

STE VSW Call for Solution Q&A.10.01.26 Vendor			
	Questions	Responses	LOT/Section
1	The Lot 5 integrator will manage a Government-owned DevSecOps CI/CD pipeline and Conformance Test Suite validating software delivered by independent Lot 1 through 4 vendors, on a "secure by design" foundation aligned to Program Protection Plan best practices and an accelerated RMF ATO timeline. In a multi-vendor ecosystem, the binaries that actually reach the Software Integration Lab often contain components that vendor-declared inventories do not list. A documented use case is validating vendor-provided SBOMs against the actual binaries. The practical effect is objective, automated evidence about third-party code entering the baseline, without adding manual review burden to the integrator or the Program Office. We recognize SBOM tooling is not named in the draft; we raise it only because the governance role you describe depends on knowing what is in each delivered build.	Thank you for the comment. The Government recognizes the importance of SBOMs for software supply chain risk management and is aligning its approach with current ASA(ALT) SBOM policy, which requires SBOM delivery, collection, storage, and ongoing monitoring for covered software. In addition, given Lot 5's role in managing the Government-owned DevSecOps environment and providing objective integration and conformance validation across multiple vendors, SBOM management and analysis may be an implied support function within that governance framework; the Government will consider whether additional vendor-neutral clarification is appropriate in the final solicitation or draft Q&A response.	Lot 5
2	The distributed data requirements associated with the Training Management/AAR Data Layer and the broader STE virtual architecture. As we reviewed the architecture, we identified a potential failure mode that may be worth validating before the architecture and integration requirements are finalized. In a distributed training environment, restoring network connectivity after a degraded or disconnected period does not necessarily restore a consistent data state. If individual nodes continue generating or modifying training, mission-command, AAR, scenario, or system data while communications are unavailable or bandwidth constrained, the architecture must ultimately determine: • What data was successfully delivered before the interruption • What remains outstanding • How interrupted transfers resume without retransmitting completed data • How queued changes are delivered after reconnection • How distributed nodes return to a synchronized and authoritative state • How this occurs over constrained links without creating a large recovery-bandwidth requirement Importantly, we are not suggesting a change to the STE applications themselves. If this data-continuity condition is already explicitly addressed within the STE-VSW architecture, I would appreciate being pointed toward the responsible technical team or integration partner. If it is not, we believe it may be worthwhile to validate the requirement now, while the architecture remains at a stage where it can be addressed without significant downstream integration impact.	Appreciate the comment. The Government welcomes offerors to propose solutions that address these challenges and prevent these potential failure nodes.	
3	With regard to submission instructions Volume III: Product Demonstration Artifacts; Will a live API/SDK Documentation access be required if the vendor selects the GOTS-provided TSS approach for all Lots of this proposal?	No, live public API/SDK documentation is not mandatory for offerors proposing Path A (GOTS-based TSS approach). The Government recognizes that the current state of the GOTS baseline as it pertains to external API/SDK documentation; an offeror will not be disqualified or penalized solely for lacking existing public-facing API/SDK links for the GFI. However, one of the fundamental objectives of this modernization effort is to open, modernize, and decouple the core architecture. Offerors proposing a GOTS-based approach must provide in Volume II a clear, detailed technical roadmap and interface design approach demonstrating how they will establish open, published SDKs and modern APIs (e.g., REST, gRPC, HLA/DIS) to expose TSS simulation services, data models, and external interfaces for third-party integration.	LOT 1

4	Will the Government consider hosting the demonstrations in the contractor facilities?	No. To ensure standard, fair, and equal evaluation conditions for all competing vendors, Phase 2 Demonstration Pitches will be conducted either: Virtually via a secure Government-hosted collaboration platform (e.g., MS Teams / Zoom for Gov); or In-Person at a designated Government facility in Orlando, FL (e.g., Central Florida Tech Grove / Partnership IV). Offerors will connect remotely or present using portable equipment. The Government will not travel to individual contractor facilities for Phase 2 demonstrations.	All
5	Is it the Government's intent that Product Demonstration Videos and the live API/SKI Documentation are anonymous?	No, Volume III artifacts (Demonstration Video and API/SDK Documentation) are not required to be anonymous. The Government intends to refine the final CFS to utilize the Volume III artifacts as an objective Pass/Fail (Go/No-Go) technical readiness gate to verify "Proof of Commercial Maturity" (TRL 8/9) and "Integration Readiness." Because Volume III serves to validate that working, fielded software actually exists rather than being subjectively scored, vendor branding and system names in Volume III are permissible. Note: Volume II (Technical Concept Submission) remains a blind, narrative evaluation focused on technical approach and architecture, and must remain free of corporate names, logos, or identifying personnel marks.	All
6	Is the "System Message Bus" equivalent to the LOT 1 data fabric?	No, they represent distinct architectural layers with strict boundary demarcation: Lot 1 Data Fabric: The high-speed, internal data distribution mechanism native to the Lot 1 Core Simulation Engine, responsible for real-time entity state management, spatial indexing, physics, and local simulation tick synchronization. System Message Bus / Enterprise API Gateway (Lot 5): The overarching "digital motherboard" operated and governed by Lot 5 on behalf of the Government. It provides the standardized, external publish-subscribe transport layer (e.g., gRPC, Kafka, DDS, HLA/DIS) that moves validated data payloads between Lot 1, Lot 2 applications, Lot 3 hardware inputs, and Lot 4 AAR analytics.	Lot 4
7	Please clarify whether the Lot 3 contractor's responsibility ends with translating physical GFE inputs/outputs into the Government-approved HAPI/HAL format and delivering compliant packets to the Lot 5 API Gateway, or whether Lot 3 is also expected to develop or modify platform-specific software residing within Lot 2 applications	Lot 3 responsibility strictly ends at the HAPI/API Gateway boundary. Per CFS Section 2 (Demarcation of Responsibilities, Page 5), Lot 3 is exclusively responsible for the physical-to-digital translation: mapping physical GFE RVCT crew stations, controls, and instruments into compliant Hardware API (HAPI) packets and delivering them to the Lot 5 gateway. Lot 3 contractors shall not develop, alter, or modify Lot 2 application software (such as vehicle dynamics, fire control logic, or weapon terminal effects) or Lot 1 simulation physics.	Lot 3
8	Please clarify the anticipated sequencing of Lot awards relative to the Lot 1 competitive sandbox and down-select. Specifically, does the Government anticipate making Lot 2, Lot 3, and Lot 4 selections prior to selection of the final Lot 1 common-core provider? If so, how should Offerors address dependencies on the final Lot 1 SDK/API, data fabric, and interface implementation in their proposed approaches?	The Government is planning to refine the phased award structure to eliminate cross-lot technical dependencies. Initial Awards: The Government will initially award Lot 1 (two competing vendors for the 90-day sandbox), Lot 3 (HIL Integration), and Lot 5 (Enterprise Integration Support) to establish the Software Integration Lab (SIL), hardware translation layers, and testing infrastructure. Deferred Solicitations/Awards (Lots 2 and 4): Formal awards and integration sprints for Lot 2 (Simulation Applications) and Lot 4 (Training Management & AAR Data Layer) will likely be deferred until the final Lot 1 Common Core provider is selected at the end of the Phase 4 competitive sandbox (Month 4). Once the winning Lot 1 provider is down-selected, the Lot 5 integrator will publish the authoritative SDK/APIs to all Lot 2 and Lot 4 offerors, ensuring all application and analytics developers build against a known, stable software foundation.	All

9	For vendors awarded under Lots 1–4, please clarify whether each Lot vendor will be required to develop and provide applicable environment, cybersecurity, RMF, STIG, vulnerability, and other accreditation/integration artifacts to the Lot 5 integrator.	Yes. While the Lot 5 Integrator administers the enterprise DevSecOps CI/CD pipeline and automated scanning infrastructure, each individual Lot 1–4 vendor is responsible for delivering security-compliant software and supporting accreditation artifacts for their respective components. Deliverables include: containerized builds hardening against applicable DISA STIGs, automated vulnerability mitigation reports, software architecture descriptions for RMF control implementation, Software Bill of Materials (SBOM), and documentation supporting the system's Authority to Operate (ATO).	All
10	Please clarify whether Offerors should include costs associated with participation in the 90-day Lot 1 competitive sandbox in their proposed pricing. If so, should those costs be separately identified, and what Government-furnished facilities, equipment, infrastructure, licenses, or other resources will be provided during the sandbox?	Costing: Yes. Lot 1 Offerors must include the labor and engineering costs for participating in the 90-day Phase 4 Sandbox within their Volume IV ROM, explicitly broken out under Milestones 1.1 through 1.4. Government-Furnished Resources (GFE/GFI): The Government (via Lots 3 and 5) will provide: - Access to the physical and virtual Software Integration Lab (SIL); - RVCT physical crew station hardware modules (GFE); - The TSS GFI source code baseline and HAPI specifications; - SIL server infrastructure, enterprise message bus, and automated CTS testing harness. Offerors are responsible for providing their own core software licenses, developer workstations, and engineering personnel.	Lot 1
11	For Lot 3 ROM pricing associated with physical fielding, installation, calibration, and integration at fielded training sites, will the Government provide an assumed number and type of RVCT devices, locations, and fielding events to establish a common pricing basis?	The government does not anticipate these activities to be within the scope for Lot 3. Please disregard this bullet as it pertains to Lot 3 ROM pricing as it will be removed in the final CFS posting.	Lot 3
12	Please clarify whether the requested pricing is intended to cover only the prototype effort described in the CFS or whether Offerors should also provide pricing assumptions for anticipated follow-on production, fielding, sustainment, and/or licensing. If follow-on or enterprise licensing pricing is requested, please provide the applicable period of performance and the scope and planning assumptions Offerors should use for the enterprise license.	Prototype Effort: The primary ROM pricing in Volume IV must cover the prototype modernization and integration effort (Months 1–9). Commercial Software Licensing: For commercial software (Lots 1, 2, and 4), Offerors must provide their long-term licensing structure, specifically defining: Initial prototype license pricing (covering the initial 9-month period of performance); and Annual recurring enterprise subscription or perpetual maintenance/support fees for follow-on production and fielding across the STE program life cycle.	Lot 1/2/3/4
13	For the Government's preferred enterprise licensing approach; does the enterprise scope cover the STE VSW only, US Army only, or Department of War wide?	The primary requirement and preference for this CFS is an Enterprise-wide license for the Synthetic Training Environment (STE) / STE Virtual Software (VSW) program ecosystem. This covers all planned STE nodes, RVCT suites, S/SVT platforms, installations, home stations, and deployed Points of Need (PoN) without per-seat, per-core, or per-installation scaling surcharges. Offerors are welcome to include optional pricing for broader Department of the Army Enterprise licensing within Volume IV, but the baseline evaluation will focus on the STE VSW program-wide enterprise scope.	Lot 1/2/3/4
14	Of the 19 ground and air platforms currently simulated, which are required for STE VSW?	All currently fielded platforms are ultimately required over the life of the program; however, integration will be prioritized and executed incrementally. Specific platform implementation schedules will be refined collaboratively as user requirements and capability drops are finalized. For the initial CFS submission and baseline evaluation, offerors should focus their primary technical approach and architectures on fulfilling the Four Core Operational Priority Capabilities (specifically achieving a certifiable Table II virtual collective gate to live fire for mounted maneuver, a true combined arms environment with integrated fires and terrain shaping, mounted mission command concurrency, and open modular SDK/API architectures.	All

