support of geo-pairing and other solutions for live training. Down-selected solutions from this RFI will be evaluated at the STE-LTS Ft. Hood testbed utilizing a 5G communications network that mitigates current latency issues with existing networks.
16	RFI	The requirement states the in addition to Placed, thrown, dropped, the government would like to review geo-pairing for Direct Fire small arms, Direct Fire Vehicles, counter defilade and indirect fire – mortars. Is it correct to assume the Govt. seeks to award OTA for Tier 2 Placed, Dropped and Thrown, and that the reference to Tier 1 Direct Fire, Counter Defilade, Indirect Fire is only for informational purposes which will be requested under a separate contracting action?	Intent is to award viable solutions as requested within the RFI which includes PDT and/or geo-pairing....this may be for Tier 1 or Tier 2 solutions.
17	RFI	Live training simulations need to be realistic enough to enable the "suspension of disbelief" necessary for Soldiers to immerse themselves in their training. Does the government expect that the live training audience will be viewing the live training environment through an augmented reality in order to see these effects introduced from the synthetic players?	Yes, the Government expects the live training audience will be viewing the live training environment through an augmented reality that enables the effects from synthetic players.
18	RFI Page 7, 5.2.1	The Government seeks the following BLUFOR placed object solutions: • Directional Fragmentation Mines (e.g., M18 Claymore Mine) • Anti-Tank Mines (e.g., M15, M19, M21). Is it the intent to provide full training tasks for the laying and proper distribution of the placed systems by the soldier?	Vendors will provide training on their specific solutions/ capabilities but TTPs for laying placed objects (e.g. minefields) is an Army responsibility.
19	5.1.1, Plus Five Enabling Technologies	Are there any changes to requirements of Tier 1 engagement solutions as they relate to geo-pairing solutions from prior Tier 1 OTA?	No change to the requirements for Geopairing solution Tier 1
20	5.1.1, Plus Five Enabling Technologies	Are there limitations to current Tier 1 engagement solution offerings which Gov't would like addressed in this OTA?	The Government is seeking leading edge position, orientation, and target acquisition solutions that can accurately and realistically simulate Tier 1 FoF engagement
21	5.1.1, Plus Five Enabling Technologies	Can solutions be dependent upon IVAS or similar Augmented Reality soldier worn device and can this device be provided by the Gov't for integration and demonstration?	The Government will evaluate solutions that are both non-dependent and dependent upon IVAS or similar Augmented Reality Soldier worn devices. At this phase of the STE-LTS Program, the Government desires to remain flexible and will consider all responses that meet the requirements outlined in the RFS.
22	5.2.1, Placed Objects	Are physical representations of placed objects required or would virtual representations be acceptable?	Yes, virtual and/or physical representations of placed objects are acceptable.
23	5.2.1, Placed Objects	What are the detonation methods associated with Placed Objects?	Detonation and command (ex IED) methods associated with Placed Objects are typically fuse-based and are activated according to pressure. Both BLUFOR and OPFOR should be considered.
24	5.2.1, Placed Objects	Are Placed Object devices required to use integrated triggering methods (i.e., pressure, proximity, timer, ...)	Both BLUFOR and OPFOR representations should consider current triggering methods.
25	5.2.1, Placed Objects	Are Placed Object devices intended to support device detection/neutralization training?	Vendors will provide training on their specific solutions/ capabilities but TTPs for detecting/neutralizing placed objects (e.g. minefields) is an Army responsibility.
26	5.2.1, Placed Objects	Are Placed Object devices intended to be fully compliant in all manner of setup and operation?	All representations should consider realistic setup and operations according to BLUFOR doctrine to eliminate negative training while providing necessary BLUFOR and OPFOR effects.

