

1. The following questions were submitted in response to this RWP. The Government’s responses are provided below:

Number	Section	Question	Answer
Amendment 0002			
1	2.1	Please confirm that the reference to 3.4 should properly be 3.5 (evaluation criteria)	Yes. Confirmed.
2	2.2	Section 2.3 is actually titled "affirmation of business status certification." As such, is the signed intellectual property statement the information that is required under section 3.5.6 (Data Rights Assertion)? If so, should the offeror add a signature block thereto, similar to that on page 10 for the Business Affirmation Status? If not, please provide the appropriate form(s) to complete the "Signed Intellectual Property/Agreements/Disclosures" requirement.	The RWP Section 2.2 bullet 2, is amended to read, “Completed Data Rights Assertion Table (Section 3.5.6)”
3	2.2	Please confirm that the reference to 2.4 should properly be 2.3.	Yes. Confirmed.
4	2.2	Please confirm that the references to sub-sections 3.4.1-3.4.7 should properly be 3.5.1-3.5.7.	Yes. Confirmed.
5	3	Please confirm that the references to sub-sections 3.4.1-3.4.7 should properly be 3.5.1-3.5.7.	Yes. Confirmed.

Number	Section	Question	Answer
Amendment 0002			
6	3.3	Please confirm that the reference to sub-section 3.4.1 should properly be 3.5.1.	Yes. Confirmed.
7	3.5.5	Please confirm that the three references to table 3 should properly be table 2. Table 3 is actually the data rights assertion.	Yes. Confirmed.
8	3.5.5	Please confirm that the ROM narrative should be free-form text provided in addition to the ROM tables and not included in the ROM tables with the required figures.	Yes, a ROM narrative is required along with the ROM Template,
9	3.5.6	Please confirm that the response to this section is not included in the 15 page limit, as this table may be extensive given the number of vendors proposed.	The 15 limited pages should be devoted exclusively to the offeror's technical response.
10	4.1	Please confirm that the two references to sub-section 3.4 should properly be sub-section 3.5.	Yes. Confirmed.
11	1.2	In order that we propose a solution best capable of integrating with the referenced DoD CC/S/A/FAs, can the Government provide us with a list of tools and vendors associated with the ICAM capabilities established by those DoD CC/S/A/FAs?	We're vendor and tool agnostic, and cannot provide a list of products or vendors. Those will be up to the discretion of those who develop any given approach. The ICAM solution must be flexible enough to accommodate a diverse set of data sources and consumers throughout its lifecycle.

Number	Section	Question	Answer
Amendment 0002			
12	1.2 and 3.5	<p>Please confirm that the ROM requested in section 3.5.5 is meant to cover only the work scope in section 1.2 starting with the beginning of preliminary prototype in technical phase 1 and extending through completion of pre-production/acceptance testing in technical phase 2 (i.e. the ROM is NOT intended to cover production, deployment, and sustainment that may be done either under a FAR-based contract or a production OT agreement).</p> <p>Also note that the ROM tables in section 3.5.5 do not currently include production, deployment, and sustainment phases. The ROM tables are limited to concept exploration, design prototype, and test & evaluation.</p>	<p>The ROM is meant to cover only Technical Phases I and II of this OTA, and <i>not</i> any follow-on production. The latter, if authorized, will be awarded under a new OTA or separate FAR-based contract.</p> <p>That is correct. The OTA only references (and requires Offeror pricing for) the two technical research and development phases described in the Request for Proposal (not production, deployment, or O&M except as specified herein).</p>
13	1.2,1.2, and 4.2	To provide a compliant and properly scalable technical solution with accurate ROM estimates, please identify the number of users anticipated for both the prototype and the production/deployment/ sustainment phases.	There is no production/deployment/sustainment phase authorized under this OTA. Should the Government elect to award an ICAM production effort in response to the solution selected in Technical Phase II, it will do so under a separate OTA or FAR-based contract.
14	1.2.1.6	What Mobile Device Management solution/tools is DISA currently using,	DISA is open to any appropriate MDM solution, and anticipates contractor recommendation of the most suitable platform.

Number	Section	Question	Answer
Amendment 0002			
		which are required to be integrated with the ICAM solution?	
15	1.2.3.4	In regards to Master User Record (MUR) insider-threat analytics, does DISA have any specific solution or tools in place that should or shall be integrated?	The data must be consumable through standard interfaces by any analytic solution.
16	2.1	What is the assumed start date for the ROM? The ROM template references fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022.	Initial award date (to 2-3 competitors) is anticipated for 16 December 2019 (which is FY 2020). Government fiscal years run from 01 October through 30 September, and are named for the year in which the majority of performance months fall (i.e., FY 2020 is 01 Oct 2019-30 Sept 2020). The OTA is expected to run through the end of FY 2021 (i.e. 30 Sept 2021). Table 2 is revised to remove the FY2022 column.
17	3.5.1	Please confirm that the numbering of the sub-sections under 3.5.1 (Technical) should properly be 3.5.1.1 through 3.5.1.8 versus 3.5.2.1 through 3.5.2.8.	Yes. Confirmed.
18	3.5.2.8	Please confirm that any resumes provided are considered outside the page count limitation.	The 15 limited pages should be devoted exclusively to the offeror's technical response.
19	3.5.7	For the offeror's response to the RWP requirement: "Insert a brief description of facility(ies)/equipment proposed for use on the project", please confirm this can be addressed by adding bullets to the	Yes, but please be certain to annotate your response to this question to reflect the fact that it is referenced in "Participant Contribution and Significance to Overall Project" column in Table 4.

Number	Section	Question	Answer
Amendment 0002			
		"Participant Contribution and Significance to Overall Project" column in Table 4?	

Number	Section	Question	Answer
20	General	Please provide the requirements for on premise or hosted solution for the prototype demonstration.	Please refer to the RWP, or clarify the intent of the questions. The demonstrations will be via videoconference.
21	General	Please provide the number of single user records/accounts to be handled demonstrated in Phase II.	The solution must be scalable for N number of users.
22	General	Please provide the number of users that have to be issued credentials allowing their log on to prototype system and their role (IAM administrators, Auditors, DDOS/IPS/FIM/penetration testers etc.)	The solution must be scalable for N number of users.
23	General	Please provide the requirements and scope relevant to the six initial customer applications that will guide the dimensions of the prototype.	This will apply to Phase II of the program, but is not relevant either to your initial response to the RWP, or to the down-selected awardees' design of a solution in Phase I.

24	General	Please provide the interphase channel types including mobile devices if required.		Please clarify the question or see the RWP.
25	General	Please provide detail on the downstream DoD component system that will need to be integrated with IDM system.		The ICAM demo solution must be compatible with the disparate agency-specific systems currently in use throughout DoD. The ultimate solution developed in Phase II of the OTA will anticipate system evolution and make provisions for expansion or modification.
26	General	What ICAM are we replacing?		This OTA does not involve the “replacement” of any ICAM; rather, its intent is to provide an over-arching DoD ICAM that subsumes and integrates all of the existing DoD ICAMs.
27	General	Why is it being replaced? Is it at EoL, underperforming, or just needs to be modernized?		Please see the response to question 26, above.
28	General	How many services will this affect? How many are needed for this effort?		Please clarify how many ‘what’ are needed? (services? FTEs?)
29	General	Do we interface with or replace the existing services?		See the response to question 26, above.
30	General	What impact does ICAM being in the cloud have to the services?		The ICAM integration design must be capable of being hosted in any number of environments. Part of this task is to identify the optimal environment.

31	General	Is there a preference for Open Source vs licensed software?		Please see the RWP.
32	General	What is the expected life cycle with regards to licensing, cost and maintenance?		This OTA does not include production and deployment; life-cycle costing, licensing, and maintenance will not be considerations until and unless the successful solution results in a follow-on production award (via a second OTA, or a FAR-based contract), except for the licensing associated with the proof of concept at the end of Phase II.
33	1.2, 3, 4.2	Based on section 1.2, 3, and 4.2 of the RWP, there are two developmental phases, can the Government please clarify the offeror's RWP response by November 5, 2019 due is only for technical phase I?		The Contractor's solution and demo (Phase I) are required on 05 November 2019 (unless extended). DISA will down-select the best two or three solutions offered, and the two or three successful contractors will continue researching and developing their approaches toward creation of a prototype. Please see the RWP for further details.
34	1.2, 3, 4.2	Based on section 1.2, 3, and 4.2 of the RWP, can the Government please clarify that the ROM price for the RWP responses will be required only in Technical Phase II after technical phase I?		The ROM is for one year. Technical Phase I will be funded by the Government @ NTE \$600K per awardee. Technical Phase II will be negotiated by the Government and the creator of the optimal ICAM solution from the ROM pricing.
35	1.2, 3, 4.2	Can the Government please confirm that the ROM price is not required for November 5, 2019 due date submission?		See Question #34, above.