15	If an Offeror is selected to demonstrate capabilities across multiple Lots, may those demonstrations be consolidated into a single extended Demonstration Pitch, or will separate sessions be required for each Lot?	Yes, the Government will permit consolidated demonstrations. If an offeror is down-selected to participate in Phase 2 across multiple Lots, the Government will allow the offeror to present their capabilities within a single, coordinated, and extended Demonstration Pitch session. The offeror will be responsible for clearly structuring their presentation agenda to address the distinct technical criteria and functional demonstrations required for each respective Lot.	All
16	Regarding anonymity, do Offeror's product names and fielded capabilities need to be excluded?	Proprietary & Restrictive Markings: Standard proprietary notices and restrictive legends are permitted on headers/footers, provided they are genericized and do not contain the company name, entity CAGE code, or corporate logos. Commercial Product Names: If a commercial product brand name is uniquely owned by and identifiable to the submitting offeror (such that mentioning it directly reveals the offeror's corporate identity), it must be genericized in Volume II (e.g., referred to as "Offeror's Core Simulation Engine" or "Offeror's AAR Analytics Tool"). Industry-standard open commercial software, third-party COTS, or third-party engines referenced for integration purposes (e.g., Unreal Engine, Unity, Kafka, gRPC, Cesium) may be named, provided their use does not disclose the offeror's identity.	All
17	Section 6 (Solution Brief Submission Requirements) states that Volume II must be submitted anonymously and that 'company name, logos, identifying marks, or names of key personnel' should not appear anywhere in the submission. Will the Government please clarify if the prohibition of identifying marks extends to proprietary markings on documents or specific commercial product names being called out?	Proprietary & Restrictive Markings: Standard proprietary notices and restrictive legends are permitted on headers/footers, provided they are genericized and do not contain the company name, entity CAGE code, or corporate logos. Commercial Product Names: If a commercial product brand name is uniquely owned by and identifiable to the submitting offeror (such that mentioning it directly reveals the offeror's corporate identity), it must be genericized in Volume II (e.g., referred to as "Offeror's Core Simulation Engine" or "Offeror's AAR Analytics Tool"). Industry-standard open commercial software, third-party COTS, or third-party engines referenced for integration purposes (e.g., Unreal Engine, Unity, Kafka, gRPC, Cesium) may be named, provided their use does not disclose the offeror's identity.	Section 6
18	Section 6 (Solution Brief Submission Requirements) for Volume III requires a direct URL to a 'live, public-facing portal... containing the offeror's existing API documentation and/or SDK.' Will the Government please confirm if a portal accessible to the public, but requiring standard user registration and password protection, meets the definition of 'public-facing' for this requirement?	Yes, conditionally. A public portal that requires standard, immediate, self-service user registration and password authentication is acceptable, provided that: 1.Registration is free, immediate, and does not require manual administrator vetting or approval delays that would hinder Government evaluators. 2.Alternatively, the offeror may provide direct guest/evaluation login credentials in Volume I (Administrative & Compliance) so evaluators have unimpeded, immediate access to Volume III artifacts without delay.	Section 6
19	Does the Government consider a parent company and a wholly-owned subsidiary to be the same, or separate entities?	For the purposes of the Lot 5 OCI Firewall, the Government considers a parent company, its wholly-owned subsidiaries, business units, and corporate affiliates to be part of the same organizational entity under FAR Subpart 9.5. Due to the inherent Impaired Objectivity conflict arising from Lot 5's role in operating the Conformance Test Suite (CTS) and certifying software compliance, an offeror and its corporate affiliates are strictly prohibited from performing Lot 5 if the offeror or any of its affiliates perform on Lots 1, 2, or 4. The government will ensure clarity in the final CFS.	Section 6

20	Regarding the "Associate Contractor Agreement (ACA)" anticipated under Section 5, can the Government please provide additional context on this requirement. Specifically, is the expectation that each of the awardees will execute an ACA with each other? Additionally, given the Government intends to "approve" the ACA, can the Government please provide Offerors with anticipated approval criteria, a draft or model ACA, or other information to inform this requirement so that Offerors can both understand the expectations while ensuring protection of proprietary and sensitive information.	Execution Expectation: Yes. All awardees across Lots 1 through 5 are required to execute bilateral or multilateral ACAs within 30 days of award to govern inter-vendor cooperation, data sharing, SDK/API exchange, and Software Integration Lab (SIL) troubleshooting without government cost escalation. Government Approval Criteria: The Government's review and approval of the ACAs will focus on ensuring: 1.No artificial barriers or proprietary restrictions are placed on required system APIs, SDK distribution, or SIL telemetry. 2.Clear protection mechanisms for background intellectual property and trade secrets among competing contractors. 3. Defined escalation and dispute-resolution timelines to prevent schedule impacts to the 90-day Sandbox and system integration milestones. The Government intends to provide a standard model ACA template (incorporating standard DFARS/AFARS ACA provisions) to all awardees upon selection to streamline execution.	Section 5
21	Volume IV (Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) and Licensing Model) states that the Government prefers a flat, Enterprise-wide licensing model. Will the Government confirm if this is assumed to be VSW-wide or Army-wide?	The primary requirement and preference for this CFS is an Enterprise-wide license for the Synthetic Training Environment (STE) / STE Virtual Software (VSW) program ecosystem. This covers all planned STE nodes, RVCT suites, S/SVT platforms, installations, home stations, and deployed Points of Need (PoN) without per-seat, per-core, or per-installation scaling surcharges. Offerors are welcome to include optional pricing for broader Department of the Army Enterprise licensing within Volume IV, but the baseline evaluation will focus on the STE VSW program-wide enterprise scope.	Volume 4
22	Regarding Lot 2, Volume 2: Can we assume that a separate 5-page narrative is to be submitted for each component included in the submission?	Yes. Because Lot 2 (Simulation Application Software) functions as an open "app marketplace" where vendors may propose one or multiple discrete, specialized software modules (e.g., Table II Precision Gunnery module, s-UAS flight physics plugin, Mounted Mission Command module), offerors may submit a separate, standalone 5-page Volume II Technical Concept narrative for each distinct specialized software application/module offered.Each module will be evaluated independently on its own technical merits.	Lot 2
23	Specifically, may a small business/nontraditional subcontractor provide engineering support, such as cloud engineering, data engineering, and/or data analytics, to one prime supporting Lots 1, 2, and/or 4, while also providing engineering support to a different prime on Lot 5? In this scenario, the subcontractor would not be providing or owning the software being evaluated by Lot 5. If this type of participation is permitted, are there any Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) restrictions, limitations, or mitigation requirements the Government intends to apply to subcontractors supporting multiple Lots?	Teaming Across Lots 1 through 4: Cross-lot teaming, partnerships, and multi-lot subcontractor participation across Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 are greatly encouraged. The Government actively promotes collaboration among commercial vendors, small businesses, and nontraditional defense contractors to assemble "best-of-breed" software and training capability solutions. Subcontractors may support multiple primes across Lots 1–4 without restriction, provided standard proprietary data-protection and NDA practices are maintained. Lot 5 Clean Separation Rule: To keep governance simple, transparent, and completely objective, a strict structural separation applies to Lot 5. Because Lot 5 operates the Software Integration Lab (SIL), executes the automated Conformance Test Suite (CTS), and provides the objective data used for Government milestone acceptance, any company or subcontractor performing on Lot 5 cannot participate in any capacity (as a prime, subcontractor, or technical advisor) on Lots 1, 2, or 4. Bottom Line: Industry partners are encouraged to freely team across the developments lots (Lots1-4). However, any entity providing support to Lot 5 must remain entirely independent of the Lots 1,2, and 4.	All

24	Please clarify when and how the Government intends to provide Offerors with access to the current TSS baseline source code, associated technical documentation, SDKs/APIs, and other applicable Government Furnished Information (GFI). Will access to the TSS baseline/GFI be provided to qualified Offerors prior to solution submission and/or demonstrations, and will authorized subcontractors/team members supporting an Offeror also be permitted access?	Yes. To enable offerors to formulate credible, technically grounded proposals (particularly for Path A GOTS and Path C Hybrid approaches), the Government will make the current TSS technical baseline, documentation, and interface specifications available prior to the Phase 1 Solution Brief submission deadline. Authorized U.S. subcontractors and teaming partners supporting an Offeror are permitted access, provided the prime Offeror formally notifies the Program Office of the name, address, and designated POC of each subcontractor, and ensures that all subcontractor personnel are briefed on and adhere to all terms of the Distribution Agreement (to be posted). Detailed instructions will be officially posted as an attachment to the CFS on SAM.gov. Offerors must email their completed, signed Distribution Agreement to the Contracting/Agreements Officers. Physical Storage Media Requirement: Due to the large size of the complete TSS software repository, terrain data, and IDE assets, electronic transfer is not supported. Offerors must provide their own external storage media (external SSD/HDD, minimum 8 TB capacity). Media Delivery & Pickup: Local Vendors (Orlando, FL area): May coordinate drop-off and pickup of their storage device at the designated Government facility in Orlando. Non-Local Vendors: May ship their storage device along with a pre-paid, tracked return shipping label to the address provided upon verification of credentials.	All
25	The Government's response to question 7 in the Q & A released on 1 September stated, "The Government intends to provide a standard model ACA template (incorporating standard DFARS/AFARS ACA provisions) to all awardees upon selection to streamline execution." Please consider providing a copy of the model ACA to offerors before proposal submission. The nature of the agreement, as well as any IP costs and associated risks, will inevitably have an impact on proposal approach and pricing. Furthermore, due to the short-turn negotiation anticipated (30 days), this will help ensure offerors are best able to align with the Government's timeline."	The ACA will be posted as an attachment	All
26	Given the Government's recent guidance regarding the submission of separate Technical Volumes for discrete software modules, combined with the refined phased award structure and the anticipated timeline dependencies (specifically the sequential award of Lot 1 prior to Lot 2 and the subsequent availability of the SDK and the referenced "Deferred Solicitations/Awards (Lots 2 and 4)"), can we assume that the government is providing an extension for the Lot 2 submission deadline? We request this clarification to ensure that offerors have sufficient time to develop fully compliant, high-quality technical narratives for each distinct application module.	Yes, there will be an extension for the Lots 2 and 4 deadline. More details to follow in the final CFS posting.	Lot 2/ 4
27	Will the Government please clarify whether cover pages, tables of contents (if included), and acronym lists count towards the specified page limit for each volume?	These items do not count towards page limits	All
28	Will the Government consider allowing offerors to submit the required video for Vol III Product Demonstration Artifacts via a secure method instead of a non-password protected link? We have video that clearly illustrates TRL 8/9 with working, fielded software, but the videos are not approved for public release.	Yes this method will be accepted	All
29	Will the Government confirm if the GFI to be provided as part of the CFS will include geospatial data products for areas of interest (e.g., OWT source data, runtime outputs)?	Yes. The TSS GFI baseline distribution (provided on the 8TB external drive upon approval of the Distribution Agreement) includes sample One World Terrain (OWT) 3D Tiles, elevation datasets, vector features, and representative operational training geographic areas of interest (AOIs)	All
30	The updated timeline released on Friday, 4 September via sam.gov still indicates that Lots 2 & 4 submission will be at the same time as Lot 1, 3, & 5. Should we expect that submission of those Lots will shift later, or will they remain simultaneous to Lot 1, 3, & 5 submission?	The formal submission deadline for Lot 2 and Lot 4 will shift later.	Lot 2/ 4

31	For Lot 2, is the Government only interested in software solutions or would the Government accept Lot 2 submissions for a software and hardware solution (HIL)	The Government will only consider software solutions for this effort at this time.	Lot 2
32	For the 5-page Volume II Anonymous Technical Concept, will the Government allow architectural diagrams to be included as an attachment that does not count against the 5-page limit? This would allow offerors to provide the detail requested in the response.	Architectural diagrams may be included as an attachment that does not count against the 5 page limit. If the Government, in its sole discretion, determines that an offeror has utilized this diagram exemption to circumvent the established page limits by embedding excessive narrative text, the narrative text will be disregarded. Narrative text on diagram pages must be limited to labels and callouts.	All
33	For the Phase 2 demonstration, is there a max number of offeror personnel that can participate in the demonstrations, either at the Government location or virtually?	There is no strict cap on in-person or virtual attendees for demonstrations, however, to ensure smooth flow of demonstrations, offerors should limit attendees to those personnel that are essential to the facilitation of the demonstration	Demo
34	For the Industry Day one-on-ones, is there a limit to the number of offeror personnel that can attend in person?	Yes. To maintain effective, focused discussions and adhere to conference breakout room capacities, each company/consortium team is limited to three (3) in-person representatives during scheduled One-on-One sessions.	ID
35	For Lot 4, please provide or identify the anticipated message-bus event schemas, peak event rates, latency targets, concurrent exercise volumes, data-retention requirements, and sample AAR outputs that vendors should use to size and demonstrate their solutions.	Additional information will be provided upon conclusion of the Lot 1 competitive sandbox and subsequent final Lot 1 award. This will inform the SKD/API standards that the Lots 2 and 4 providers will adhere to. Lots 2 and 4 awards will be extended/delayed for this dependency. In the meantime, reference Attachment A to the CFS for the operational requirements of the system	Lot 4
36	Please confirm the anticipated classification, CUI handling requirements, DoD impact level, RMF control baseline, and deployment environments for Lot 4, including whether operation is required at disconnected or intermittently connected field sites and whether any FedRAMP or DoD provisional authorization must exist at submission.	CUI at this present time. Existing FedRAMP High or DoD IL4/IL5 Provisional Authorizations (PA) for cloud components are highly favorable but not mandatory at initial submission, provided the offeror demonstrates containerized STIG compliance and security control inheritance within the Lot 5 DevSecOps pipeline. More information will be provided upon the award of Lot 1 and Lot 5	Lot 4
37	For Lot 4, may the TRL 8/9 and recent/relevant-experience requirements be satisfied by a fielded commercial training analytics or AAR platform deployed outside the Army LVC environment, provided that the vendor demonstrates mature APIs and a credible integration path to the Government-approved SDK?	Yes. TRL 8/9 and past experience requirements may be satisfied by mature, operational commercial platforms deployed in non-defense sectors (e.g., civil aviation, commercial esports/gaming analytics, enterprise telemetry analytics), provided the offeror provides verifiable proof of live deployment, mature pub-sub APIs, and a credible path to ingesting military simulation telemetry.	Lot 4
38	Please provide the anticipated period of performance and planning quantities for Lot 4, including installations, physical nodes, environments, instructors, concurrent users, and support hours, and confirm whether enterprise subscription and perpetual-license approaches will be compared on total evaluated cost over the same period.	There are 22 planned fielded sites for RVCT, that at the most, must be capable of running simultaneous operations up to Battalion-level scale. The Government will consider/compare the perpetual vs enterprise license approach.	Lot 4
39	Please define the minimum Government rights and ACA sharing requirements applicable to Lot 4 source code, proprietary platform components, connectors, SDKs, API documentation, and interface-control documents, including whether a vendor may retain ownership of its commercial core platform while granting ecosystem participants access only to documented interfaces.	Commercial Core IP Retention: Yes. Commercial vendors retain full ownership and proprietary data rights to their underlying, commercial core analytics software engines. Mandatory Government Rights: The Government requires Government Purpose Rights (GPR) or Unlimited Rights for all custom-developed integration code, API schemas, connectors, and Interface Control Documents (ICDs) developed under this effort. ACA Interface Sharing: Under the Associate Contractor Agreement (ACA), vendors are required to share only documented APIs, SDK stubs, data schemas, and interface definitions with ecosystem participants—not proprietary internal source code.	Lot 4

