

Question #	Source Document	Paragraph	Question	Answer
1	STE-LTS-Tier-2_RFI_Supplement-final	<b>2. RFI Response Instructions, Para #1.</b> Companies electing to respond to this RFI shall be submitted electronically no later than noon 3 January 2022.	Of the 35 days allocated for responses to the RFI, 15 days are consumed by I/ITSEC, weekends or holidays. In order for all Vendors to put their best solution forward and maximize personnel holiday attendance, we request an extension of two weeks.	The Government will extend one week only until 10 January 2022 noon Eastern.
2	STE-LTS-Tier-2_RFI_Supplement-final	<b>2. RFI Response Instructions, Para #1.</b> Font must be Arial no smaller than 11-font size on body or charts and graphs.	In order to accommodate the 11-font size for charts and graphics and provide sufficient detail for evaluation, will the Government please allow a single-side 11x17 fold out page (to count as 1 full page)?	Yes, this is acceptable.
3	STE-LTS-Tier-2_RFI_Supplement-final	<b>2. RFI Response Instructions, Para #1.</b> The responses shall not exceed two (2) pages for introduction and administration and no more than 15 pages for all engagement types and enabling technologies. Font must be Arial no smaller than 11-font size on body or charts and graphs.	In order to stay within the Government's page count and provide sufficient detail for evaluation will the Government allow Arial 9-font size for charts and graphs (as per standard RFI responses)?	Yes, this is acceptable.
4	RFI-Attach-5.1-Technical-Supplement-for-SOW	<b>1. Purpose.</b> Vendors should provide additional input in order to collaborate the final SOW.	Are we correct to assume that SOW collaboration information is due after RFI submission and no other information is needed at this time?	Initial SOW collaboration information is with RFI submissions as a starting point for possible future SOW collaborations. Vendor input is required in the SOW technical supplement.
5	RFI-Attach-5.1-Technical-Supplement-for-SOW	<b>1. Purpose.</b> Vendors should provide additional input in order to collaborate the final SOW.	Can the Government please confirm that Vendors will provide their SOW collaboration information in-line in Attachment 5.1?	Yes
6	RFI-Attach-5-STE-LTS-Tier 2-SOW	<b>1.0 Background, Para #3.</b> The overarching strategy is to accelerate development of promising technologies through Middle-Tier Acquisition - Rapid Prototyping authorities.	There are many tier 2 technologies that are ready for modifications and fielding to begin. Under rapid prototyping there are demonstrations in an operational environment within 5 years from start but no pathway to production. Would the government consider changing this approach to rapid fielding path which provides the use of existing products and technologies to begin fielding with in 6 months and complete fielding within five years?	All Vendor solutions regardless of Vendor described Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) will be evaluated by the Government within the Middle-Tier Acquisition - Rapid Prototyping (MTA-RP) construct for STE-LTS. The Government will explore the merit of transitioning capabilities from MTA-RP to MTA-Rapid Fielding (RF) as a means of accelerating capabilities into production.
7	STE-LTS-Tier-2_RFI_Supplement-final	<b>3.1. Technical Data Rights, Para c.</b> Prime and sub-vendors' proprietary software coding or hardware development (to include vendor licensing requirements) should not be included without prior Government approval.	Are we correct to assume that data rights assertions less than COTS/EULA, GPR, or unlimited would require this approval?	Yes, data rights assertions less than COTS/EULA, GPR, or unlimited would require Government approval.
8	RFI-Attach-5.1-Technical-Supplement-for-SOW	<b>3.10 Communications.</b> Device shall communicate directly with the Live Training network or the Player Instrumentation instead of going through a gateway or secondary exercise control suite.	Specifically for the Dropped use case (e.g. Mk84 and similar simulation) multi-domain/air-warfare centre implementation would be LVC integration of Air and Ground range. Will the Government please clarify that for Dropped use case use of LVC integration / gateway (protocols, security, etc) is an acceptable implementation ?	Yes, use of LVC standard protocol is acceptable for synthetic dropped object simulations.
9	RFI-Attach-5.1-Technical-Supplement-for-SOW	<b>4.1 Prototype Type.</b> The vendor shall develop a prototype that simulates a (list of prototypes e.g., M18 Claymore, MON-50...) ..... virtual solutions with physical instrumented/un-instrumented components (example, for an emplaced minefield) ...	Will the Government please clarify that where virtual weapon effect simulation is provided centrally by TMT/TSS - common with other weapon effects beyond those Placed, Thrown, Dropped defined here - that a STE-LTS-Tier2 (PDT) Vendor can provide an architecture/interface/algorithm definition and assume Government Furnished TSS/TMT implementation ?	Yes. The Government will provide TSS/TMT as available, as this program does not own the data once the Vendor provides an architecture/interface/algorithm definition.
10	RFI-Attach-5.1-Technical-Supplement-for-SOW	<b>4.1 Prototype Type.</b> The vendor shall develop a prototype that simulates a (list of prototypes e.g., M18 Claymore, MON-50...) ..... and/or virtual, software-based effects (example, for a Volcano emplaced minefield).	Will the Government please clarify that where: (a) virtual simulation is centrally provided by TMT/TSS, and (b) simulated vehicle capability is provided by vehicle instrumentation that a STE-LTS-Tier2 (PDT) Vendor can provide architecture / interface / algorithm definition and assume Government Furnished TSS/TMT & Vehicle Instrumentation implementation ?	A) Yes, virtual simulation is centrally provided by TSS B) Yes, simulated vehicle capabilities are provided by vehicle instrumentation that STE-LTS Tier 2 Vendors can provide architecture / interface / algorithm definition; synthetic vehicles are provided by TSS.