36	3.5.5	Please confirm the Table 2 (Rough Order of Magnitude Cost/Price Template) is the template for pricing submission.		Yes, that correct.
37	2.2, 3, 3.3	Can the Government please confirm that this is supposed to read 3.5.1 - 3.5.7 instead of 3.4.1 - 3.4.7?		See the response to Question 4.
38	5.5	Since there are no specific integration points or data defined for Technical Phase I, can the Government please provide an estimate of the security clearance level required?		Please clarify the question: the security clearance level of the presenters? Of the hypothetical users? Of the overall system? The highest level of clearance required is SECRET, for personnel and systems. The demonstrations at Offeror facilities shall be unclassified.
39	5.5	If properly segregated from DoD data and systems, will personnel with no security clearance be able to participate in the development of the Technical Phase I prototype?		Technical Phase I involves no classified material. However, the participation of foreign nationals without U.S. Government clearances is not authorized.
40	1.2.3	Are there any other requirements around Privileged Access Management?		No. The requirements are as stated in the RWP.
41	1.2.3	Should the prototype manage this type of access/account?		What type of access/account (please clarify).

42	1.2	CNSSD No. 507 is written for the secret network. What network (s) are this prototype to be deployed to, and will they be NIPR and SIPR?		The over-arching solution is expected to be DoD-enterprise network agnostic, but the prototype will be demonstrated on NIPR. (The system functionality should be independent of network deployment, since only the data being aggregated and transmitted will raise the level of classification.)
43	1.2	Should cross-domain identity be discussed?		The RWP requires all respondents to address existing ICAM components, and to provide scalability to incorporate future requirements. If cross-domain identity is integral to your solution, yes, it should be incorporated.
44	1.2	What about disconnected networks within each of these networks?		Please clarify the question.
45	1.2	Will the government accept SaaS provider solutions that are not currently FedRAMP'd?		SaaS is acceptable. However, if the solution involves functionality that is not FedRAMP-approved, the Offeror should explain how and when it would obtain such approval, and at what cost.
46	1.2	What about FedRAMP'd solutions?		Please see Question #45 above.

47	1.2	Should all solutions be able to be run disconnected from the Internet?		The system functionality must include the ability for agency ICAMs to operate independently if disconnected from the DoD-wide federated solution.
48	1.2.2.11	Since Audit Role and Compliance Services is only available under AAP, is it assumed that audit services aren't to be integrated with the IDP and MUR services?		This capability is not relevant to the required AAP functionality.
49	1.2.2.11	The government uses the term "Per-asset." Can the government provide additional context around this?		Auditing capabilities apply to both individual users and the equipment they utilize.
50	1.2.2.11	Is this considered privileged accounts? Service accounts? User devices? Integrated Applications?		Is <i>what</i> "considered privileged accounts? Service accounts? User devices? Integrated Applications?" Please clarify.
51	1.2.3.3	Please expand on the government's need to audit privileged and unprivileged accounts with the MUR vs. AAP solution?		Please refer to the RWP. The need for audit capability exists across AAP, IdP, and MUR, and these are the selected parameters for auditing any aspect of the DoD enterprise.
52	3.3	Can the government provide more on the expectations of the oral presentations, including how long they expect them to be?		We have not specified a limit because the length of the presentation will depend upon the quality of the content. Please make your demo as long as it takes to adequately and comprehensively explain your approach (which should generally not take longer than 120

				minutes, including time for questions and comments).
53	1.2.3.4	Can the government provide more details around its expectations on this item (Enabling insider threat analytics)?		Please clarify the question. The proposed solution is expected to enable insider threat analytics, since such threats are increasingly detrimental. The means of such enablement is up to the candidate.
54	1.2.3.4	Is this an assumption that the data contained in this system will provide data in support of insider threat analytics vs. will identify insider threats on its own?		Please see the response to question #53 above.
55	3.5.5	If vendors are to propose licenses for software, how many user licenses should we assume?		Please see the response to question #32 above.
56	3.5.5	How big is the scope of users, partners, external, and service accounts?		The requirement is DoD-wide; therefore, the scope is all incumbent and future DoD users, partners, external users, and service accounts.
57	3.5.5	Can we assume some sort of enterprise license agreement?		No licensing will be required for Phase I. Licensing appropriate to the proposed solution will be required for Phase II, and will depend upon the composition thereof.
58	3.5.5	How would this differ for the Prototype, the 6 initial application		Please clarify.

		integrations, and the eventual full implementation via Technical Phase II?		
59	3.5.5	Without a place of performance, how would the government assume we estimate ODCs/Travel?		Travel under this OTA will be approved (and funded) on a case-by-case basis via an Other Direct Cost (ODC) travel CLIN. It is not necessary for respondents to estimate travel at this time.
60	3.5.5	Do we assume the government will pay hosting bills for the services if they run on Cloud 1 (AWS/Azure) or do we need to include estimates for that as well?		This will be negotiated by the Government and the successful offeror in Technical Phase II, and will depend upon the configuration of the successful solution.
61	2.2	Section 2.3 Does not contain the Signed Intellectual Property Statements/Agreements/Disclosures. Instead, the section contains the Affirmation of Business status Certification.		Please see the response to Question #2, above.
62	2.2	Will DISA please confirm the Affirmation of Business Status Certification located in Section 2.3, should be included in (the missing) Section 2.4?		Please see the response to Question #2, above.
63	2.2	Section 2.4 is missing from the RWP. Will DISA please amend the RWP to include Section 2.4 and its content?		Please see the response to Question #2, above.

64	2.2	Section 3.4 does not contain the Evaluation Criteria. Will DISA please confirm the correct section cross reference for the Evaluation Criteria in Section 2.2, is “all Evaluation Criteria Factors (sub-sections 3.5.1-3.5.7)?”		Evaluation Criteria are contained in Section 3.5 of the RWP.
65	2.2	Will DISA please amend the RWP to include the corrected cross reference to Evaluation Criteria in Section 2.2?		Please see the response to Question 4, above.
66	3.5.2.8	Will DISA please confirm that resumes and contingent letters of commitment are not included in the 15 page limit for the RWP response?		The 15 limited pages should be devoted exclusively to the offeror’s technical response.
67	2.1	Will the Gov’t please confirm Offerors’ responses to Sections 3.5.2-7 (Security, Viability, Schedule, ROM Narrative, Data Rights Assertion, Participants...) will be excluded from the 15-page limit for the technical response?		The 15 limited pages should be devoted exclusively to the offeror’s technical response.
68	2.2	Will the Gov’t please clarify the signature requirement for IP Statements / Disclosures? Section 3.5.6 provides a table for completion, whereas Section 2.2 references “Signed IP Statements” and cross references Section 2.3.		Please see Question #61, above.

69	2.2	Will the Government please confirm the reference to Section 2.3 within the Signed IP statements requirement is a typo, and should instead reference Section 3.5.6?		Confirmed.
70	3.5.4, 3.5.5	Will the Government please clarify the requirements for schedule and ROM submission with initial white paper responses? Should Offerors include a schedule and ROM to accomplish Technical Phase I for a preliminary prototype within forty-five (45) days, a schedule to accomplish Technical Phase II for a full prototype for the two (2) year period of performance, or both?		Please see the responses to Question 12, 33, and 34.
71	1.2	Technical Phase II - How many Identity repositories will have to be addressed for the six initial customer applications?		The number of initial customer applications may vary, depending upon DoD CIO's evolving requirements at the time of release of the RFPP. Response to the question will therefore be addressed at that time.
72	1.2	Technical Phase II - Will the production, deployment, and sustainment be addressing DISA's CONUS and OCONUS environments?		Yes. However, please note that production and deployment are not part of the current OTA. Should the Government authorize production and deployment, it will do so under a follow-on OTA or FAR-based contract.
73	1.2	Technical Phase II - Will the production, deployment, and sustainment include TAC/DIL environments?		Please see Question #72, above.