40	Section 6.1 indicates that Volume II cannot mention the offeror's company name or include any of the offeror's logos; it can be difficult to effectively describe a technical solution without being able to name the components and modules. Does that mean the offers also must avoid mentioning names of any COTS products they might be using (e.g., VBS, Unreal, VR-Forces, Cesium, MASSV, etc.) as that might give away the offeror's identity? If so, could this place COTS providers at a disadvantage?	Mentioning COTS/GOTS Names: Permitted for integration context. Offerors may reference standard industry technologies, commercial tools, and GOTS baselines (e.g., "utilizes Unreal Engine," "connects to OneSAF," "implements Kafka streaming") to explain technical architecture and interoperability. Developer Status & Discriminators: In Volume II, offerors must NOT state "we are the creator/owner of Product X" or include corporate marketing claims that explicitly identify the bidding company. Offerors can fully articulate their technical agility, source-code access, and roadmap velocity functionally (e.g., "The proposed engineering team maintains full architectural control and direct codebase modification authority over the core engine"). Retaining Anonymous Volume II: The Government will NOT drop the anonymity requirement for Volume II. Blind reviews are a core principle of the Army Open Solicitation (AOS) framework to ensure an objective, merit-based technical evaluation.	
41	If COTS products names cannot be mentioned, does that restriction apply to GOTS products as well (e.g., OneSAF, AFSIM, etc.)? If not, the rule would seem to disadvantage companies using COTS solutions.		All
42	If names of products "are" allowed, is it allowed to mention if the offeror is the developer of the products? It seems difficult to avoid mentioning this without leaving out a potentially significant technical discriminator that the Government might want to consider (i.e., that the offeror could steer the product roadmap and after the product codebase to specially meet program requirements).		All
43	Given that companies can always find ways of conveying what products they are using without actually naming them (e.g. "the engine that was used in the Games for Training Program"), would the Government consider dropping the anonymity require – al least for Lots 1, 2, and 4 when product / technology discriminators are important to the Government evaluation?		Lot 1/2//4
44	I am looking for the posted Characteristic of Need (CoN) for Virtual Software (former VCTS) but I do not see it linked here any longer: SAM.gov	Please note, the STE VSW effort was previously titled, "STE VCTS" but has since been revised to "STE VSW" The previous name was already a title assigned to another effort, which required rebranding of the project name.	SAM
45	Section 5 states the Government will establish a basket of vendors identified as having developed highly qualified solutions for potential future selection. What are the criteria for inclusion in that basket, how will vendors be notified, and can a company be considered for it without submitting a Solution Brief against a specific Lot under this Call?	The basket of vendors option will be clarified in the FINAL CFS posting. The following is the intended language to be identified in the FINAL STE VSW CFS, Section 5, "The Government will also establish a basket of vendors that have been identified to have developed solutions of technical merit but were not invited to Phase II. These vendors may be selected to be retained in a basket for up to twenty-four (24) months from notice for potential future selection during the performance of any of the identified Lots. Please note, Lot 2 will remain open for on boarding opportunities throughout the performance of Lot 2. Additional opportunities will be identified at various times of the year." and Section 7.2, " Based on the evaluated sections, the Solution submission will be categorized as Selected for Further Consideration or Not Selected for Further Consideration. Those selected to have technical merit but not selected for further consideration may be selected for basket consideration for up to twenty-four (24) months."	All
46	Lot 2 is described as remaining open for the life of the project, with subsequent competitive awards for new applications. What is the mechanism and expected cadence for submitting a Lot 2 application after the 21 September 2026 suspense, and will those submissions be made under this Call or under a separate future announcement?	Following the baseline Lot 1 award and release of the standardized Lot 1 SDK (approx. Month 4–5), the Government will publish a Lot 2 Application Catalog & Call Notice. From that point forward, Lot 2 will operate on a continuous, rolling submission cadence (frequency TBD) under the AOS umbrella, enabling industry to propose specialized tactical modules, vehicle dynamics plugins, and weapon systems on an ongoing basis.	Lot 2
47	Lot 2 references future vehicle platforms and s-UAS modules, and Section 3 makes native ingest and render of One World Terrain data a non-negotiable requirement for initial system acceptance. Is the production of 3D content, including vehicle and platform models at simulation fidelity and terrain and environment authoring against the OWT pipeline, in scope for any of the five Lots, or does the Government intend to acquire that content separately?	The intent is for the Government to acquire this content from OWT, outside the scope for any of the five lots.	

48	Section 3 requires mature, fielded products at the time of solution submission. For Lots 2 and 4, will software that is fielded and operational with commercial or non-defense customers satisfy the TRL 8/9 requirement, or must the offeror demonstrate fielding in a Government or defense training context?	Yes, commercial/non-defense fielding fully satisfies the TRL 8/9 requirement. In alignment with Commercial Solutions Opening (CSO) authorities (DFARS 212.70), mature commercial gaming, physics simulation, autonomous vehicle simulation, or data analytics platforms fielded in the private commercial sector meet the entry threshold, provided they can be integrated via the Government-approved SDK.	Lot 2/4
49	The Lot 1 platform and its Government-approved SDK will not have been selected at the time Lot 2 solution briefs are due. For a Lot 2 application that is engine-native today, will the effort of re-targeting it to the selected Lot 1 SDK be treated as minor configuration and integration, or as software development that renders the solution non-compliant under Section 3?	Re-targeting an existing, mature application to the new Lot 1 SDK/API is considered standard integration and configuration, NOT new software development. Section 3's technological maturity restriction is intended to prohibit offerors from submitting conceptual, unbuilt software that requires ground-up development. If the underlying core algorithms, flight/vehicle physics, or fire-control logic are already built and proven (TRL 8/9), the engineering effort required to adapt those capabilities to the standardized Lot 1 SDK/APIs is expected and fully compliant.	Lot 2
50	Volume II must contain no company names, logos, identifying marks, or names of key personnel. Where an offeror's solution incorporates a component or capability provided by a named teammate, how should that relationship be described in Volume II without breaching the anonymity requirement, and should the teammate's fielded product and past performance be carried in the offeror's Volume I and Volume V?	Reference previous questions regarding Volume II Anonymity. That has been answered at length.	
51	Where are the ACA LOI, GFI request, and software list forms?	The STE VSW sam.gov posting will include Att 04 ACA LOI, 06 STE-IS SDA and 06a TSS-TMT GFI available for review and submission POCs.	
52	The CFS states that Volume IV (ROM) "will not be evaluated," yet Section 7 identifies "Volumes II and IV" as part of the weighted evaluation factors. Question: Can the Government clarify whether Volume IV will be evaluated during Phase 1, and if so, which elements of Volume IV factor into the weighted scoring?	Volume IV will not be evaluated during the Phase I down-select. Refined submission requirements and evaluation criteria will be in the final CFS posting	Section 6; Section 7
53	Volume II is limited to a maximum of 5 pages per Lot, yet it must address architecture, modernization path, SDK/API maturity, data segregation, licensing model, and a detailed technical schedule narrative. These requirements exceed what can be reasonably captured within 5 pages. Question: Will the Government consider expanding the Volume II page limit or clarifying which elements are required within the 5 pages versus which may be included as appendices?	Page Limit Maintained: The 5-page limit per Lot for Volume II remains in effect (with Lot 2 permitted up to 5 pages per distinct software application/module offered). Content Focus: Volume II is intended as a high-impact, executive technical summary. Offerors should focus the 5 pages on their Modernization Path, core architectural diagram, and technical approach to meeting the core Operational Priorities. Relief / Appendices: Licensing terms, data rights assertions, and administrative compliance details belong in other Volumes, freeing up Volume II space exclusively for the technical narrative and embedded architectural diagrams.	Section 6, Section 7
54	Section 3 lists OWT ingestion/rendering as the requirement. However, Phase 1 evaluation (Volume I Requirement #3) requires OGC standard compliance (WMS, WFS, 3D Tiles) as proof of OWT capability. Question: Is OGC standards compliance a mandatory submission requirement, or will OWT ingestion alone satisfy the Phase 1 evaluation criteria? If OGC compliance is mandatory, will the Government update Section 3 to reflect this?	OWT ingestion alone will satisfy the Phase 1 Criteria. The Government will clarify in the final CFS posting	Section 3, Section 7

55	Volume III is described as the “primary technical validation” for Lots 1, 2, and 4, but Section 7 does not specify if or how Volume III factors into weighted evaluation. Question: Can the Government clarify whether Volume III will be scored in Phase 1, and if so, what specific evaluation criteria apply to the demo and API/SDK documentation?	The Government intends to refine the final CFS to utilize the Volume III artifacts as an objective Pass/Fail (Go/No-Go) technical readiness gate to verify "Proof of Commercial Maturity" (TRL 8/9) and "Integration Readiness." Because Volume III serves to validate that working, fielded software actually exists rather than being subjectively scored.	Section 6, Section 7
56	Section 12 requires an OCI analysis for all offerors, but the evaluation criteria do not specify how OCI compliance affects scoring. Given the strict Lot 5 firewall restrictions, this may affect eligibility. Question: Will OCI findings or mitigation plans be evaluated as part of Phase 1 scoring, or are they treated solely as pass/fail compliance checks?	The Government will refine the OCI requirements as pass/fail and will not be a part of scoring. The intent of the OCI is to cover the Lot 5 firewall.	Section 12, Section 7, Section 5
57	If a company is awarded Lot 5, are they precluded from providing support on Lots 1, 2 and 4?	Yes.	
58	Requirement (Section 3) Technological Maturity (TRL 8/9): All submitted solutions must be mature, fielded products (TRL 8/9). No major development or re-architecting allowed. Discrepancy: Section 6 requires Lot 1 to declare a modernization path (GOTS, COTS, Hybrid), each of which involves modifying or enhancing the TSS baseline—work that is contradictory to the TRL 8/9 restriction. Questions: Will the government please define no major development. Does the solution have to include the existing TSS/TMT software? What is the current TRL for TSS?	The government understands that a path may require integration and minor configuration. The underlying foundational simulation software engine, rendering pipeline, physics models, or analytics architectures must already exist, be fielded, and be operational (TRL 8/9). The Government is funding integration, API adaptation, HAPI mapping, and configuration—not the ground-up development of a new, unproven simulation engine. Offerors may propose Path A (GOTS enhancement), Path B (complete COTS replacement), or Path C (Hybrid). Solutions are not required to incorporate the existing TSS/TMT baseline. TSS is an actual system proven through successful mission operations, so a TRL 9 is appropriate.	Section 3, Section 6
59	Requirement (Section 1) User Scripting Environment: The Government has a strong desire for the Lot 1 CCS to provide a high-level scripting environment accessible to non-developer "Power Users." Discrepancy: Section 6 allows vendors to provide a future roadmap instead of a working scripting environment, while Section 3 requires all major components to be mature at submission. Questions: Can the government please clarify the discrepancies between the three Sections. Is the user scripting environment part of the TRL 8/9 maturity requirement?	The Government will refine the language regarding "Power Users" There is no discrepancy. A mature solution can still plan and provide for future enhancement to meet future requirements. The scripting environment is a "Government desire", not a pass fail requirement. Per the CFS: "If a submitted solution does not have a user scripting environment at the time of award, the offeror must provide a detailed technical roadmap for delivering this capability in a future, near-term software release."	Section 1; Section 6, Section 3
60	Requirement (Section 7): Speed to IOC is the highest-weighted evaluation factor. Discrepancy: Section 3 prohibits major development, but achieving aggressive IOC timelines may require development work beyond “minor configuration.” Questions: If accelerated IOC requires development beyond minor configuration, does this violate TRL requirements? Are vendors expected to propose additional development work to meet aggressive schedules, or strictly limit efforts to integration?	There is no discrepancy. Per the CFS: "Submitted solutions requiring software development, major re architecting, or any effort beyond minor configuration and integration to meet the baseline capabilities of a lot will be considered non-compliant."	Section 7, Section 3