11	RFI-Attach-5.1-Technical-Supplement-for-SOW	<p><b>6. Requirements for Dropped Objects, 6.1 Prototype.</b> The vendor shall develop a prototype that enables the dropping of OPFOR and/or BLUFOR simulated munitions.</p> <p><b>6. Requirements for Dropped Objects, 6.2. Safety.</b> Given range safety regulations will preclude personnel on the range when replica Mk84 or similar inert simulated munitions are dropped, will the Government please clarify the Dropped simulation comprises Live / Virtual / Constructive Air platforms, no physical replica ordnance, and a resulting virtual weapon effect communicated to Ground entities.</p>		Vendors need to provide accurate, safe, and realistic solutions for dropped objects and inform the Government as to how their solution(s) would be implemented in the Live Training Environment.
12	STE-LTS-Tier-2_RFI_Supplement-final	<p><b>2. RFI Response Instructions.</b> The responses shall not exceed two (2) pages for introduction and administration and no more than 15 pages for all engagement types and enabling technologies.</p> <p><b>1.0 Objectives, 1.1 Objective 1 – Placed, Thrown, &amp; Dropped Objects.</b></p> <p><b>1.0 Objectives, 1.2 Objective 2 – Alternate Direct Fire Engagements.</b></p>	Please clarify if the Government will accept multiple responses from a single vendor (each response within 15 pages), each which may address a separate objective or sub-set of an objective.	Yes, the Government will accept multiple responses from a single vendor (each response within 15 pages) addressing separate objectives or sub-sets of an objective.
13	RFI	Attachments	In parenthesis, it is stated, "to be submitted with RFI Response" If there are no additional terms or definitions that the offeror wishes to provide, is attachment 3 to be included as provided?	Attachments 3 and 4 are reference documents to complete Attachment 2. They do not need to be submitted as part of RFI response if there are no changes. Data Rights will be fully negotiated with those vendors that are most advantageous to the Government closer to award.
14	RFI	Attachments	In parenthesis, it is stated, "to be submitted with RFI Response" What is required to be submitted with respect to Terms and Conditions and EULA?	Attachments 3 and 4 are reference documents to complete Attachment 2. They do not need to be submitted as part of RFI response if there are no changes. Data Rights will be fully negotiated with those vendors that are most advantageous to the Government closer to award.
15	RFI	3.2.a	A price volume is mentioned in this data rights paragraph, but there is no specification of a price volume elsewhere. Is there an expectation to provide pricing for data rights? If so, what are the expected quantities and delivery timeline?	There is an expectation that Vendors will provide detailed pricing information after the RFI responses have been evaluated and during SOW collaborations.
16	Attach 5.1	3.7	Do the STE LTS Tier 2 CONOPS include dropping dummy bombs (e.g. Mk 84) in live training?	Vendors need to provide accurate, safe, and realistic solutions for dropped objects (Live, Virtual, Constructive - LVC) and inform the Government as to how their solution(s) would be implemented in the Live Training Environment.
17	Attach 5.1	3.11	Will the specifications of the STAAR 4G/5G network be provided prior to submission suspense?	5G-redundant core network, 5G non-standalone (NSA), 5G Standalone (SA). The team will either use NSA or SA not both simultaneously. As it pertains to frequencies, the team will utilize Band 3 for LTE and N78 for 5G. 5G utilizes a beamforming antenna via a cell on wheels (COW) deployment. Each COW is comprised of 3 sectors. The STAAR team will provide SIM cards (standard, micro, or nano) to Vendors as needed. Additional information will be provided (e.g. APN) during SOW collaborations.
18	Attach 5.1	3.14	Please define "common engine" intent to simulate different tactical weapons. For example, does it mean that a placed device must replicate all types of mines?	Yes, ideally the Government desires to replicate both BLUFOR and OPFOR weapon systems utilizing a "common engine" so the Live Training Environment can remain current with threats and fielded weapon systems. Form factors should indeed vary, however, the electronics (internals) and software should have some level of commonality - "common engine".

19	RFI Supplement Page 5 List of RFI Attachments	Is there an error with the text in the parentheses and this was just intended to identify the list of attachments provided by the Government with the RFI supplement for vendor information? If not, what is the Government looking for in regards to items 3 & 4 - do you want us to return the documents as they were provided with the RFI supplement? Additionally, since vendors have already provided a self-vetting form and the data rights table is included with the cover sheet requirements, does the Government also want these separately provided as attachments?	Attachments 3 and 4 are reference documents to complete Attachment 2. They do not need to be submitted as part of RFI response if there are no changes. Data Rights will be fully negotiated with those vendors that are most advantageous to the Government closer to award.
20	Attch 5.1 Technical Suppl 3.3 Standards	Do all 19 General Requirements apply to just SOW Objective 1 (Placed, Thrown, & Dropped Objects) or to SOW Objective 2 (Alternate Direct Fire Engagements) as well? Please identify which General Requirements apply to SOW Objective 2	The General Requirements are for both Objective 1 and Objective 2.
21	Attch 5.1 Technical Suppl 3.3 Standards c	Can Gov't specify existing Live Training Environment standards of particular importance to Objective 2?	During this prototyping phase, all standards are of equal importance. The Government desires a modular open systems architecture approach from each Vendor.