74	1.2.3	How many identities should be assumed for the prototype, and additionally, how many identities should be assumed in production, deployment, and sustainment?		The ICAM initiative is DoD-wide.
75	3.2	Please confirm that the \$600K figure is intended to include the acquisition of licenses for the software tools for the prototype.		If your demonstration solution includes the need for licensing in Technical Phase I, then the cost of that licensing must be deducted from the \$600K.
76	3.0	“Section 3.4.1 – 3.4.7” Please confirm the sections are 3.5.1 – 3.5.7		Please see the responses to questions #4 and #5 above.
77	3.5	Page 12, “final submission” Please clarify if final submission is specific to phase I or will there be “final submissions” for each phase?		Final submission is for the White Paper submittal.
78	3.5.3	“sales and cost” As a privately held company we request the cost information be requested if we are down selected for Phase II.		As stated in the RWP, the Government’s assessment as to whether the company has the technical capability and resources to effectively accomplish the work delineated herein. The Government needs this information to determine Business Viability. Please submit the information as requested.
79	2.1, 3.5.7	Pages 8, 23, “Participants” Please confirm the list of participants does not count towards page count.		The 15 limited pages should be devoted exclusively to the offeror’s technical response.

80	3.5.2.8	Page 13, Key Personnel, Would the government consider excluding resumes and contingent letters of commitment from page count?		See the response to question #79 (et al.) above.
81	General	If our white paper is chosen, what is the expected date to award OTAs under Phase 2?		That will depend upon the number (and quality) of the solutions submitted. As indicated in the RWP, the Government's intent is (first) to award two to three contractors
82	General	Please confirm the ROM costing required is that to create a technical pilot under Technical Phase 1 (TRL4), following award under Phase IV of this RWP, and should not include any costs to perform Phase II (Initial Prototype) under this RWP.		The Government will fund Technical Phase I (comprised of the research and development of an ICAM solution) at NTE \$600K for each of the two or three awardees; the ROM applies to Technical Phase II (which will entail pre-production development of a prototype), not including the cost of proposal preparation in response to DISA's Request for Project Proposals (RFPP).
83	General	Are there specific existing DoD provisioning services we should be considering at this stage?		Provisioning services will be dependent upon your solution, and must be functional DoD enterprise-wide.
84	General	Are we to assume that provisioning of accounts in disparate systems, and retrieval of user directories for ingestion can be performed in those systems via API calls or other standard methods?		Standard interfaces are appropriate.

85	General	For manual data ingest, is the vision that this is a one-time event per legacy application, and users will not be created outside of the proposed ICAM after this ingestion?		Please explain the context of the question, since it is somewhat ambiguous, and our response will depend upon your discrete meaning.
86	General	How common are user name clashes between disparate systems, e.g. can two people named John Smith have the same userid in different systems?		Since the system envisioned by this OTA is DoD-wide, yes, it's entirely possible that username clashes will occur. The one-person/one-record approach will apply, and it is up to the developer to devise a viable solution.
87	General	Can the government provide sizing and scope guidelines (number of users/identities, instances, architecture, etc.) for respondents to use in the development of their ROMs?		The solution must be DoD-wide. Please see the response to Question #56.
88	General	Does the government have a test and evaluation plan they can share with the community?		No: the respondent will be required to develop its own T&E plan, tailored to its solution.
89	1.2	Will the Government please identify the place of performance for the Technical Phase I prototype demonstration within a government managed lab environment?		Demos will be briefed electronically from the Offeror's facility, and not in a Government laboratory.
90	1.2	Similarly, will the Government please identify the place of performance for the Technical Phase II prototype operation in a		There is no "production environment" contemplated by this OTA. The place of performance of the Phase II prototype will be the successful offeror's facility.

		production environment for integration with six initial applications?		
91	1.2.2	What is the scope of Automated Account provisioning?		The scope of this initiative is DoD-enterprise wide.
92	1.2.2	Please clarify or limit the definition concerning if tokens/devices/certificates have been installed, given, etc. Is this an authentication of enabling existing tokens/devices/certificates into appropriate security policies?		Please clarify your question.
93	1.2.3	How would this master user record relate to other CCSAs deployed ICAM solutions?		Please clarify, including the meaning of the abbreviation CCSA?
94	1.2.3	Are other solutions partnered and syncing with one another?		Please clarify the question. All ICAM functionalities must be integrated and synched.
95	1.2.3	Is this solution a master communication in terms of authority to update identities of personnel (for example multiple records for a singular entity that exists in more than one system)?		No. MUR is at DoD level and aggregates the input from all of the other systems so that diverse users can access it when needed, but it is not the origin of the input.

96	2.2	The format for "Signed Intellectual Property Statements/Agreements/ Disclosures (section 2.3)" is missing from the solicitation. Is there a template for the vendors to fill? If not, what type of documents does DISA OTA expect as a response to this section?		See response to Question #2, above.
97	3.5	The solicitation has provided several tables and templates for vendors to fill in, for e.g. 3.5.4 Schedule, 3.5.6 Data Rights Assertion, 3.5.7 Participants. Will the responses to these tables and templates be counted in the page limit?		Please see the response to Question #66 (et al.).
98	Page 4	Technical phase I test - Will that be an integration test to a single or more applications, and to what extent will we demonstrate the Identity Management platform?		The demo will be the Offeror's choice; you can demonstrate as many applications or platforms as you think feasible or necessary to effectively show the capabilities of your concept.
99	Page 4	Technical phase II: Where will the point development take place in order to optimize resource planning?		Please clarify the meaning of your question.
100	Page 4	Identity Provider: What multifactor authentication is presently being used and needs to be integrated?		The solution is to be DoD-enterprise wide, and must be capable of integrating all of the various multifactor authentications used by DoD components, as well as scalable to accommodate future applications.

101	Page 4	Automated Account Provisioning: Who will be operating the AAP and who will assign the rights?		Please explain the relevance of the question. The solution is to be DoD-enterprise wide.
102	Page 4	MUR: Who will be operating the AAP and who will assign the rights?		Please explain the relevance of the question. The solution is to be DoD-enterprise wide.
103	Page 5	ICAM Enablement Services: Will that eventually be designed as a basis for a Trusted Authentication Partner?		Please explain the intent of this question.
104	1.2.1 (pin 4)	Is this also for physical access and will it cover anything from contact to contactless access?		Yes.
105	1.2.1.6	What is the type size of this data?		The system must be able to accommodate all types of DoD data in a range of sizes.
106	1.2.2	Who will grant rights and access to the AAP account provisioning?		The authorized Government or third party designee(s).
107	1.2.2.2	Does this include a self service KYC solution?		Please clarify, and provide the meaning of KYC.

108	1.2.2.3	Please provide examples of end-user requests.		Inability to access systems, inability to connect to the Internet, inability to log on using VPN, name is misspelled (or reversed), and so on.
109	1.2.2.8	Can Automation Workflow approvals be defined more precisely?		The approvals are unique to each DoD component and its protocols.
110	1.2.3.2	Can the government provide an overview of provisioning services used by DoD components?		Provisioning services will be dependent upon your solution, and must be functional DoD enterprise-wide.
111	1.2.3.4	Does the analytics tool need to contain KYC/Staff vetting tool?		Please see the response to Question #108.
112	1.2.3.5	Can the reports required be defined?		Reports will only be required of the authors of the 2-3 successful candidate solutions in Phase I, and will be defined at the time of award.
113	1.2.4.1, 3	Do we have a number of sources and templates requested?		Please clarify the question.
114	1.2.4.4	Can we get a view of the Microsoft Identity Management policies and solutions?		This will be discussed at the award of Phase I contracts to the two or three best solutions.

115	1.2.5	Does the solution need to include a Payment certification (MasterCard or similar) and does a follow up milestone plan exist at the present?		This system does not involve point of sale transactions.
116	Page 8	Total ROM cost says 2 years but the template includes 3 years. What is correct?		See response to Question 16, above.
117	3.2	Is the prototype test with live users, and how much load should the test be prepared for or is it a fully generic setup?		The response to this question will depend on the parameters established by the solution designers.
118	3.3	Reference is made to 3.4.1 which doesn't exist. Please confirm 3.5.1 is the paragraph meant for reference.		Confirmed.
119	Page 12	First paragraph makes it unclear if it is the Phase II solution to be reused in Phase IV with respect to dollar threshold. Please clarify and confirm this is the basis for the ROM calculation.		Acquisition Phase IV (RWP paragraph 3.4) refers to Technical Phase II, which will be awarded to the best of the two or three solutions selected for Technical Phase I.
120	3.5	Can the government forward the templates referred to?		The templates are provided in the RWP.