61	Requirement (Section 6): Volume II must be completely anonymous and contain no content revealing vendor identity. Discrepancy: Modernization path declarations (GOTS, COTS, Hybrid) and architecture diagrams may inherently reveal identity (e.g., vendors known for specific COTS engines). Questions: Should vendors avoid naming specific engines/products in Volume II even if required for architecture clarity? How will the Government enforce unbiased evaluation if modernization path inherently reveals the vendor?	Reference previous questions regarding Volume II Anonymity. That has been answered at length.	Section 6
62	We are currently reviewing the STE VSW Call for Solutions (STE-VSW-26-0006) and the newly released Attachments 06 and 06a. We would appreciate clarification regarding access to the TSS/TMT Government Furnished Information for Lot 1. RAMROD XR is an international organization with both a U.S. entity and a German development organization. For a Lot 1 offeror requiring access to the TSS/TMT GFI identified in Attachment 06a, are foreign-owned or affiliated offerors eligible to participate in the Lot 1 competitive sandbox? If so, could you please clarify what foreign disclosure, FOCI mitigation, TAA, or other approvals would be required for non-U.S. development personnel to support the effort and access the required GFI? This clarification would help us determine the appropriate organizational structure for a potential Lot 1 submission.	Foreign-owned or affiliated offerors are not eligible to participate in the Lot 1 competitive sandbox. RVCT is a CUI/NOFORN system and not approved for foreign disclosure at this time.	Lot I
63	Please clarify when and how the Government intends to provide Offerors with access to the current TSS baseline source code, associated technical documentation, SDKs/APIs, and other applicable Government Furnished Information (GFI). Will access to the TSS baseline/GFI be provided to qualified Offerors prior to solution submission and/or demonstrations, and will authorized subcontractors/team members supporting an Offeror also be permitted access?	To enable offerors to formulate credible, technically grounded proposals (particularly for Path A GOTS and Path C Hybrid approaches), the Government will make the current TSS technical baseline, documentation, and interface specifications available prior to the Phase 1 Solution Brief submission deadline. Authorized U.S. subcontractors and teaming partners supporting an Offeror are permitted access, provided the prime Offeror formally notifies the Program Office of the name, address, and designated POC of each subcontractor, and ensures that all subcontractor personnel are briefed on and adhere to all terms of the Distribution Agreement (to be posted). Detailed instructions will be officially posted as an attachment to the CFS on SAM.gov. Offerors must email their completed, signed Distribution Agreement to the Contracting/Agreements Officers. Physical Storage Media Requirement: Due to the large size of the complete TSS software repository, terrain data, and IDE assets, electronic transfer is not supported. Offerors must provide their own external storage media (external SSD/HDD, minimum 8 TB capacity). Media Delivery & Pickup: Local Vendors (Orlando, FL area): May coordinate drop-off and pickup of their storage device at the designated Government facility in Orlando. Non-Local Vendors: May ship their storage device along with a pre-paid, tracked return shipping label to the address provided upon verification of credentials.	GFI
64	Will there be a monitor available to display slides to guide the Vendor conversation during One-on-One's?	Yes.	One-on-One's
65	Does "human performance analytics" in the Lot 4 scope encompass measurement of individual trainee state — visual attention and physiological load — or is it limited to task-outcome telemetry derived from the simulation event bus?	Any analytics are limited to real-time event data from the system message bus.	Lot 4 — Scope and Requirements

66	Q&A response 6 confirms Lot 4 subscribes to the Lot 5 System Message Bus rather than the Lot 1 data fabric. Does the 50,000-entity throughput figure in the Lot 4 criteria describe the bus's aggregate capacity, or a throughput each Lot 4 tool must independently sustain?	The 50,000+ active entity count describes the throughput for After Action Review of each independent training exercise. It is not the aggregate of all entities for a site.	Lot 4 — Scope and Requirements
67	Section 3 makes native One World Terrain ingest and render a critical requirement, while the Volume I OGC compliance proof is scoped to Lot 1. Is the OWT requirement applicable to Lot 4 offerors, and if so what constitutes acceptable evidence?	The OWT Integration requirement applies to all solutions incorporating a terrain engine. The Volume I OGC language will be revised.	Section 3
68	Are entities from Five Eyes partner nations eligible for direct award under the Army Open Solicitation? For a Canadian offeror, would DFARS 225.870 and Canadian Commercial Corporation routing apply to a FAR-based award under this Call, and how does that differ if the award is an Other Transaction agreement?	The STE VSW Solution is currently a CUI/NOFORN system. Five Yes partner nations will not be eligible for award.	Eligibility and Teaming
69	Q&A response 24 states GFI access extends to "authorized U.S. subcontractors and teaming partners." Does this exclude subcontractors from Five Eyes partner nations, or does it reflect a distribution restriction specific to the TSS baseline? Separately, is TSS GFI access expected to be required for Lot 4 offerors, given Lot 4 integrates via the Lot 5 message bus?	GFI access excludes subcontractors from Five Eyes partner nations. TSS GFI is not required to propose a Lot 4 solution, however, the Government understands that Lot 4 will have a dependency on the eventual Lot 1/5 awardees.	Lot 4
70	Will a teamed submission — a prime with a specialist subcontractor — be evaluated as a single Solution? Given Q&A responses 16 and 17 require genericizing the offeror's own product names in Volume II, may a subcontractor's role and contribution be described without breaching the anonymity requirement?	Yes it will be evaluated as a single Solution. Reference previous questions regarding Volume II Anonymity.	Eligibility and Teaming
71	Is an anticipated value range available for Lot 4 within the approximately \$250M combined ceiling?	The Government is not able to provide that information at this time	Administrative
72	Regarding Lot 1, If the Government determines that only one complete and compliant capability exists in an offeror's response as demonstrated in Phases 1, 2, and 3, will you consider removing the Phase 4: Lot I Competitive Table II STX-V Sandbox?	The Government reserves the right to adjust the competitive structure if necessary.	Lot 1
73	Can the Government please confirm if offeror's may include a compliance matrix in the submission of each volume that does not count towards the page limit for each volume?	The CFS states that the required compliance documentation for Volume I does not count against the page limit. Inclusion in any other volume will be counted towards that volumes stated page limit.	All
74	Can the government submit, as an addendum, a document that lists the known gaps and feature needs for the current TSS? Providing this information would help ensure that all offerors have a common understanding of the existing technical baseline and the Government's anticipated needs and can develop informed, competitive solutions.	The core operational gaps and required outcomes are explicitly detailed in CFS Section 1 (Background), Section 2 (Problem Statement), and Attachment A (STE Virtual Software Training Requirements Overview). Specifically, solutions must focus on the Four Operational Priority Capability Deliverables: (1) Certifiable Table II live-fire virtual collective gate (TC 3-20.0), (2) True Combined Arms integration (including BFIST and indirect fires/terrain shaping), (3) Full Mounted Mission Command (MMC/MCIS) concurrency, and (4) Open modular architecture with published SDKs/APIs. These are the core gaps and features.	Lot 1 - Current TSS Gaps and Feature Needs p. 11-12 Volume II
75	How will the government be evaluating submissions to Lot 2, given that there will likely be submissions for multiple modules with different capabilities? Will submissions be evaluated competitively against each other, or evaluated individually on their own merit and funding availability?	Lot 2 submissions will be evaluated individually on their own technical merit, SDK compliance, and alignment with Army operational priorities and funding availability, rather than in direct competition against dissimilar applications. Because Lot 2 operates as an open "app marketplace" (with formal solicitations deferred until Month 4–5 following the Lot 1 baseline award), specialized modules (e.g., s-UAS flight physics, tactical vehicle plug-ins, new weapons/platforms) will be evaluated independently. The Government anticipates making multiple awards across various functional domains based on technical merit, operational need, and available budget.	Lot 2 - Evaluation of Multiple Module Submissions Section 2 - Lot 2-Simulation Application, Section 7 - eval criteria

76	For the training management layer, is there a current or ongoing capability for training event AARs and analytics? Or should the proposer assume that this capability will be brand new to the program?	The Army currently utilizes the Training Management Tool (TMT) in the STE-IS architecture, and is included in the GFI. Offerors should propose highly automated AAR and analytics solutions capable of subscribing directly to the Lot 5 System Message Bus to ingest real-time event telemetry and generate standardized After-Action Review products, 3D spatial replays, and automated TC 3-20.0 Table II scorecards. Offerors may propose adaptations of mature commercial analytics platforms (TRL 8/9) or enhanced TMT GOTS capabilities.	Lot 4 - Existing Training Management / AAR Capability Section 2 Lot 4 - Training Management
77	Is the Army expanding the scope of STE, in terms of the types and echelons of training it can support, with this solicitation and call for new application software?	For this specific STE VSW solicitation, the Army is focusing initial modernization efforts on delivering a certifiable Table II virtual collective gate for mounted maneuver at section through company level (with objective scaling to battalion), integrated fires, terrain shaping, and mounted mission command concurrency. Broader multi-echelon and specialized capabilities will be onboarded incrementally in subsequent Lot 2 releases.	STE - Expansion of Training Scopes p 2-3, Core operational Priority, Att A
78	For Lot 5, please confirm the level of detail expected for the Phase 1 Volume IV ROM. Given that the ROM is identified as non-binding and not evaluated, is the Government seeking a high-level planning estimate by major activity/milestone, or is a detailed bottoms-up labor estimate by labor category and annual hours required at Phase 1?	Phase 1 Expectation: For Phase 1 Volume IV (which is non-binding and not evaluated for down-select scoring), the Government requires a high-level planning ROM broken down by major activity/milestone. Specifically, Lot 5 offerors should separate initial setup costs (establishing the DevSecOps CI/CD pipeline, SIL test scaffolding, and API Gateway) from recurring costs (ongoing SIL management, CTS operations, and SDK governance), along with estimated annual labor hours by primary labor categories. Phase 3 Detail: Fully detailed, binding cost proposals, certified rates, and formal milestone payment breakdowns will only be required from down-selected vendors during Phase 3 (Request for Revised Solutions).	Lot 5 - Phase 1 ROM Level of Detail p. 14, Volume IV
79	For Lot 5, what specific capabilities does the Government expect to see demonstrated in the Phase 1 five-minute Product Demonstration Video to establish technical maturity and integration readiness? For example, should the demonstration focus primarily on DevSecOps/CI-CD, API/message-bus integration, automated conformance testing, SIL management, or a combination of these capabilities?	Because Lot 5 (Enterprise Integration Support) serves as the Government's technical execution agent, lab manager, and testing authority rather than a 3D simulation provider, the video should demonstrate actual, running software tools, dashboards, and automated pipeline environments (from existing DoD, federal, or commercial enterprise deployments) showing capabilities in a combination of the following core areas: Automated DevSecOps Pipeline & Security/SBOM Analysis: Demonstrating an operational CI/CD pipeline performing automated code ingestion, container builds, automated DISA STIG / vulnerability scanning, and automated Software Bill of Materials (SBOM) generation, validation, and policy enforcement. Automated Conformance Testing & Compliance Telemetry: Demonstrating an automated testing harness or Conformance Test Suite (CTS) executing automated test runs against multi-component builds, measuring telemetry, and generating data-driven compliance reports/dashboards.	Lot 5 - Product Demonstration Expectations p.13, Volume III

80	For Lot 5, may an offeror demonstrate mature, currently fielded enterprise integration/DevSecOps capabilities from another operational environment as evidence of TRL 8/9, provided the offeror clearly explains how those capabilities would be applied to the STE VSW architecture?	Yes this is an acceptable approach.	Lot 5 - TRL 8/9 Demo Using Existing Capability .11 & 13, Volume 1
81	Please clarify the applicability of the Volume III live API/SDK documentation requirement to Lot 5. Given Lot 5's role as the Government's integration and governance support partner rather than the provider of the Lot 1 common-core SDK, what existing API/SDK documentation is expected from a Lot 5 offeror?	For Lot 5, the live documentation requirement applies to the offeror's existing enterprise integration tools, API gateway management portals, test automation APIs, or CI/CD developer documentation (e.g., public or user-accessible portals showing documentation for their automated test harnesses, schema registries, or pipeline hooks) to demonstrate their corporate experience and readiness to administer and publish multi-vendor developer SDKs/APIs.	Lot 5 - API/SDL Documentation Requirements p.13m, Volume III
82	For Lot 5, please further clarify the Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) restrictions. Does the prohibition on a Lot 5 awardee proposing or providing software under Lots 1, 2, or 4 apply only to the prime contractor/legal entity performing Lot 5, or does it also extend to affiliated entities, teammates, subcontractors, or other business units within the same corporate organization? If potential conflicts exist within an affiliated organization or proposed team, will the Government consider an OCI mitigation plan/firewall sufficient to permit participation in Lot 5?	The Lot 5 OCI restriction is a strict structural exclusion that extends across the entire corporate family: Under FAR Subpart 9.5, the prohibition applies to the legal prime entity, its parent company, wholly-owned or partially-owned subsidiaries, sister business units, corporate affiliates, joint ventures, and any subcontractors performing Lot 5 integration, testing, or governance functions. Because Lot 5 operates the physical SIL, executes the automated Conformance Test Suite (CTS), and produces the objective telemetry used for Government milestone acceptance, an inherent Impaired Objectivity OCI exists. Firewall-only OCI mitigation plans between corporate affiliates will NOT be accepted. A corporate organization must elect whether to perform for Lot 5 or for the software development lots (Lots 1, 2, and 4).	Lot 5 - OCI Restrictions p. 5 & 11 Lot 5 - OCI Firewall, Volume I OCI Mitigation plan
83	Please provide the registration process for the upcoming Industry Day and one-on-one sessions. Additionally, will the one-on-one sessions allow offerors to discuss their proposed Lot-specific approach and demonstration strategy with the Government prior to submission?	Registration details, schedule instructions, and RSVP links are published as an attachment on SAM.gov for Industry Day (22-24 September 2026 at the Central Florida Tech Grove, Orlando, FL). Each company/team is limited to three (3) in-person representatives during scheduled One-on-One sessions. Offerors are encouraged to discuss their Lot-specific technical concepts, architectural approaches, and demonstration strategies during One-on-Ones. Note: Government feedback during One-on-Ones is informational only and does not constitute a formal evaluation or pre-screening of proposals.	Industry Day / One on one Registration and Scope