121	3.5.2.5	Can the government state which provisioning services are used by DoD components?		Provisioning services will be dependent upon your solution, and must be functional DoD enterprise-wide.
122	3.5.3	Please confirm whether this is for Prime vendor only or sub-vendors as well.		That will depend on the solution proposed.
123	3.5.4	Schedule: Please confirm this schedule is for the phase II initial prototype.		Both ICAM OTA phases are included in the schedule.
124	3.5.5	Price: Is the ROM calculation for the phase II initial prototype?		Yes.
125	5.5	What is the security clearing process?		The Government will provide guidance to successful white paper solution.
126	5.9	Phase II is elsewhere given a maximum of USD 600 K. Here it says no cost coverage. Please clarify what is correct.		Paragraph 5.9 is intended to notify potential offerors that the costs associated with white paper/project proposal preparation and submittal hereunder are not considered allowable charges, and should not be included within the ROM or any other pricing information provided in response to this OTA.
127	Page 9	Per section 2.3 Affirmation of Business Status Certification, clause 10 U.S.C Section 2371b(d)(1), a requirement of this provision is		This is an OTA, not a FAR-based contract. Offerors may provide other relevant and applicable NAICS codes

		that the responding company be a small business. However, the FBO page this was listed on shows it as a N/A under both Small Business and Set Aside, but the NAIC code provided is a \$25 million dollar per annum Small Business Set Aside size standard. We ask that the government clarify if this is truly a small business set aside and if so will it accept other relevant and applicable NAICS codes?		
128	Page 8,11, 12	Is this ROM for 2-year POP of the initial prototype OT Agreement or the follow on work in Phase IV OTA agreement?		There is no “follow-on work in Phase IV OTA agreement” contemplated by this RWP. There are two technical phases, involving (I) a down-select to the two or three most viable candidate solutions, followed by research and development leading to a prototype design, and (II) down-select to a single optimal solution, with pre-production execution of that prototype design. Any “follow-on” work authorized by the Government will occur under a new OTA, or a standard FAR-based contract.
129	Page 25	Can the government clarify whether they are requesting additional capabilities to an existing system or a new solution with the described capabilities?		The answer to that question is the substance of this Request for White Papers.

130	Page 8,11, 12	<p>Additionally, Government is asking for a 2-year ROM however the pricing Table is set for 3 years. Can Government please Clarify the pricing requirements for this RWP?</p>		<p>Table 2 is revised to remove FY2022 column. See response to question 16.</p>
131	5 (Page 3)	<p>Can the government provide an architecture or network diagram that would indicate the number of different systems and environments that would utilize the ICAM service- giving context to the statement on page 3, which states: “The issue persists because DoD does not have an enterprise-wide ICAM capability to centrally monitor, manage, secure, and audit identity, access, and authorization seamlessly across DoD Components and their dynamic and disjointed computing environments.”? Alternately can the government provide the nature of the systems which require data synchronization and sharing (DEERS, CAC CMS etc.)?</p>		<p>This system is intended to integrate and coordinate the functions and functional efficacy, as well as to provide data transfer across, the multiple DoD agency ICAMs already resident in the system, and to be scalable to future evolution.</p>

132	1.2.3	Is it the government's intention for the MUR to be the authoritative identity data source for all systems?		No.
133	1.2.3	Can the government provide a list of attributes for the MUR?		No. Defining the attributes is part of the White Paper task.
134	1.2.5	Will the ICAM service include identity credential production or only authentication?		The system will be required to tie into identity credential production and authentication, but it will not be "producing" such authentication.
135	5 (Page 25)	<p>In order to provide a detailed response addressing government concerns or needs we request the government provide additional details such as systems, data type, workflow, existing capabilities for requirements such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2.1.6 • 1.2.4.1 • 1.2.2.10 • 1.2.4.4 		This system is intended to integrate and coordinate the functions and functional efficacy, as well as to provide data transfer across, the multiple DoD agency ICAMs already resident in the system, and be scalable to future evolution.
136	General	Please quantify the scope of the effort to be addressed by the Technical Phase II solution as well as the overall end-state solution, specifically –		<p>The scope of the effort is DoD-wide.</p> <p>The overall end-state solution will not be developed until Technical Phase II of this OTA.</p>

		<p>1. Number of users, including quantification of CAC and non-CAC users</p> <p>2. Number of authoritative data sources that should be considered</p> <p>Doing so will help us provide the Government with a more accurate ROM for the three-year cost estimate.</p>		<p>The ROM is for one year. Technical Phase I will be funded by the Government @ NTE \$600K per awardee. Technical Phase II will be negotiated by the Government and the creator of the optimal ICAM solution from the ROM pricing. OTA regulations do not preclude interested offerors from partnering financially with the Government to fund the ultimate solution.</p>
137	General	<p>Are Commercially-hosted and/or Cloud-hosted solutions acceptable for the Phase 1 Demo and Phase 2 solution?</p>		<p>COTS/Open-source solutions are preferred.</p>
138	1.2	<p>Will the Government clarify what is meant by "Government managed lab environment?"</p>		<p>The lab environment will be at a Government-owned and operated facility.</p>
139	5.6	<p>Would the Government support cloud-only solutions?</p>		<p>Yes. The Government is open to consideration of whatever solution is proposed.</p>
140	1.2	<p>Will the Government clarify if the prototype will leverage production or test data? Will Contract require an Interim Authorization to Test (IATT) or an ATO to migrate to production?</p>		<p>Testing will be defined in Phase II at or after the time of award.</p>

141	1.2	Have the 6 applications referenced in Technical Phase II been identified? Can the Government provide any technical architecture information for these systems?		The number and mix of applications may change prior to award of the Phase II OTA effort, and will be identified at that time.
142	1.2.1	What product/solution is the Government currently utilizing for Single Sign-On (SSO)?		Each DoD agency uses its own SSO source.
143	General	Does the Government intend and/or will the Government accept an Identity-as-a-Service (IaaS) solution?		Yes. The Government will consider all solutions proposed.
144	3.2	Will the Government clarify if the \$600K budget for the prototype includes Labor and Licenses? Is the \$600K prototype budget fully funded?		If your proposed solution requires licensing, then yes, the cost thereof should be deducted from the maximum \$600K prototype funding. The (maximum) \$600K prototype research and development effort is fully funded.
145	3.5.6	On page 23 of the RWP, Table 3, will the Government clarify if the red text in the column entitled "Name of Entity Asserting Restrictions" is correct? If not, what is the correct language?		It is correct.
146	3.5.5	Is the Government evaluating the ROM for the three-year cost estimate as part of the down-selection into Phase 2? If so what is the criteria?		Please see the response to Part III of Question 136. The criteria for evaluating the ROM proposal will be price reasonableness, constrained by the DISA budget for this initiative. Please note that OTA regulations do

				not preclude interested offerors from partnering financially with the Government to fund the ultimate solution.
147	3.5.5	To what extent will the three year cost estimate be evaluated for down-selection?		Please see the response to Question 136.
148	3.5.4	To what length is the schedule estimates evaluated for down selection?		Please clarify the question.
149	General	Will the Government extend the submission deadline by one week (until November 12, 2019) in order to provide offerors with adequate time to verify license conditions, terms, and pricing for a best of breed solution?		The RWP due date is extended until November 12, 2019 at 4PM EST.
150	3.5.2.8	Will the Government confirm if resumes and schedule are outside the page limit? If not, would the Government consider increasing the response page limit by 10 pages, to a total of 25 pages?		The 15 limited pages should be devoted exclusively to the offeror's technical response.

151	1.2.4	Can the Government explain as to the intended relationship/integration between the end-state ICAM solution and existing DISA/DMDC identity services (e.g., EDS/IDSS)? Is it the Government's intent that such services be integrated into/merged with the end-state ICAM solution or will they remain stand alone?		The solution is DoD-enterprise wide (not limited to DISA).
152	3.5	Can the Government provide a table that delineates the combined technical/risk ratings as well as any weightings/ priorities for the evaluation factors for the phase 1 down select?		This is an OTA, not a FAR Part 15 acquisition. The Government will select the top two or three white paper solutions that best meet the Government's needs.
153	General	Is it the Government's intent that the end state ICAM solution replaces DISA's Active Directory Forest (ADFS)? Is there intent to have the end state ICAM solution merge with and/or supplement ADFS? Please clarify.		No.
154	General	Does the Government intend for the end state ICAM solution to be deployed to a DISA Data Center or a Government cloud? Is there a preference on the end state deployment architecture (i.e., traditional on-prem vs cloud-based)?		All solutions will be considered.