84	Given that the Hardware Application Programming Interface (HAPI) provides the critical connection between the RVCT hardware and the Lot 1 Common Core Software, much of the Lot 3 scope appears closely aligned with the Lot 1 awardee's responsibilities. The Lot 1 awardee must understand the simulation engine, data fabric, timing, performance, and software interfaces necessary to process hardware inputs and generate the corresponding simulation outputs. Separating HAPI integration into a standalone Lot could introduce additional interface boundaries, divided accountability, and technical risk when diagnosing latency, fidelity, or performance issues. Combining Lot 1 and Lot 3 would establish clear end-to-end accountability, reduce integration risk, and accelerate delivery of a fully functional Common Core Software solution on the existing RVCT hardware. Would the Government consider incorporating the Lot 3 HAPI integration, testing, and hardware abstraction responsibilities into Lot 1?	No. The Government will maintain Lot 1 (Common Core Software) and Lot 3 (HIL Integration and Test) as separate, distinct Lots. Architectural Rationale: The foundational tenet of the STE VSW acquisition is a Modular Open Systems Approach (MOSA) under the Government-as-Integrator model. Decoupling the core simulation and rendering engine (Lot 1) from physical hardware-to-digital translation (Lot 3 via the HAPI standard) ensures that the simulation software remains modular, hardware-agnostic, and portable across various physical simulator devices (e.g., RVCT) and embedded combat vehicle platforms without vendor lock-in. Teaming Encouraged: However, the Government actively encourages cross-lot teaming across Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4. An offeror (or teamed industry partners) may submit proposals for both Lot 1 and Lot 3, provided the technical demarcation between the core engine and the HAPI translation layer is maintained.	Lot 3
85	Regarding the Lot 2 "App Store" model and continuous onboarding: does the Government envision individual and small-arms weapons training applications, and human performance assessment/measurement applications, as in-scope capability categories for current or future Lot 2 awards, or is Lot 2 scope limited to mounted/collective platform training?	The Government views small-arms weapons training applications and individual human performance applications as out of scope for this effort, and falls within the scope of Soldier Virtual Trainer (SVT). The STE Virtual SW scope is limited to collective training capability at this time.	Lot 2
86	What form factor does the Government envision for Lot 2 applications: in-process plug-ins compiled against the Lot 1 SDK, externally hosted services communicating via the data fabric/message bus, or both? Will engine-agnostic, service-based applications be acceptable?	The Government envisions and will accept both architectural patterns. Lot 2 applications may be either tightly-coupled plug-ins compiled directly against the Lot 1 SDK or decoupled, engine-agnostic external services that communicate via the Lot 5 System Message Bus. The primary requirement is that all Lot 2 applications must adhere to the data standards, interface contracts, and governance protocols established by the Government-approved SDK and the Lot 5 integrator to ensure seamless interoperability.	Lot 2
87	Volume III requires a direct URL to a live, public-facing portal containing existing API/SDK documentation. Will the Government accept SDK/API documentation provided under NDA, via a credentialed portal, or within the submission package, for offerors whose interface documentation is not publicly hosted for commercial or security reasons?	Yes. As stated in the previous answers, the Government's intent is to verify technical maturity (TRL 8/9), not to mandate public hosting. Offerors may provide API/SDK documentation via secure means, including credentialed portals, direct secure transfer, or as part of the submission package under NDA. If a credentialed portal is used, access credentials must be provided in Volume I to ensure unimpeded evaluator access.	Volume III
88	Is the Table II "gate to live fire" capability scoped exclusively to mounted maneuver platform gunnery per TC 3-20.0, or does the Government intend the STE VSW ecosystem to eventually encompass individual/small-arms weapons training tables as well?	The immediate, primary focus of this solicitation is to deliver a certifiable Table II virtual collective gate for mounted maneuver platforms (e.g., Abrams, Bradley, Stryker) and Aviation platforms (IAW TC 3-04.3) as outlined in the Core Operational Priority Capabilities. While the STE architecture is intended to be extensible, the inclusion of or interoperability with individual or dismounted small-arms training tables within the SVT portfolio would be a future objective and not within the scope of this initial modernization effort.	Table II
89	For Lot 4, does the Government intend the AAR/performance analytics layer to incorporate human performance and physiological/biometric data streams (e.g., stress response, weapon handling telemetry) beyond simulation event data, and if so, will the message bus schema accommodate third-party sensor inputs?	No. Per the response to Q65, the scope for Lot 4 is limited to consuming real-time simulation event data from the Lot 5 System Message Bus. While the architecture may accommodate future sensor integration, the current requirement for Lot 4 is to generate AARs and analytics based on the telemetry produced by the Lot 1 and Lot 2 simulation components.	Lot 4

90	Will the Government publish or facilitate a list of offerors/interested vendors by Lot to enable teaming arrangements, given the ACA collaboration requirements and the Government-as-Integrator model?	The Government will not publish or facilitate a list of offerors/interested vendors by Lot. Please note that sam.gov has a function that allows for interested vendors to be identified through the webstie.	All
91	Will one-on-one session slots at Industry Day be available to vendors who have not yet submitted a solution brief, and what is the RSVP mechanism?	Yes. One-on-one sessions are open to all interested vendors, regardless of their submission status. Registration details and the RSVP mechanism are published as an attachment on the official SAM.gov posting for this solicitation	Industry Day / One on one Registration
92	This section states “Standard Forms” but the Call for Solution does not identify which standard forms are required. Can the Government please clarify?	The only standard form required for Phase I submission is the ACA Letter of Intent (LOI), which is provided as Attachment 4 to the CFS. The "Interested Vendor and Information Form" is a web-based form accessible via the link in the CFS. No other "Standard Forms" are required for the Phase I Solution Brief. The CFS will be updated to remove ambiguity and specify any forms/documentation required.	Section 6.1, Volume I
93	The "Technical Schedule Narrative" requirement is unclear whether it is outside the numbered list of Volume II submission requirements. Please confirm whether it counts against the five-page Volume II limit.	The Schedule Narrative is an integral part of the Volume II Technical Concept and does count against the established page limit for that volume.	Section 6.1, Volume II
94	The sub-heading directly below the Volume II and V heading indicates evaluation factors for Volumes II and IV. Can the Government please confirm that the evaluation factors are for Volumes II and V?	This appears to be a typo. As confirmed in Q52 and the final CFS structure, Volume IV (ROM) is for planning purposes only and will not be evaluated or scored in Phase I. The weighted qualitative evaluation factors apply to Volume II (Technical Concept) and Volume V (Recent/Relevant Experience). The final CFS will reflect this correction.	Section 7.1, Volume II and V
95	This section directs offerors to "submit the results of that analysis in addition to the Solution Brief submission" and states that "this section will not count against submission page limits," while Section 5.2 requires offerors to disclose OCIs "prior to award." Please confirm that the OCI analysis is due with the Phase 1 Solution Brief.	There will be updates to the OCI language in the final CFS. For any offeror proposing on Lot 5, the OCI Dual-Submission Acknowledgement Statement is a mandatory part of the Volume I submission for Phase 1. This is a compliance gate. A formal, detailed OCI mitigation plan is not required until prior to award, but acknowledgement of the structural firewall is required at Phase 1.	Section 12
96	This section communicates that “The Government heavily prefers flat, Enterprise-wide licensing models that do not penalize the Army for scaling user counts or adding installations.” Does the Government have baseline metrics for user counts, installations, or training events that it can share?	As stated in Q38, there are 22 planned fielded RVCT sites. At this time, the Government cannot provide definitive metrics for total user counts or training events. For the purposes of the ROM, offerors should assume the system must be capable of supporting simultaneous, company-level collective training events across all 22 sites, with the scalability to support up to battalion-level operations at any single site. The enterprise model should provide the Government with maximum flexibility without incurring scaling costs based on users or nodes.	Section 6.1, Volume IV
97	How does the Government intend to identify, prevent, and mitigate potential Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) concerns associated with the incumbent contractor or any offeror that has had prior access to STE/TSS source code, architecture, requirements, or other non-public technical information?	The Government has made available, upon request, the TSS/TMT Baseline as GFI. Please review the Final STE VSW Call for Solutions (CFS) dated 09/15/2026 and attachments. Normal familiarity with existing Government systems gained through incumbent performance does not constitute an unfair competitive advantage or an unmitigable OCI.	OCI / Incumbent Advantage

98	For Lot 3, does the Government intend for the offeror to provide the System Integration Laboratory (SIL), and should all software, hardware, tools, licenses, cybersecurity, facility, and support costs associated with the SIL be included in the Lot 3 ROM?	No. As specified in CFS Section 2 (Lot 5 Scope, Page 4) and Section 5 (Page 10), Lot 5 is responsible for deploying, managing, and maintaining the physical SIL and DevSecOps infrastructure under the Program Office's direct supervision, utilizing Government Furnished Property (GFP). Per Section 6.1.4 (Page 17), Lot 3 ROM pricing must focus exclusively on HIL engineering, Hardware API (HAPI) translation development, and integration testing within the Government-provided SIL.	Pricing / SIL Scope
99	The Call states that Lot 3 ROM costs must separate HIL integration/testing in the SIL from travel/labor for fielding, installation, and calibration. Will the Government provide estimated number of fielded sites, site locations, installation quantities, and calibration events?	As clarified in prior Q&A and finalized in the CFS, site fielding, physical installation, and onsite calibration are not within the scope of Lot 3. The final CFS removed this requirement. Lot 3 scope is strictly confined to physical-to-digital translation, HAPI mapping, and SIL integration testing	Pricing / Fielding
100	Is Lot 3 responsible for maintaining SIL configuration management and baseline control, or is that responsibility assigned to Lot 5 or the Government?	Configuration management and baseline control of the SIL and the enterprise code repositories are assigned exclusively to Lot 5 under direct Government supervision. Per Section 2 (Demarcation of Responsibilities), the Government retains sole, non-delegable authority over all system configurations, baseline approvals, and architectural decisions.	Configuration Management
101	Should ROM pricing include only prototype costs, or should it include production scaling, sustainment, licensing, integration support, and recurring operations?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS and Volume IV ROM and Licensing Model for submission requirements. As stated in prior Q&A #12 and Section 6.1.4 (Pages 16–17), primary labor and integration ROM pricing in Volume IV must cover the software prototype modernization effort. For commercial software (Lots 1, 2, and 4), offerors must also provide their long-term commercial software licensing structure, delineating initial prototype licensing from annual recurring enterprise subscriptions or perpetual maintenance fees for follow-on scaling.	Pricing / Scope
102	Should offerors include ROM pricing for Government site travel, security compliance, cybersecurity scans, lab equipment, cloud hosting, software licenses, and third-party tools?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS and Volume IV ROM and Licensing Model for submission requirements. Offerors must include ROM pricing for all labor, vendor-provided tools, developer software licenses, and direct travel necessary to execute their Lot's scope. Only Lot 5 should price SIL physical facility equipment and enterprise DevSecOps infrastructure. GFE RVCT hardware does not need to be priced, as these are provided as GFE/GFP via Lots 3 and 5 (ref. Q&A #10).	Pricing/ODc's
103	For labor and integration services, what period of performance should be assumed for annual hours and labor category estimates?	The Government is not placing limits on labor hours as the Government is anticipating unique solutions.	Pricing/ Labor Assumptions
104	Will the Government allow alternate pricing models such as enterprise licensing, per-seat licensing, per-site licensing, usage-based licensing, or unlimited Government-purpose licensing?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS and Volume IV ROM and Licensing Model for submission requirements. The Government is not limiting vendors on pricing or licensing models.	Pricing / Licensing Model
105	How will the Government evaluate affordability when different Lots have dependencies on other Lots' software, tools, licenses, or integration environments?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS and Volume IV ROM and Licensing Model for submission requirements. Please note, the ROM is being collected for planning and market research only; this volume will NOT be evaluated or scored.	Pricing / Cross-Lot Dependency

106	What cybersecurity framework applies to each Lot, including RMF, NIST 800-53, DISA STIGs/SRGs, DoDI 8510.01, FISMA, CMMC, or other requirements?	Solutions must comply with the DoD Risk Management Framework (RMF) pursuant to DoDI 8510.01 and NIST SP 800-53 security controls. Software deliverables must be containerized and hardened in compliance with applicable DISA Security Technical Implementation Guides (STIGs) and Security Requirements Guides (SRGs).	Cybersecurity / Compliance
107	What Impact Level, classification level, CUI handling requirement, or network environment should offerors assume?	Software and components must operate in an unclassified Controlled Unclassified Information environment. Any proposed cloud-hosted components should target FedRAMP High or DoD Impact Level 4/5 (IL4/IL5) provisional authorizations	Cybersecurity / Environment
108	Will the Government require an ATO, IATT, cATO, reciprocity package, or continuous monitoring strategy for the prototype?	Yes. The prototype will operate in the Government-managed SIL and DevSecOps environment with the objective of achieving an accelerated RMF Open Network Authority to Operate (ATO) or Interim Authority to Test (IATT). The Lot 5 DevSecOps pipeline is architected to support automated continuous monitoring and rapid security control inheritance leading to a continuous ATO (cATO) pathway	Cybersecurity / Authorization
109	Who is responsible for preparing, submitting, updating, and maintaining cybersecurity artifacts such as SSP, POA&M, SCTM, hardware/software lists, network diagrams, vulnerability scans, and contingency plans?	Per prior Q&A #9, each Lot 1–4 vendor is responsible for delivering component-level cybersecurity artifacts (e.g., container STIG compliance results, vulnerability mitigation reports, software architecture descriptions, and SBOMs) for their modules. The Lot 5 integrator aggregates these artifacts, executes automated pipeline security testing, and maintains the integrated system security package under Government oversight.	Cybersecurity / Responsibility
110	Will the Government provide access to eMASS, MCCASt, or another authorization repository?	Direct access to enterprise eMASS is maintained by the Government Program Office and designated Lot 5 cybersecurity personnel. Lot 1–4 vendors will provide their required security artifacts and STIG compliance data directly into the Lot 5 DevSecOps repository rather than working directly in eMASS.	Cybersecurity / Tool Access
111	What vulnerability scanning tools are required or preferred, such as ACAS, SCAP Compliance Checker, container scanners, SBOM tools, or SAST/DAST tools?	Each Lot 1–4 offeror is responsible for budgeting labor and tools required to perform secure coding, STIG hardening, component scanning, and remediation of their own software codebases. Lot 5 budgets the overarching infrastructure costs for administering the centralized DevSecOps scanning tools, CTS pipelines, and enterprise authorization aggregation.	Cybersecurity / Scanning Tools
112	How should cybersecurity costs be allocated if scanning, remediation, and accreditation activities span multiple Lots?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS and Volume IV ROM and Licensing Model for submission requirements. The Government is not limiting vendors on pricing or licensing models. each Lot 1–4 vendor is responsible for conducting these activities for their specific lot components and artifacts.	Cybersecurity / Pricing
113	The Final paragraph on the title page indicates that the Government has not determined how they will solicit this effort. As the regulatory requirements of a FAR based agreement can add cost to an effort, when will the Government make the determination if this effort will be solicited under OTA or FAR / CSO requirements?	Please note, the referenced title page section outlines the authority for the Call for Solutions. Additional information related to the solicitation for this effort is also found within the Army Open Solicitation (AOS) number. The Government has not restricted the acquisition of the STE VSW effort to a specific award authority.	Call for Solution
114	Please clarify whether Lot 3 offerors are required to submit a Volume IV.2 licensing model and data-rights narrative. If required, should the Lot 3 response address only software delivered to the Government, or also contractor-owned tools, test applications, emulators, middleware, SIL management tools, and other software used solely to perform HIL integration/testing?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS and Volume IV ROM and Licensing Model for submission requirements. Lot 3 should address any non-COTS/GOTS tools required for test and integration.	Pricing / Licensing / Lot 3 Scope

115	Are there specific page layout requirements offerors have to follow for Volume 2 and Volume 5?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS Section 6.	Compliance
116	Can offerors provide a cover/title page for Volume 2 and Volume 5 that do not count toward the page limitations?	These items do not count towards page limits, however, it is important to submit Volume II as identified in the CFS.	Compliance
117	The Government does not believe that the Lot 5 Integration Support vendor will have an OCI with Lot 3. As such the Government will not have an issue with the Lot 3 awardee also being the Lot 5 awardee, correct?	Correct. Please review the Final STE VSW CFS.	Problem Statement
118	Will the Government allow the use of solutions that do not utilize COTS or GOTS solutions? In other words will Commercial solutions that do not contain COTS or GOTS be allowable?	Need more details on this question. Unclear what exactly is being asked.	Required Solution Attributes
119	With whom must the Awardees execute ACAs? The Government is stating the requirement, but not stating who the Parties that the awardees need to execute the ACA with are? Are they the other awardees, or are they 3rd Parties?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS. As stated in CFS Section 5 (Page 9) and prior Q&A #20, awardees across Lots 1 through 5 are required to execute bilateral or multilateral ACAs with each other (the other awarded prime vendors across the five Lots).	Call Instructions and Notes
120	For Phase 2 Demonstration Pitches, the Government has stated that demonstrations may be conducted either virtually via a secure Government-hosted collaboration platform or in person at a designated Government facility in Orlando, FL, and that the Government will not travel to individual contractor facilities. For offerors whose existing TRL 8/9 capability resides on a fielded or fielding system supporting a current program and cannot reasonably be disconnected, transported, or reinstalled at the designated Government facility due to size, configuration, accreditation, operational availability, or program constraints, a pre-recorded video may not provide sufficient fidelity for the Government to verify operational maturity, integration, latency, system responsiveness, hardware/software interaction, and evaluator-directed functionality. In such cases, will the Government permit an in-person observation at an offeror-provided Orlando-area facility at no cost to the Government, provided the location, access procedures, demonstration agenda, evaluation conditions, and evaluator-directed test points are coordinated in advance and applied in a manner that preserves fair and equal evaluation conditions for all offerors?	No. As stated in prior Q&A #4, Phase 2 demonstrations will be conducted either virtually via a secure Government-hosted platform (e.g., MS Teams / Zoom for Gov) or in person at the designated Government facility in Orlando, FL (Central Florida Tech Grove / Partnership IV). To preserve fair, equal, and standardized evaluation conditions across all competing offerors, the Government will not travel to contractor facilities. The same opportunity would have to be afforded to all vendors, including those who are non-local and may be based in other states... It will not be feasible for the Government evaluation team to travel to each vendor's facility. Offerors with fixed or large-scale fielded systems are encouraged to participate via the virtual demonstration option.	Demonstration / Environment

121	Section 5.1 (Updated Phased Solicitations and Awards) states that formal proposal submission deadlines and awards for Lot 2 (Simulation Applications) and Lot 4 (AAR Data Layer) are deferred until completion of the 90-day sandbox and selection of the final Lot 1 Common Core provider (approx. Month 4), at which point the Government-approved SDK and API specifications will be released to Lot 2 and Lot 4 offerors. Q&A responses 25 and 28 (09.15.26 Q&A) likewise confirm the Lot 2/Lot 4 deadline will shift later.1. Whether the 29 September 2026 suspense applies only to Lot 1, Lot 3, and Lot 5 submissions, with Lot 2 and Lot 4 submissions deferred per Section 5.1; However, the acquisition events table in Section 5 lists a single "STE VSW CFS solutions due" date of 29 September 2026 and "Anticipated Lots 1–5 awards" on 13 November 2026, and Section 6.1 requires all solution briefs by 29 September 2026 at 1300 EDT without distinguishing among Lots. 1. Whether the 29 September 2026 suspense applies only to Lot 1, Lot 3, and Lot 5 submissions, with Lot 2 and Lot 4 submissions deferred per Section 5.1; 2. If deferred, whether the Government will publish a separate Lot 2/Lot 4 call notice (e.g., the Lot 2 Application Catalog & Call Notice referenced in Q&A response 51) with its own submission instructions and deadline, and the anticipated timing of that notice; and 3. Whether a Lot 2 solution brief submitted by the 29 September suspense would be evaluated at that time, held for evaluation under the deferred Lot 2 process, or should instead be withheld and submitted in response to the later notice.	Offerors may still submit Solutions Briefs for Lot 2 and 4 on September 29, but it is not required.	Section 5.1
122	In light of the significantly expanded technical scope for RVCT-Air and revised structural OCI governance rules now allowing bidders who plan to bid on Lots 1, 2, or 4 to also bid on Lot 5, will the Government consider extending the Phase 1 proposal submission deadline by two (2) weeks (e.g., to October 13, 2026) to enable offerors to deliver fully compliant, high-quality solution briefs?	No. The Phase 1 Solution Brief submission deadline remains Monday, 29 September 2026 at 1300 EDT for Lots 1, 3, and 5 to maintain an accelerated program schedule to deliver the desired capabilities to the warfighter.	All
123	Section 5.1 explicitly states that formal proposal submission deadlines and awards for Lot 2 (Simulation Applications) and Lot 4 (AAR Data Layer) are deferred until completion of the 90-day sandbox and selection of the final Lot 1 provider (approx. Month 4). However, Section 6.1.2 provides page limits, submission instructions, and content guidelines for Phase 1 submissions across Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 due on September 29, 2026. Are offerors required to submit Phase 1 Volume II Solution Briefs for Lot 2 and Lot 4 on September 29, 2026, or are Phase 1 submissions for Lot 2 and Lot 4 fully deferred until Month 4 post-sandbox?	Phase 1 Volume II submissions for Lot 2 and Lot 4 are fully deferred until Month 4 post-sandbox. Offerors proposing on Lots 2 and 4 will not submit Phase 1 briefs on 29 September 2026.	Section 5.1
124	Section 7.3 states that Phase 2 evaluation criteria will remain the same as Phase 1 for Lots 1, 2, and 4. If Phase 1 submissions for Lots 2 and 4 are deferred until Month 4, will Phase 2 Demonstration Pitches for Lots 2 and 4 also be deferred until after the Month 4 proposal submission?	Yes.	Section 7.3

125	Regarding Offeror's Intent to Submit a Solution, if we previously emailed and completed the form provided in the DRAFT CFS, do we need to state our intention again with the Final CFS?	No, if the initial intent to submit a solution Form was completed and submitted during the DRAFT CFS posting, it has been captured by the Government and resubmitting a new intent Form is not required.	Cover Page
126	Section 6.2 of the Final CFS identifies a new submission requirement: "Vendors are responsible for identifying risks within their submission, as well as providing specific mitigating solutions." However, the instructions do not identify which volume the risks and mitigating solutions should appear in. Please identify which volume(s) the Government expects this information to appear so vendors can be compliant. Please also identify if additional page count is allowed for this additional content, especially if risk information is required in the limited page counts of Volume II & V.	Section 6.2 Overall Risk requirement is associated to the overall project risk for each submission. This requirement is not restricted to specific Lots. If it is applicable to the submission, at the vendors discretion. "Vendors are responsible for identifying risks within their submissions, as well as providing specific mitigating solutions."	Section 6.2
127	DevSecOps Pipeline Baseline: The document states the Lot 5 vendor will "manage the Government-owned DevSecOps CI/CD pipeline." Can the Government clarify if there is a pre-existing baseline toolchain (e.g., based on DoD's Platform One) that will be provided as GFI, or if the Government expects the Lot 5 vendor to propose and stand up this pipeline from a list of approved tools?	Per The Lot 5 scope, the Lot 5 vendor will strive to leverage the Government's investment in the UnITE IDE/DevSecOps environment, however, vendors should propose what they believe is the best solution for the DevSecOps CI/CD pipeline.	Lot 5
128	Software Integration Lab (SIL) GFE: Will the Government provide the physical space and network infrastructure for the Software Integration Lab (SIL), or is the Lot 5 vendor responsible for providing and provisioning the facility and networks as part of our proposal?	The lot 5 vendor will be responsible for providing the physical space and network infrastructure	Lot 5
129	Existing GOTS Baseline: The document states "the Government will make available the complete technical baseline for the current Training Simulation Software (TSS) as GFI." As the Lot 5 integrator and configuration manager, at what point in the acquisition timeline will our team be granted access to this GFI to prepare the SIL environment?	Please review the Final STE VSW CFS, specific attention to Section 4. The Government will make available the complete technical baseline for the current TSS, including all available source code, documentation, and Integrated Development Environments (IDEs), as GFI to all qualified offerors upon request. GFI Distribution Agreement is proved as Attachment 6 and the available GFI is referenced in Attachment 6a. All necessary RVCT hardware units, HAPI, technical manuals, and existing software as Government Furnished Property (GFP)/GFI to the Lot 5 awardee upon contract or agreement award. This GFP will be utilized to establish the physical STE Virtual Software Integration Lab (SIL) for multi-vendor testing and conformance validation.	Lot 5
130	Data Rights & IP Management: As the technical custodian for the system's common APIs and SDKs, what are the Lot 5 vendor's responsibilities regarding the management, storage, and enforcement of data rights and intellectual property from the various Lot 1, 2, and 4 vendors?	Lot 5 serves as the technical repository administrator under direct Government authority. Lot 5 is responsible for maintaining secure repository access controls, enforcing role-based permissions, and ensuring that proprietary codebases belonging to individual vendors are strictly partitioned in accordance with signed Associate Contractor Agreements (ACAs). Lot 5 does not adjudicate or legally enforce data rights; legal enforcement and data rights determinations remain the sole non-delegable authority of the Government Agreements Officer.	Lot 5