155	General	Are the respondents allowed to communicate with the Government points of contact with questions throughout the OTA process, or will this be the only opportunity to submit questions?		This will be the only opportunity to ask questions prior to Phase II award.
156	General	Will the Government share the responses from all respondents?		Questions from and responses to the ICAM OTA Q&A will be posted on Dreamport. White papers will not be shared with the competitors
157	General	Can you provide any information regarding the size or complexity of the six applications being targeted for integration so that we can best prepare the timeline for their integration?		No. The number and mix of applications may change prior to award of the Phase II OTA effort, and will be identified at that time.
158	General	Will the contractor be required to successfully complete Assessment and Authorization (A&A) during the Technical Phases of this effort?		A&A is not relevant at this stage of the acquisition.
159	General	Please provide anticipated # of users in each phase.		The solution must be DoD-enterprise wide, and scalable to accommodate future expansion.
160	General	DISA intends to provide this capability internally (DISA employees and contractors) as well as externally (mission partners, customers, suppliers, even citizens) Please provide anticipated user		See the response to Question #159.

		counts for internal and external use in each phase?		
161	General	A series of foundational ICAM capabilities can be achieved with COTS solutions. Does DISA have Enterprise level licenses of ICAM COTS solutions which respondents should consider for business value in order to provide a make/buy recommendation? If COTS licenses are required, would they be considered Government Furnished or should they be priced by the respondents for the prototype and accommodated within the approximate not-to-exceed (NTE) of \$600K?		These questions will be addressed upon award of Phase II.
162	General	When considering the costs and timelines for a successful ICAM implementation, an important variable cost is driven by the number of environments and the number of users supported by the ICAM architecture. Noting DISA's multi-security domain footprint and globally distributed architecture, which environments (CONUS vs OCONUS, NIPR, SIPR, JWICS, TAC), users, and security domains would		The proposed solution is required to be scalable to support all existing and future systems regardless of geophysical locations.

		ultimately have to be supported by a successful solution?		
163	General	Does DISA require a stateful session management solution that supports an active-active configuration across multiple data centers and/or cloud infrastructure services?		DISA has no preconceived design concept in mind.
164	General	How many users would need to be supported as part of the Prototype and how many identity repositories (e.g. AD, LDAPs, RESTful, DBs, etc) would need to be addressed to support the 6 applications?		The number and mix of applications may change prior to award of the Phase II OTA effort, and will be identified at that time. The solution is DoD-enterprise wide.
165	General	Does a successful solution need to support mobile authentication use cases and mobile application management (MAM) or mobile device management (MDM)?		Yes.
166	General	If respondents identify solutions for additional authentication factors that can support DISA's use cases, should the cost of the additional authentication tokens/mechanisms be fully accounted within the ROM?		This OTA is for research and development of a prototype, and does not involve production, deployment, or the acquisition of tokens or mechanisms (except as may be necessary to demonstrate your design, in which case they should be accounted for in the ROM).

167	General	Can respondents assume that the enterprise already includes F5 devices with the Access Policy Manager?		Yes.
168	General	Would the government consider an extension on the RWP's due date in order to accommodate the feedback from these questions on our response?		The RWP due date is extended until November 12, 2019 at 4PM EST.
169	General	How many identities will comprise the pilot and subsequent roll-out?		Please clarify the question. This OTA does not involve production, and the meaning of "identities" in this context is unclear.
170	General	Will the \$600,000 the government has allocated for each prototype include separate funding for licenses for software tools?		If your demonstration solution includes the need for licensing in Technical Phase I, then the cost of that licensing must be deducted from the \$600K.
171	General	How many identity repositories will have to be addressed for the 6 Application in the POC?		The number and mix of applications may change prior to award of the Phase II OTA effort, and will be identified at that time.
172	General	Will the production-level scope of work address DISA's CONUS and OCONUS environments?		The scope of work is the entire DoD Enterprise.
173	General	Will the production-level scope of work include TAC/DIL environments?		The response to this question will be addressed upon Phase II award.

174	General	Requirement 1.2.4.4 talks about migrating existing Microsoft Identity Manager capabilities into the solution. Will MIM be decommissioned as a result of this effort?		No.
175	General	Can the government estimate the number of users required for the prototype?		No.
176	General	Can the government estimate the number of users required for the ICAM system?		No.
177	General	Can the government estimate the number of users for each of the 6 systems required to be integrated in the ICAM prototype?		No. The number and mix of applications may change prior to award of the Phase II OTA effort, and will be identified at that time.
178	General	Can the government estimate the number of systems that will be integrated after the 45-day / IOC?		Please clarify the meaning of “systems” in this context. The number and mix of applications may change prior to award of the Phase II OTA effort, and will be identified at that time.
179	Page 4	Will the government provide the list of 6 systems required for the ICAM prototype to integrate?		Please see the response to Question #178, above.

180	Page 4	Is it the government's expectation that all 6 systems be integrated within the 45 Day/initial operating capability (IOC)?		No. All that is required within 45 days of the down-select to two or three offerors is a demonstration that your proposed solution is viable.
181	Various	Is it the government's expectation that offeror's ICAM prototype be developed on commercial infrastructure or government provided infrastructure?		The prototype will be developed at the contractor's facilities.
182	Page 4	Can the government clarify what authentications standards are required for the 6 applications to be integrated in the ICAM prototype?		No. The number and mix of applications may change prior to award of the Phase II OTA effort, and will be identified at that time.
183	Page 4	Will the government provide technical analysis information for the 6 applications, underlying databases, and LDAP?		Please see the response to Question #182, above.
184	Page 4	Can the government provide a list of existing ICAM components that will remain as part of the architecture after the deployment of the target solution?		No.
185	Page 4	For the 6 in-scope applications required for integration, has a role-mapping exercise been completed within the last year		Please see the response to Question #182, above.

186	1.2.3	For the 6 in-scope applications required for integration, has Separation of Duty (SoD) policies and rules been established?		Please see the response to Question #182, above.
187	1.2.3.4	Is the government's definition of insider-threat include link and peer group analysis and stateful user tracking?		Insider threats are any potential compromises of the system from Federal users, or others authorized to access Federal systems.
188	1.2.4.4	Can the government provide the number of policies and capabilities currently in production for Microsoft Forefront Identity Manager?		This will be discussed at award of Phase I agreements to the two or three best solutions.
189	3.5.2	Are there any risk management framework (RMF) activities expected to be completed by the offeror during the 45-day IOC?		This OTA does not include production.
190	2.1, 3.5.5	Can the government clarify the request for a Total ROM cost over a two (2) year period of performance listed on page 8 and the ROM request over a three (3) year period in table 2?		RWP revised.
191	General	What platforms and operating systems (clients, servers, mobile, other) will require support for PoC and T&E for "six" applications?		Please see the response to Question #182, above.

192	General	Can you provide any specific requirements with regard to cloud support, VM support, or containerization?		DISA will consider all viable solutions.
193	General	Within the ROM template and schedule template please confirm that you are seeking the schedule and ROM to cover all Phases PI-PIV (inclusive of Technical Phases I and II). If not, please clarify.		There are no "Phases PI-PIV." The Government will fund Technical Phase I (comprised of the research and development of an ICAM solution) at NTE \$600K for each of the two or three awardees; the ROM applies to Technical Phase II (which will entail pre-production development of a prototype), not including the cost of proposal preparation in response to DISA's Request for Project Proposals (RFPP).
194	General	Within Technical Phase I, what will be used/applied for Government Acceptance Testing (GAT)?		There is no GAT in Technical Phase I.
195	General	For both the Technical Phase I and II, can you please provide an estimate the number of credentials (or entities) that will be supported within each of the prototype phases?		The solution must be DoD-wide.
196	Page 9	Page 9 of the RWP states that a complete RWP must "Address all of the Evaluation Criteria Factors (sub-sections 3.4.1– 3.4.7)." Please confirm this is a reference to sub-sections 3.5.1-3.5.7.		Please see the response to Question #4 (et. al) above.

197	General	The requirements for this RWP are similar to a prototype proposal in nature, including a detailed technical solution and ROM pricing. We request an extension to give vendors a 30-day window to address the detailed requirements in a comprehensive fashion.		This ICAM OTA is by definition a requirement for prototype proposals. However, our schedule does not permit a 30-day extension.
198	3.5.5	Section 3.5.5 provides a ROM pricing template for vendors to use, with columns extending to 2022. Please clarify the phases and period of performance for pricing purpose. Should the ROM reflect the price estimate for the initial 45-day prototype phase only? If not, please clarify the scope to be priced.		Please see the response to Question #16, above.
199	General	Are vendors allowed to add line items or additional detail to the ROM pricing format by adding additional rows?		Yes, the vendors are allowed to add line items or additional details to the ROM pricing format by adding additional rows.
200	2.3	RWP 2.3 requests that participants complete the Affirmation of Business Status Certification. Please clarify if this form should be completed by the prime contractor only, or if all team members should complete this form.		Each participants (Prime Vendors and all Sub-Vendors) much complete the Affirmation of Business Status Certification.

201	General	How many user identities are associated with the six selected initial applications?		The requirement is DoD-wide. Please see the response to Question #182, above.
202	General	Where does the customer plan/prefer to host the prototype? If "on-premises", should the offerors assume hardware and resources will be provided as GFE? If in the cloud, will the Government provide the cloud instance and resources as GFE or does the vendor need to calculate this in their cost? For a cloud SAAS offering, is DoD PA IL2 acceptable, or would this need to be hosted in a IL4/5 or higher?		Please see the RWP.
203	General	Are all six preliminary applications CONUS, or will there be OCONUS applications? As a part of this prototype evaluation, do vendors/offerors need to articulate how they will support OCONUS customers?		Please see the response to Question #182, above.
204	General	Does the scope include support for NIPR, SIPR, and JWICS? Please clarify the extent of the network support required for both the prototype and the desired long-term solution.		Please see the response to Question #42.

<p>205</p>	<p>1.1</p>	<p>RFP Section 1.1 Purpose paragraph 1 states “This request meets the statutory requirements of Other Transaction Authority (OTA) (10 U.S.C. §2371) for the development and deployment of a DoD Enterprise Identity Service that will create a single user record, consolidating all pertinent data associated with the individual under one account, and automatically deleting such accounts when they are no longer required.”</p> <p>Question: Will DISA provide all data attributes and schema of the identity sources to be consolidated at the start of the Evaluation Phase II?</p>		<p>The response to this question will be given to the successful Offeror at award of Phase II.</p>
<p>206</p>	<p>1.2, 3, 4.2</p>	<p>Section 1.2 – Statement of need defines 2 Technical Phases – Technical Phase 1 which includes white paper evaluation, prototype demonstration and Government Acceptance Testing. Technical Phase 2 States that ‘</p> <p>Phase II, during which the awardee will develop the ICAM prototype in a production environment for integration with six initial customer applications, and support pre-production/acceptance testing</p>		<p>The Acquisition Phases are separate and apart from Technical Phases I and II, and do not parallel one another.</p> <p>Phase I = Award +45 calendar days</p> <p>The Phase II timeline will be established at negotiation of award to the successful Phase II solution offeror.</p>

	<p>Section 3 3.1 – 3.4 Defines the Evaluation phases and describes the activities in each of these phases.</p> <p>Section 4.2 states “The Government intends to award two (2) or three (3) prototype OTAs in Technical Phase I and down-select to one (1) prototype OTA in Technical Phase II”</p> <p>These 3 sections have requirement variations regarding the multiple phases, deliverables and delivery of prototypes.</p> <p>Can the Government provide a complete timeline showing the interconnects between the Technical and evaluation phases and provide additional clarification regarding the timing and expected milestones of the preliminary prototype and the production prototype?</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>207</p>	<p>1.2</p>	<p>The RFP states “The successful candidates will develop preliminary prototypes that will demonstrate functionally critical, software components that are integrated, and functionally validated, to establish interoperability and validated in both vendor and government managed lab environments for initial development and government acceptance testing (GAT).”</p> <p>For all vendors to correctly size the prototype environments for the preliminary prototypes, can the government provide estimates of the number of internal, external, and non-person/machine-type identities to be migrated and used in demonstration and government acceptance testing?</p> <p>Can the government provide the number of identities that will be expected in the product environment?</p>		<p>Please see the response to Question #182, above.</p>
<p>208</p>	<p>1.2</p>	<p>Can the government provide what is the anticipated sample size of the user base that will be used for pre-production/acceptance testing in Technical Phase I</p>		<p>All viable solutions will be considered. The solution must be scalable and DoD-enterprise wide.</p>

209	1.2	<p>The RFP states “The successful candidates will develop preliminary prototypes that will demonstrate functionally critical, software components that are integrated, and functionally validated, to establish interoperability and validated in both vendor and government managed lab environments for initial development and government acceptance testing (GAT).”</p> <p>Can the government provide the parameters and compliance requirements to be met when establishing the prototype environment or connecting vendor environments to the Government Lab environments (security, process, procedures, etc.)?</p>		<p>Preliminary prototypes will be demonstration only, and will not connect to other laboratory environments. Connectivity requirements will be discussed upon award of Phase II.</p>
210	1.2	<p>Are there any prerequisites that need to be met to install/operate within the Government lab?</p>		<p>Yes. However, installation/operation at Government laboratory sites is not required in Phase I.</p>

211	1.2	What steps and timeframe should be assumed when working with the Government lab environment in Technical Phase I? What processes and procedures need to be followed?		See Question #210, above.
212	1.2	<p>In regard to the Government Lab environment:</p> <p>Does the Government-managed lab need to include all elements of the prototype as a stand-alone environment, or does it require external integration with the offeror's lab or outside applications or data sources?</p> <p>Will candidates be permitted connect vendor managed lab environments to government managed lab environments?</p>		Prototypes will be developed at the contractor's facility (only).
213	1.2	With regard to "government acceptance testing (GAT)", please describe what tests will occur during the Technical Phase I GAT process and how the Government will evaluate test results.		There is no GAT in Phase I.
214	1.2.1	Requirement 1.2.1.6 states "Integration with DoD enterprise mobile device management capabilities to ingest device management state data."		We are vendor agnostic. Your solution should include whatever constitutes the "best of breed" in your technical opinion.

		<p>What is the government using for Mobile Device Manager?</p> <p>What attributes are available from the MDM for use in ICAM processes?</p>		
215	1.2, 1.2.5	<p>RFP Sections State:</p> <p>(1.2 – Statement of Need) “Technical Phase II will consist of selection of the best solution, and award of a prototype Other Transaction (OT) agreement to the most successful offeror for Phase II, during which the awardee will develop the ICAM prototype in a production environment for integration with six initial customer applications, and support pre-production/acceptance testing.”</p> <p>(1.2.5- ICAM Integration Services) ”In Technical Phase I, the Offerors of the two or three best solutions will be required to design and develop a prototype capable of demonstrating and integrating six high priority applications identified by the DoD into the enterprise ICAM services.”</p> <p>Please clarify whether the integration with the six high-priority applications is part of</p>		<p>See the response to Question #182, above.</p> <p>The RWP provides the ground rules for prototype development.</p>

		<p>timeline for Technical Phase I or Technical Phase II.</p> <p>Can the government provide ground rules for the 45 day development period in Technical Phase I?</p>		
216	1.2.4.2	<p>In section 1.2.4.2, the government requires the offeror to migrate the current DISA implemented Microsoft [Forefront] Identity Manager policies and capabilities into the solution.</p> <p>Will the government provide a comprehensive list of the Manager policies and capabilities into the solution to be migrated?</p>		<p>This will be discussed at the award of Phase I contracts to the two or three best solutions.</p>
217	1.2.5	<p>The RFP states: “In Technical Phase I, the Offerors of the two or three best solutions will be required to design and develop a prototype capable of demonstrating and integrating six high priority applications identified by the DoD into the enterprise ICAM services “</p> <p>Can the government validate an assumption that each application represents a single data source (database, master data record, etc)? If this assumption is not valid, will the government provide</p>		<p>See the response to Question #182, above.</p>

		information regarding the original data sources for each application?		
218	1.2.5	How many Identity repositories will have to be addressed for the 6 Applications?		See the response to Questions #132 and #182, et al., above.
219	3	<p>In evaluating the vendors' submission the Government indicated that selection will be based on the submission that is determined to be the best overall value to the Government.</p> <p>To aid vendors' ability to present our best proposal, can the Government provide a prioritization of the factors (price, technical, other factors) that will determine best overall value?</p>		No. This is not a FAR Part 15 acquisition. The winning solution will be the one that both represents the best technical value to the Government (i.e. the optimal solution to the issue described in the RWP) and is within the available budget (or demonstrates the offeror's willingness to partner financially with DISA and the DoD in this enterprise).
220	3.2	What is the anticipated timeframe between the Evaluation Phase I White Paper Submissions and the start of the Evaluation Phase II Initial Prototype?		We anticipate 45 calendar days between completion of the Technical Phase I RWP response assessments, award of Phase I contracts to the two or three best solutions, and development of the Phase I prototype (for demonstration). The timing of the Phase II award will depend on how many viable prototype proposals are received, and how long it takes the Government to assess and negotiate the best of the offerings.