131	Definition of "Technical Custodian": Could the Government further define the role of "technical custodian"? For instance, if a Lot 2 vendor's application introduces a critical defect into the core simulation, where does the Lot 5 vendor's responsibility to "troubleshoot" end and the Lot 2 vendor's responsibility to "fix" begin?	Per Section 2 (Demarcation of Responsibilities), Lot 5's responsibility is to execute automated CTS test runs, collect pipeline telemetry, isolate interface failures, and identify the root cause of non-conformance (i.e., whether failure occurs in core transport or application logic). Once Lot 5 provides the objective diagnostic telemetry report to the Government and vendor, Lot 5's role ends. The respective Lot 1 or Lot 2 software provider is contractually responsible for refactoring, fixing, and re-submitting their code to pass conformance.	Lot 1/2
132	Conformance Test Suite (CTS) Authority: The CTS is used as the basis for acceptance. What happens if the Lot 5 integrator's CTS identifies a performance or compliance failure, but the Lot 1 or 2 vendor disputes the finding? What is the formal adjudication process, and what is the Lot 5 vendor's role in it?	Lot 5 acts solely as an objective data provider and does not possess autonomous decision-making authority regarding system compliance or acceptance (CFS Section 2, Page 5). In the event of a disputed test result, the vendor presents its technical justification and telemetry logs to the Government Program Office and Agreements/Contracting Officer/Representative, who retain sole and final authority to adjudicate compliance determinations, grant deviations, or mandate corrective sprints.	Lot 5
133	Could CPE ST3 please clarify if the STE Virtual Software contract is a new requirement or the follow-on work to the existing Training Simulation Software / Training Management Tool (TSS/TMT) contract?	The STE VSW effort is not a follow-on effort and is being solicited from the Army Open Solicitation (AOS) referenced in the cover page. This is a new requirement to execute MOSA and establish a Government as Integrator architecture. While it provides the existing TSS/TMT baseline as GFI for use as a common functional starting point, it is not a direct follow-on contract.	General
134	Evaluation of Lot 5 "Demonstration": For Lots 1, 2, and 4, the product demonstration artifacts are straightforward. For Lot 5, which is a service, can the government clarify that a demo representing a delivery solution to accelerate DevSecOps would meet the request for the demo requirement, even if that actual solution would not necessarily be used?	The Government recognizes that an offeror cannot demonstrate the final, unassumed STE VSW pipeline prior to award. Therefore, an offeror may demonstrate an existing, fielded DevSecOps delivery solution, automated test harness, or pipeline accelerator operational in another defense or commercial enterprise environment as proof of TRL 8/9 maturity. However, the demonstrated solution must directly substantiate the technical approach, methodologies, and tooling capabilities proposed in the offeror's Volume II Technical Concept. An offeror may not submit a disconnected or theoretical demonstration of software tools that have no relevance to the methodologies, architectural practices, and DevSecOps governance they propose to deliver for STE VSW	Lot 5
135	Funding structure for Lot 1. Specifically, is the proposed 90-day sprint for Lot 1 funded as part of the Lot 1 award, or are funds for the 90-day sprint only allocated after the solution has been fully selected and the Lot 1 award has been executed?	The 90-day competitive sandbox is funded as part of the initial Lot 1 prototype awards. The Government intends to award initial prototype agreements to two competing Lot 1 vendors. The down-selected winning Lot 1 provider will subsequently be funded for follow-on development and core integration sprints.	Lot 1

136	If the program's foreign disclosure posture changes, or if a US entity with FOCI mitigation in place, would the Government be open to a Lot 2 or Lot 4 onboarding conversation at that point—and is there a Foreign Disclosure Office point of contact you would suggest we engage in the meantime?	If a vendor is an eligible U.S. legal entity operating under a Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DCSA) approved Foreign Ownership, Control, or Influence (FOCI) Mitigation Agreement (e.g., Special Security Agreement [SSA], Proxy Agreement, or Security Control Agreement) authorizing work on CUI/NOFORN defense systems, or if the Army's formal Foreign Disclosure posture is officially updated, the Government would be open to consideration of submissions for Lot 2 (which features continuous onboarding opportunities) and Lot 4. Offerors must not directly contact the Army Foreign Disclosure Office (FDO) or Program Office personnel regarding this active solicitation. All inquiries regarding foreign participation, FOCI determinations, or disclosure approvals must be directed exclusively through the cognizant Contracting/Agreements Officers identified on Page 1 of the CFS, who will coordinate formally with the FDO on the offeror's behalf.	Lot 2/4
137	Where (Location and Time) can MAK bring an external device to receive the TSS GFI baseline? (Question 29 Answer - was not clear of the location.)	Please reference the GFI request guidance identified in the CFS. Upon formal request to the POCs on page 1 of the CFS, you will be linked in with the responsible POC for coordination.	GFI
138	The Government response to Question #12 answered during the DRAFT STE VSW CSF review noted "The primary ROM pricing in Volume IV must cover the prototype modernization and integration effort (Months 1–9). Commercial Software Licensing: For commercial software (Lots 1, 2, and 4), Offerors must provide their long-term licensing structure, specifically defining: Initial prototype license pricing (covering the initial 9-month period of performance); and Annual recurring enterprise subscription or perpetual maintenance/support fees for follow-on production and fielding across the STE program life cycle." However, this information (specifically the 9-month period of performance) is not reflected in the updated/final CFS released on September 15. Please confirm if ROM pricing for the 9-month period of performance is still what the Government expects to see in Lot 1 Volume IV.	Confirmed. For Lot 1 Volume IV planning ROMs, offerors must structure their estimates around an initial baseline Period of Performance (PoP) of nine (9) months covering core engine prototype modernization and integration. Commercial software pricing in Volume IV should separate the initial 9-month prototype performance cost from recurring annual enterprise subscription or maintenance/sustainment fees for follow-on production.	Lot 1
139	We noted the Government removed the requirement for Phase 4 Competitive Table II STX-V Sandbox in the updates from the Draft to the Final CFS. How does this removal impact the phased solicitation and awards schedules identified in Section 5.1 that references the completion of the 90-day sandbox?	The Government still intends to award two (2) concurrent prototype agreements/contracts for Lot 1 at Phase 3 to compete in a follow-on head-to-head in the physical Software Integration Lab (SIL) in Orlando, FL. The detailed operational parameters, daily testing scripts, and scoring rubrics were removed from the solicitation text because they will be formally refined and finalized jointly with the two awardees after Phase 3 within the first 30 days of award.	Phase 4

140	2.b on Page 15. The CFS states, Lot 3 (HIL Integrator): Detail the engineering methodology for mapping physical GFE RVCT inputs to the HAPI standard, minimizing latency, and the deployment plan for fielded sites. The response to Q&A #11 indicates that fielding's are not within the scope of Lot 3. Are offerors required to provide the deployment plan for the Lot 3 response?	No. Offerors submitting for Lot 3 are NOT required to provide a site deployment plan. Consistent with the response to Q&A #11, physical site delivery, site installation, travel, and fielding across training locations are out of scope for Lot 3. The reference on Page 15 is a legacy text artifact and should be disregarded. An amendment will be issued to clarify. Lot 3 offerors should focus their Volume II narrative strictly on the engineering methodology for mapping physical GFE RVCT inputs to the HAPI/HAL standard, minimizing input latency, and executing hardware integration/test procedures in the Orlando Software Integration Lab (SIL).	Lot 3
141	6.2 Page 17 and 7.2 page 20, Overall Risks. The CFS states that, "Vendors are responsible for identifying risks within their submissions, as well as providing specific mitigating solutions". Where should vendors put this information in their proposals? Since the risk assessment is a finding across all volumes, it is suggested that the risk/mitigation response be located in Volume 1.	Offerors must embed their risk identifications and proposed mitigations directly within Volume II (Technical Concept) and Volume V (Recent and Relevant Experience). Because Volumes I and III are evaluated strictly on acceptable/not acceptable compliance basis, qualitative risk assessments must reside in the evaluated volumes where risk ratings are applied (II and V). The Government does not require a standalone, multi-page risk management plan in Phase 1; rather, evaluators will assess and assign an overall risk rating based on how effectively the offeror identifies potential technical hurdles and articulates realistic mitigations within Volumes II and V.	Risk
142	With the removal of Phase 4, could the Government clarify which Lot 1 tasks and activities Offerors should include in their proposed scope and pricing for the first 90 days of performance?	To clarify, the Government still intends for two Lot 1 awardees to compete head-to-head in the Orlando Software Integration Lab (SIL) following Phase 3 award. The specific operational guidelines and scoring rubrics were removed from the CFS text simply because they will be finalized post-award with the awardees. For the Phase 1 Solution Brief, offerors are submitting a high-level summary and non-binding planning ROM. The Phase 1 Solution Brief must address the offeror's complete architectural strategy to achieve ALL Core Operational Priority Deliverables outlined in Section 1 and Attachment A (Ground Table II live-fire gating, Collective Gunnery Gate for Air, Combined Arms/BFIST integration, Mounted Mission Command concurrency, and open SDK/API architecture). Planning ROM (Volume IV): A high-level, non-binding cost estimate covering the full 9-month prototype effort, with the on-site engineering labor, Orlando SIL travel, and integration support required. The initial 90-day competitive sprint objectives will be refined following Phase 3 award.	Phase 4
143	Please confirm that Offerors should not submit solicitation proposals for Lot 2 and/or Lot 4 on the 29 SEP 2026 solicitations due date. Our interpretation of the final solicitation is that the Government will provide a future solicitation opening announcements for Lots 2 and 4 after the 90-day sandbox and selection of Lot 1.	Confirmed. Offerors should NOT submit Solution Briefs for Lot 2 (Simulation Application Software) or Lot 4 (Training Management & AAR Data Layer) on the 29 September 2026 closing date. The 29 September 2026 deadline applies strictly to Lot 1, Lot 3, and Lot 5.	Lot 2/4

144	I would like to bring an issue to your attention in reference to the Q&A, specifically the government's response to question #24. In summary, the government stated in order to enable offerors to formulate a credible, technically ground proposal offers will have access to TSS technical baseline data by providing an 8 TB capacity storage media. Since the technical data to be distributed by the government is CUI, we are assuming that the storage media must be TAA compliant. The issue we are having is the difficulty in finding a TAA compliant hard drive with 8 TB capacity, and by the time we are able to find one and receive the data from the government it could take an additional week. Transferring this much information can take days. My ask is whether the storage media must be TAA compliant, and if so, would the government allow for an additional week extension to the solution due date.	The drive does not need to be TAA-compliant. The Phase 1 submission deadline remains unchanged (Monday, 29 September 2026 at 1300 EDT)	
145	Two things I'd appreciate your help with: 1. Since I cannot travel to Orlando during the Industry Day window, I wanted to introduce my partnering vendor directly rather than miss the opportunity entirely. 2. If one-on-one sessions can be attended virtually, I'd welcome a slot focused on Lot 5, Enterprise Integration Support. If they're in-person only, I completely understand, and I'd appreciate knowing whether the Government plans any virtual industry engagement later in the acquisition process. We are evaluating participation in Lot 5, most likely as a teaming partner to a Lot 5 integrator rather than as a prime. One point that may be relevant to the Government's interest in Lot 5 independence: the partnering vendor has no simulation software business of any kind and proposes nothing under Lots 1 through 4, so we fall entirely outside the Lot 5 OCI firewall described in the Q&A, with no corporate affiliates to mitigate.	The Government will support alibi virtual one-on-ones. Teaming with an independent entity that has no software stake in Lots 1–4 is fully compliant with the Lot 5 Structural OCI policy. The Government cannot act as a broker or directly facilitate bilateral commercial teaming relationships. Offerors must use the SAM.gov Interested Vendors List (IVL) or communicate independently to execute teaming agreements.	
146	What is the anticipated period of performance, including base period and option periods for each of the Lots?	Prototype execution covers a 9-month period of performance [CFS Section 5.1]. Follow-on production, sustainment, and iterative development will be structured across multi-year option periods in accordance with Section 10.	Draft CFS Call Instructions and Notes
147	What is the anticipated funding range or ceiling for each Lot?	Please reference the Final CFS Amendment 001 Section 5 for approximate ceiling information.	Draft CFS Call Instructions and Notes
148	What is the expected contract type CPFF or FFP?	The Government is not specifying a specific Contract or CLIN type. However, please note, the Government requirement is defined as being COTS, GOTS, Hybrid, or Alternate. The Government believe that all requirements will be clearly defined to support a more equal risk arrangement contract or agreement.	Draft CFS Awarding Instrument
149	Please identify the LOT 5 Government-furnished software, licenses and source repositories.	The Lot 5 vendor will strive to leverage the Government's investment in the UnITE IDE/DevSecOps environment to facilitate operations and management of the STE Virtual Software. All existing GFI is listed in Attachment 06 and are available now upon request	Draft CFS Lot 5 / Call Instructions and Notes

150	For Lot 5, what hardware and network connectivity will be provided for the SIL?	The Government will issue a formal amendment to the CFS to clarify this. The Lot 5 awardee must provide, lease, secure, accredit, and operate the brick-and-mortar physical SIL facility in the greater Orlando, FL area and manage all internal simulation and development local area networks (LANs), switches, and server racks. The Government will not furnish real estate, physical space, utilities, or lab networks.	Draft CFS Lot 5 / Call Instructions and Notes
151	When will GFP/GFI be available relative to award and the first 30-day SIL milestone?	HAPI documentation and TSS GFI software are available upon request now. GFE RVCT units will be delivered promptly to the Lot 5 Orlando facility upon agreement award (~13 November 2026)	Draft CFS Call Instructions and Notes / Phase 4 Sandbox
152	Does an existing Conformance Test Suite exist, or must Lot 5 design, procure hardware and implement the CTS?	Lot 5 must design, procure hardware, and implement the CTS	Draft CFS Lot 5 / Lot 5 Evaluation Criteria
153	What cybersecurity classification and Impact Levels must the development environment, SIL, repositories, and test environments support?	The development pipeline and SIL must support CUI//SP-CTI and target DoD Impact Level 4/5 (IL4/IL5).	Draft CFS Cybersecurity and Rapid Accreditation
154	Please clarify Lot 5's RMF/ATO responsibilities, including whether Lot 5 is responsible for operating the environment only, preparing accreditation artifacts, maintaining an ATO package, or supporting a Government-led authorization process	Lot 5 acts as repository host and package aggregator for the continuous Authority to Operate (cATO) pathway, while Lot 1–4 vendors deliver component-level Software Bills of Materials (SBOMs) and STIG-hardened container artifacts.	Draft CFS Cybersecurity and Rapid Accreditation
155	The government states that Lot 5, "owns the "digital motherboard" (API Gateway, Message Bus, and HAPI standard) on behalf of, and under the direct authority of, the Government.". Can the Government confirm that these artifacts are managed standards for reference not runtime execution?	Please reference the Final CFS Section 2 for revised information related to your question.	Draft CFS Lot 5 / Demarcation of Responsibilities
156	Will the SIL be provided in a government owned environment or does the vendor need to provide the facility? If so, will the Government provide the facility requirements for square footage, power, HVAC, high bay, etc.	Please reference the Final CFS Section 2 for revised information related to your question.	Draft CFS Lot 5 / Call Instructions and Notes
157	Can the government confirm that OCI constraints only apply to lots in this contract and not apply to other existing or future contracts?	The Government has specific OCI requirements defined for the effort identified in the STE VSW CFS. The Government can not speak to other existing or future requirements that are not defined in the STE VSW CFS solicitation.	Draft CFS Lot 5 - OCI Firewall / Organizational Conflict of Interest

158	Does Volume III's video and public API/SDK documentation site requirements apply to Lot 5?	Lot 5 offerors are exempt from public API portal links for non-commercial code, but must submit the 5-minute video demonstrating operational DevSecOps pipelines, automated testing harnesses, or repository governance tools	Draft CFS Volume III - Product Demonstration Artifacts
159	Please provide required font, margins, page size, file naming, email subject, email attachment-size limits, and instructions for files too large for email.	Please reference Final CFS Amendment 001 Section 5.	Draft CFS Phase 1 - Solution Brief
160	Will the Government clarify or confirm that using an 11 x 17 or tabloid count as 1 page?	Please reference Final CFS Amendment 001 Section 5.	Draft CFS Volume II - Anonymous Technical Concept Submission
161	Deferred Solicitations (Lots 2 and 4): Formal proposal submission deadlines and awards for Lot 2 (Simulation Applications) and Lot 4 (MR Data Layer) are deferred until completion of the 90-day sandbox and selection of the final Lot 1 Common Core provider (approx. Month 4). However, the sam.gov listing still has Lot 2 down select on 2 Oct and demonstration on 20-22 Oct. Vendor's products are proven and TRL 9, but they are always improving. We would prefer to have one submission based on our 2027 products rather than updating multiple submissions to remain current with our latest technology. We release software updates every quarter. Can you please confirm that Lot 2 only vendors will not be submitting on 29 Sept and will not be doing demonstrations on 20-22 Oct? Vendors would love to still participate in those demos if allowed, but understand if Lot 1,3,5 are the priorities for that event and Lot 2 vendors will need to wait.	This has been addressed in the sam.gov posting and also within the STE VSW CFS amendment 001.	Lots 2 & 4 submission
Please note, responses to the following questions are applicable to the data referenced in Amendement 003 and may differ from previously provided responses. Please ensure that you review all questions and apply the updated information from STE VSW CFS Amendement 003 when making solution development decision.			
162	Does the requirement exclude any non-U.S. affiliate or subcontractor, including where its work does not require access to NOFORN information?	The STE Virtual Software solution baseline is currently designated as CUI//SP-CTI / NOFORN; therefore, foreign entities and non-U.S. citizens are not eligible for prime awards or unmitigated participation.	
163	Is there an opportunity for the Government to reconsider the Foreign Disclosure position, including REL TO USA, AUS or another approved arrangement for Australian participation?	An Australian exception / REL TO USA, AUS arrangement is not authorized at this time.	
164	If the current position remains for Lot 3, could it be reconsidered for the later Lot 2 continuous-onboarding opportunity?	While the baseline security posture remains CUI//SP-CTI/NOFORN for initial awards, the Government will reassess foreign disclosure and export control release baselines prior to issuing subsequent rolling Lot 2 "App Store" catalog announcements.	
165	The Government released the list of interested vendors yesterday. Can the Government provide Point of Contact information (name, phone number, e-mail) for each of the vendor companies to facilitate teaming discussions / partnering opportunities for this effort in accordance with the Government's Solicitation and Answers to Questions?	The ACC APG Office of Small Business Programs (OSBP) representative supporting our office is Ms. Cindy Sierra her email is cindy.a.sierra.civ@army.mil. Please feel free to reach out to her with any capabilities you may have and any questions regarding partnership requests.	

166	The government stated in CFS amendment 2, page 11, "The total combined value of all awarded Lots is approximately \$250M." Understanding the approximate \$250M value of the effort across the 5 lots, is that for the 9-month effort under the scope of this call for solutions or for an extended period of time thereafter? If so, what is that time period?	Please reference Section 5 of CFS Amendment 003. Program Lifecycle, Multi-Year Options, and Performance Off-Ramps: While initial awards execute a nine (9) month prototype period of performance to validate core software stability, hardware integration, and Table II live-fire gating, the STE Virtual Software (VSW) program is planned and funded across the FYDP as a multi-year effort with an estimated overall programmatic ceiling of \$250M. •The Government intends to structure resulting awards with a 9-month base prototype period, followed by pre-priced option periods covering a five (5) year lifecycle.
167	The submission instructions state that "All solution briefs must conform to the guidance outlined in Section 6 and be sent electronically to all Point of Contracts (POCs) for Solution Brief Submission, identified on Page 1 of the Call for Solution", it is further stated that "File size shall be broken up to no larger than 5MB size per email submission". Can you confirm that we are able to submit our entire proposal via DOD SAFE, and only if submitting via email do we need to break it up into 5MB size.	Please reference Section 6.1 of the CFS Amendment 003. File size shall be broken up to no larger than 30MB size per email submission. The entire proposal is not permitted to be submitted via DoD Safe. Please reference Section 6.1.3 of CFS Amendment 003. Product Demonstration Video ONLY, may be submitted via DoD Safe with password and phrase provided via email to the POCs identified on the cover page of STE VSW CFS.
168	For Volume I: Valid SAM.gov registration, is the intent that the full SAM Certs and Reps should be included in Volume I, or just the cover page showing the registration?	The requirement does not require Certs and Reps, only the cover page showing the registration.
169	Do you know when all companies can expect to see the next amendment release?	The Government intent is to issue the CFS Amendment 003 no later than 10/02/2026.
170	GFI access. Q&A response 24 states the TSS baseline source, documentation, and interface specifications	Access to GFI to a foreign owned US entity is not authorized.
171	Ingest sizing. For a representative platoon run on the current TSS, what are the estimated message rate, exercise duration, and entity count on the message bus? Is any example or sample data available so offerors can size ingestion demands realistically?	Please reference Section 3 in the CFS Amendment 003 for targeted use case. Sample data and message rates will be entirely dependent on the eventual Lot 1 awardee, hence the delay of Lots 2 and 4.
172	Lot 4 ingest and persistence load. We understand the 50,000 active entity, 60Hz figure is a Lot 1 Common Core Software requirement. What portion of that data is Lot 4 expected to ingest and persist, and what concurrent load should offerors plan for in terms of number of sites, concurrent exercises, and crews per exercise?	
173	Trainees per session. How many trainees, as distinct from simulated entities, are expected per session at the crew, platoon, and company levels?	Please reference Section 3 in the CFS Amendment 003. Number of trainees varies depending on type and echelon of unit. However, an Abrams manned module requires 4 operators, a Bradley requires 3. Dismounts all operate individually on RVCT-S laptops. Total trainee numbers can be extrapolated from there.
174	Data retention. What retention applies to raw telemetry, derived AAR outputs, and Digital Training Records, and who sets that policy, the Army, the Lot 5 integrator, or the Lot 4 vendor?	The Government will establish all policies with regards to retention. This will be refined at a later date prior to the subsequent calls for Lot 2 and 4 submissions.
175	Object storage. Is Government furnished, S3 compatible object storage available at the training sites, and if so what throughput can it sustain? If not, should standing up and licensing that storage be within Lot 4	This will be determined as Lot 1 and Lot 5 implementation becomes finalized.
176	Operations and continuity. Who is responsible for backups, software upgrades, capacity growth, and disaster recovery of the training record store, the Lot 4 vendor, the Lot 5 integrator, or the Army?	Shared responsibility: The Lot 4 vendor provides the software backup/restore utilities, schema migration tools, and application upgrades. The Lot 5 integrator manages pipeline deployment and lab infrastructure. The Government/Site Operations team executes operational system backups and disaster recovery procedures in fielded environments.
177	Hardware. Is the Lot 4 vendor expected to acquire the hardware required to meet Lot 4 requirements, or only to provide recommendations while the Government or Lot 5 provides the infrastructure?	Lot 4 is not expected to acquire hardware for this effort.
178	Hosting posture. Should Lot 4 assume an air gapped environment with all data hosted locally at the training centers, or is a cloud or hybrid hosting model, such as the optional Lot 5 hosting appendix, in play for the data layer?	The Government is open to all potential solutions and will be dependent on the Lot 5 implementation and evolution over time.

179	Enterprise licensing basis. For pricing the flat, STE VSW program wide enterprise license, will the Government provide approximate planning quantities, such as number of sites and nodes, total users, RVCT and S/SVT simulators, and Points of Need, as a common basis, or should offerors state and price to their own stated assumptions?	Please reference the STE VSW CFS Amendment 003 Section 6.1.4 Program Planning Baseline and RVCT Quantities: For the purpose of structuring commercial licensing models and Volume IV planning ROMs, offerors should utilize a baseline of 22 planned fielded sites worldwide supporting simultaneous operation of 348 RVCT-Ground suites, 82 RVCT-Air suites, 1,476 RVCT-Soldier laptops, 270 TMT laptops, and 102 Instructor/Operator stations.
180	What form is the USG expecting be used to satisfy the U.S. Security & Recipient Eligibility?	Please reference the CFS Amendment 003, Section 7.1.1
181	From Slide 23 of the Industry Day slide deck, do all parts listed in Volume I (Mandatory Technical Readiness and Compliance) apply to Lot 5 Offers? I believe it was stated that OWT/OGC Ingestion link or screen capture is not required for Lot 5 submission. Is this correct?	Lot 5 offerors are exempt from the OWT ingestion proof requirement. Proof of One World Terrain (OWT) / OGC ingestion applies strictly to offerors proposing solutions with a 3D terrain/rendering engine. All other administrative items in Volume I apply to Lot 5.
182	Is the Risk & Mitigation Plan required for Lot 5 Offerors?	Yes. All offerors across all Lots must identify technical, schedule, and execution risks and mitigations. For Lot 5, this includes things like facility mobilization, SIL stand-up, and CTS execution risks
183	I want to confirm that sending our solution file via email to the 5 POCs listed on page 1 of the CFS satisfies the "sent electronically" requirement. Is this correct?	Please reference the STE VSW CFS Amendment 003 cover page for POCs. Yes, submission to the POC referenced on the cover page qualifies as "sent electronically."
184	We left with the understanding that use of DOD Safe to submit our video is acceptable. Is so, while a 5MB video limit is the goal for transmittal purposes, is it acceptable for our video size to be larger than 5MB if DOD Safe is used for transmittal? Please confirm?	Please reference response to question 169. File size limitation for video submission using DoD Safe are limited to the size restrictions referenced on the DoD Safe webpage.