221	3.2	<p>What is the anticipated timing between Evaluation Phase II – Initial Prototype and Evaluation Phase III Oral Presentations and Solution Demonstrations?</p>		<p>Please see the response to Question #220, above.</p>
222	3.2	<p>The RFP states: “Upon completion of White Paper evaluations, the Government intends to award two or three prototype OT Agreements to the best candidate solutions. Offerors will be given approximately 45 calendar days and approximately \$600K to develop a demonstration of their proposed White Paper solution and develop their concept to IOC.”</p> <p>Please confirm that the 45-day timeline and \$600K to develop the initial prototype is referring to the activities that are part of the Technical Phase I only.</p>		<p>Please see the response to Question #220, above.</p>
223	3	<p>Can the government provide a comprehensive notional timeline for start/finish durations for all evaluation phases?</p>		<p>Please see the response to Question #220, above.</p>

224	3	Can the government provide the notional time line for all technical and evaluation phases of the OTA.		Please see the response to Question #220, above.
225	3	<p>In Evaluation Phase IV the government intends for the awardee to develop the ICAM prototype in a production environment for integration with six initial customer applications.</p> <p>Does the government have a list of candidate customer applications? If so please provide the list or provide the classification/type of applications that will be subject to integration.</p>		<p>There is no “production environment” contemplated by this OTA.</p> <p>The Government will fund Technical Phase I (comprised of the research and development of an ICAM solution) at NTE \$600K for each of the two or three awardees; the ROM applies to Technical Phase II (which will entail pre-production development of a prototype), not including the cost of proposal preparation in response to DISA’s Request for Project Proposals (RFPP).</p> <p>The Government does not have a list of candidate customer applications. The solution must be DoD enterprise-wide, and be sufficiently scalable to accommodate evolving DoD requirements.</p>
226	3	Will the production environment address DISA’s CONUS & OCONUS environments?		No “production environment” is contemplated by this acquisition. Should the Government elect to fund a follow-on effort for production, it will be awarded via a separate OTA or FAR-based acquisition vehicle.

227	3	Will the production environment include TAC/DIL environments?		Please see the response to Question #226, above. Additional production requirements will be discussed at award of any contemplated follow-on procurement.
228	3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.8	<p>Evaluation Factor 3.5.2.8 “The quality of the respondent’s detailed, executable program plan to support and provide outreach to DoD components to onboard to ICAM services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the estimated level of effort • the resumes and contingent letters of commitment of [whatever personnel you are considering key] • a schedule template • Documented enterprise ICAM architecture in blueprint or process-flow format <p>In light of the length of the schedule tasks and components, will the government allow the schedule to be included as an attachment to the white paper and exclude from the 15 page white paper limitation?</p>		The RWP due date is extended until November 12, 2019 at 4PM EST.
229	3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.8	Are Resumes and contingent letters of commitment required for the White Paper content? If yes, may these be included as an attachment		The 15 limited pages should be devoted exclusively to the offeror’s technical response.

		to the white paper and be excluded from the 15 page white paper limitation?		
230	3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2.8	Are Documented enterprise ICAM architecture in blueprint or process-flow format to be included in the White paper and if yes, due to the size to be legible will the Government allow these to be included as attachments to the white paper and be excluded from the 15 page white paper limitation?		Please see the responses to Question #229 (et al.) above.
231	3.5.4	<p>“The Government will evaluate the respondent’s proposed schedule/ timeline/sprints to include milestones, activities, and deliverables to research, evaluate, test, and deliver a prototype. The multifaceted concept exploration and design approach must demonstrate the respondent’s ability to provide the Government with a viable solution that comprehensively and innovatively addresses the requirements and evaluation criteria set forth in Sections 1.2—Statement of Need, and 3.5—Evaluation Criteria, above.”</p> <p>Do the standard DoD SEMP milestones/deliverable</p>		A System Engineering Master Plan will be required for Phase II.

		requirements apply to the prototype development plan/schedule?		
232	5.5	For the Evaluation Phase II and Phase III 45-day prototype development period, will any cleared personnel be required and if so, at what clearance level(s)?		There is no Technical Phase III. Personnel responding to this OTA will require clearances at the "SECRET/NOFORN" level only.
233	General	To ensure offerors can bring the best of both traditional and non-traditional government contractors to the solution additional time is needed to provide an approach that can be rapidly fielded. Would the Government consider extended the due date by one week (12 November) to provide offerors the opportunity to solidify their solution / approach		Please see the responses to Question #228 (et al.) above.
234	1.1	The section describes integration with allies. Will an ITAR license be required during the course of the OTA?		Not during this OTA.
235	3.5.5	Should vendors assume that the contract-type targeted for the ROM is firm-fixed price?		Yes. The Government's budget is restricted; however, OTA regulations do not preclude interested offerors from partnering financially with the Government to fund the ultimate solution.

236	3.2	Will the Government provide the source selection criteria for phase 2 prior to the 45-day window?		The overall evaluation for each phase will be based on the integrated assessment of the criteria outlined in sub-sections 3.5.1—3.5.7.
237	3.2	Given this is a potential multi-year effort and the demonstration phase is 45 calendar days, will the Government be providing the subset of requirements for the demonstration phase?		The requirements for demonstration Technical Phase I are as stipulated in the RWP. In keeping with the spirit of Other Transaction Authorities, we are allowing offerors as much latitude as possible to propose the most innovative and optimal solutions they can devise.
238	3.2	Should vendors be including the \$600k for the 45-day demonstration in their ROM?		No. The ROM applies exclusively to Phase II.
239	3.5.2.8	Will DISA provide the metrics they will use for measuring the effectiveness of outreach during course of this effort?		The overall evaluation for each phase will be based on the integrated assessment of the criteria outlined in sub-sections 3.5.1—3.5.7.
240	3.5.2.2	Will DISA have the appropriate MOUs in place to connect to the attribute data sources?		Assume that there are no MOUs in place, given the fact that, as explained in several responses above, the number and mix of applications may change prior to award of the Phase II OTA effort. The then-current specifics will be provided at that time.
241	3.5.5	Many tools available on the market have a per-user cost. How many users does DISA anticipate having during the scope of work for which the ROM applies?		The solution is DoD-enterprise wide. The ROM applies to pre-production development of a viable prototype only; therefore, the number of users is dependent upon the capacity of the Offeror's solution.

242	1.2.3.4	Enable insider-threat analytics: Is the government looking for offerors to provide an UEBA solution? If not, does the Government currently have an UEBA solution that the prototype needs to integrate with?		No, but the Government is open to consideration of whatever solution is proposed.
243	General	What is the hosting preference for this ICAM solution? On-premise/cloud? Managed service or traditional?		The Government will consider all viable solutions.
244	General	What are the anticipated user quantities for identities? Employee/Contractor/NPE/External (G2C), etc.		The solution is DoD-enterprise wide.
245	Page 5	What are the anticipated max load transactions per/second for authentications?		This question will be addressed in Technical Phase II of the OTA.
246	Page 6	What are the major downstream ICAM/IGA systems that need integration?		This question will be addressed in Technical Phase II of the OTA. The solution must be sufficiently scalable to include all incumbent DoD component systems, and system evolution.
247	Page 5	What are the major MDM systems that need to be integrated?		DISA is open to any appropriate MDM solution, and anticipates contractor recommendation of the most suitable platform.

248	Page 4	Please describe the 6 initial applications and desired high-level use cases.		Please see the response to Question #183 (et al.).
249	Page 4	Please describe the use cases in scope for demonstration in the prototype.		This will be discussed at the award of Phase I contracts to the two or three best solutions.
250	General	Is "the cost for material/equipment for fiscal 2020-22" specifically tied to the initial and recurring costs for "the ICAM prototype in a production environment for integration with six initial customer applications"? - or do offerors need to make pricing assumptions beyond the scope of the prototype?		No "production environment" is contemplated by this acquisition. Should the Government elect to fund a follow-on effort for production, it will be awarded via a separate OTA or FAR-based acquisition vehicle.
251	Page 28	Will DISA extend the deadline for responses by 2 weeks to allow respondents time to adjust proposed solutions based on DISA's answers to questions?		The RWP due date is extended until November 12, 2019 at 4PM EST.

252	General	<p>Within the RFW, the Government expresses concerns with budget. Requesting a ROM for three years' support without having boundaries presents many issues for industry – especially with pricing. Some of these questions will require an answer prior to building the ROMs, such as number of identities included in the six applications, hosting, and other questions closely related to pricing. It would be in the Government's best interest to define those boundaries and allow all industry respondents to have a level playing ground. Would the Government consider slipping the due date of the white paper equal to the number of days required to receive the answer?</p>		<p>The RWP due date is extended until November 12, 2019 at 4PM EST.</p>
253	2.1	<p>The Government states "Total ROM cost for the two (2) year period of performance....". Table 2 Rough Order of Magnitude Cost/Price Template reflects three (3) year period. Could you please clarify?</p>		<p>The ROM template was updated to reflect the correct period of performance.</p>

254	1.2	<p>The Government states: "the awardee will develop the ICAM prototype in a production environment for integration with six initial customer applications" Could the Government please identify the number of identity repositories and or users we will be expected to support with the six (6) initial applications?</p>		<p>See the response to Question#182, above.</p>
255	1.2	<p>The Government states: "If the Government elects to adopt the solution thus developed for production, deployment, and sustainment, it may do so under a FAR-based contract or a production OT Agreement." How many users or identities will we need to support across CONUS and OCONUS?</p>		<p>The response to this question will be provided at award of Technical Phase II.</p>
256	1.2	<p>The Government states: "If the Government elects to adopt the solution thus developed for production, deployment, and sustainment, it may do so under a FAR-based contract or a production OT Agreement." Will the production rollout include TAC/DIL environments?</p>		<p>The response to this question will be provided at award of Technical Phase II.</p>

257	1.2	<p>The Government states: "If the Government elects to adopt the solution thus developed for production, deployment, and sustainment, it may do so under a FAR-based contract or a production OT Agreement." Question: If the Government is planning to implement in the TAC/DIL environment how many users or identities does the contractor need to support?</p>		<p>The response to this question will be provided at award of Technical Phase II.</p>
258	3.5.5	<p>Is "the cost for material/equipment for fiscal 2020-22" specifically tied to the initial and recurring costs for "the ICAM prototype in a production environment for integration with six initial customer applications", that is, offerors do not need to make pricing assumptions beyond the scope of the prototype?</p>		<p>There is no production/deployment/sustainment phase authorized under this OTA. Should the Government elect to award an ICAM production effort in response to the solution selected in Technical Phase II, it will do so under a separate OTA or FAR-based contract. Integration with six initial application in phase II would be expected to include material/equipment to implement the proof of concept.</p>
259	General	<p>Where does the customer plan/prefer to host the prototype? If "on-premises", should the offerors assume hardware and resources will be provided as GFE? If in the cloud, will the Government provide the cloud instance and resources as GFE or does the vendor need to calculate this in</p>		<p>The prototype will be developed (and hosted) at the Offeror's facilities.</p>

		their cost? For a cloud SAAS offering, is DoD PA IL2 acceptable, or would this need to be hosted in a IL4/5 or higher?		
260	1.2.3.4	The Government states: "Enable insider-threat analytics" Is the government looking for offerors to provide an UEBA solution? If not, does the Government currently have an UEBA solution that the prototype needs to integrate with?		See the response to Question#242, above.
261	General	Is there any chance an extension to the 5 NOV submission date can be granted?		The RWP due date is extended until November 12, 2019 at 4PM EST.
Amendment 0004				
262	Amend 0002, Q&A 33	The response to this question stated the demo is due the same time as the whitepaper	The RWP states the demo is due upon completion of the 45-day prototype. Which is correct?	The demo is due at time of Oral Presentations.
263		Interim prototype agreement	How will this contract be issued? What type of contract? What contract vehicle?	The ICAM prototype will be awarded as an Other Transaction Agreement.
264	Amend 0002, Q&A 16, 34	Response 16 states the ROM is through September 2021. Question 34 states the ROM is for one year.	Which is correct?	Response to question 16 is correct. The ROM is through September 2021.

265	Amend 0002, Q&A 2, 69	Response 2 states completed IP data tables are required. Question 69 indicates these must be signed.	Which is correct?	Yes, signed IP data tables are required.
266	Amend 0002, Q&A 156	“Will the Government share the responses from all respondents?” Yes	With whom will the government share responses? Will they publish all the whitepapers to all respondents?	See the response to Question #156, above.
267	Amend 0002, Q&A 206	Implies a tight timeline.	Will the 45 days be shortened if there is a delay in the OTA prototype agreement?	Yes; an OTA procurement is by intention designed to be accomplished far more rapidly than a FAR-based acquisition.
268	Amend 0002, Q&A 21	The solution will be scalable to n number of users	How many users does the Government expect during the prototype phase? (This information is critical for Vendors to establish appropriate pricing and infrastructure ROM costs) How many users does the Government expect during phase 2? (This information is critical for Vendors to establish appropriate pricing and infrastructure ROM costs)	As indicated in multiple responses above, the ICAM solution is DoD-enterprise-wide. We cannot predict at present how many DoD users are likely to be accessing the system at any future time, and such estimates should be a stated part of the Offeror’s solution (e.g., “this system design is scalable and the initial solution will accommodate three million users.”) The number of users expected during Phase II will be discussed with the successful Phase II Offeror.
269	Amend 0002, Q&A 74	The ICAM initiative is DoD-wide.	How many unique identities does the Government expect during the prototype phase? (This information is critical for	As indicated in multiple responses above, the ICAM solution is DoD-enterprise-wide. We cannot predict at present how many DoD users are likely to be accessing the system at

			Vendors to establish appropriate pricing and infrastructure ROM costs)	any future time, and such estimates should be a stated part of the Offeror’s solution (e.g., “this system design is scalable and the initial solution will accommodate three million users.”) The number of users expected during Phase II will be discussed with the successful Phase II Offeror.
270	Amend 0002, Q&A 183	References 183	<p>Question 248 is asking for the high level use cases for the prototype. The government references the responses to questions 183 and 182, which are about standards and details about the specific applications. These are lower level requirements than high level use cases.</p> <p>What are the user authentication use-cases, per system, envisioned by the Government?</p> <p>(This information is critical for Vendors to establish appropriate pricing and infrastructure ROM costs)</p>	DISA is open to any appropriate solution, and anticipates contractor recommendation of the most suitable solution. The exact details will be discussed at the award of Phase I contracts to the two or three best solutions.
271	General	International applicability	Will DISA be considering proposals from companies outside of the US, and are in the process of applying for DUNS and CAGE (though they don't have these numbers yet)?	Personnel responding to this OTA will require clearances at the “SECRET/NOFORN” level only. Therefore, neither companies outside of the U.S., nor individuals employed by companies within the U.S, who are not U.S. citizens, will be able to work on the ICAM OTA.

Amendment 0005			
272	General	This requirement details important dialog and we request a technical working session with the program and technical team from DISA. We have the intent to develop and deploy prototypes from this response, we find too many areas of risk to the program without having the direct interface and deliver on the reputation that our company is recognized for with our customers.	This would create an unfair advantage, especially since the opportunity would not be offered to every potential offeror in succession. All perceived risks to the program should be identified in the Q&A and addressed in subsequent solutions as expressed in White Paper submittals.
273	General	May a respondent submit more than one white paper response, if the responses are based on different technology solutions?	We will accept no more than one solution submitted in response to the RWP. Due to time constraints involved, we expect each respondent to put forth its best effort on a single solution.