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

Question	Answer
The Response Guidelines section (Appendix 1, Section 3.0 Technical Capability Questions) currently allows for: * a one (1) page table for requested vendor demographic information; * two (2) pages for the response to acquisition questions; * four (4) pages for the response to the Technical Capability questions; and * one (1) page for additional recommendations – for a total page count of eight (8) pages. Respectfully request that the government consider increasing the Technical Capability questions section 3.0 (which is currently at 4 pages) to 12 pages (for a total page count of 16 pages). This will allow vendors the adequate page count to showcase capabilities for the 10 technical questions and provide the details needed to evaluate the RFI response.	Reverse industry days are designed to allow vendors to showcase their capabilities and recommendations in a more meaningful way. In cases where the 4 page limit appears inadequate, please describe the additional capabilities that would be showcased in a reverse industry day.
In beta.SAM, the Response Guidelines notes, "Companies who wish to respond to this RFI should send responses via email no later than 03 July 2020 at 4:00pm EST to Vanessa McCollum, Agreements Officer, at vanessa.a.mccollum.civ@mail.mil and Craig Carlton, Agreements Specialist, at craig.j.carlton.civ@mail.mil." However, in the	Yes, Vendors should include the OTA Requirements mailbox address at disa.scott.ditco.mbx.pl84-other-transaction-authority@mail.mil in all correspondence relating to this RFI.

Question	Answer
attached PDF (also on beta.SAM) for Amendment 1, it notes "Companies who wish to respond to this RFI should send responses via email no later than 03 July 2020 at 4:00pm EST to Vanessa McCollum, Agreements Officer, at vanessa.a.mccollum.civ@mail.mil, Craig Carlton, Agreements Specialist, at craig.j.carlton.civ@mail.mil, and the OTA Requirements mailbox address at disa.scott.ditco.mbx.pl84-other-transaction-authority@mail.mil." It also notes to send questions to the OTA requirements mailbox too. Would the government please clarify if vendors should include the OTA Requirements mailbox email address for questions and the RFI submission?	
Does the Government have any Other Transaction Authorities (OTAs) being considered at this time? If so, would the government please share?	None at this time.
What is driving the use of Minimum Viable Capability Release (MVCR) as compared to typical agile processes? Is MVCR already being practiced by DSO?	A Minimum Viable Capability Release (MVCR) is the first version of the software that contains sufficient capability to be fielded for operational use. An MVCR is required to enable operational utilization of developed capabilities within a timely manner. Agile processes are intended to mature a Minimum Viable Product (MVP) into an MVCR.
With regard to 2. Technical Requirements, does the Government have plans for integrating to a Top Secret cloud such as AWS-TS or JEDI?	Not at this time
Is the Government open to other DevSecOps environments besides Cloud One and Platform One?	Yes, if they provide similar capabilities (e.g. PaaS, continuous-ATO, hardened containers, service mesh architecture)

Question	Answer
Has funding for this effort, OTA and follow on contract been committed?	Funding for this effort is contingent upon the successful completion of auction activities.
Can the government share the name of the existing system?	This is a new requirement. There is not an existing system.
Are large businesses required to identify an NTDC partner in this RFI response, or can partnering decisions be made at later stages of the acquisition (for example, after the reverse industry day)?	Partnering decisions are not required at this time; however, companies should indicate their intent, abilities, and experience with NTDC partnering within their responses.
The government stated that "there must be enduring and constant synchronization between the different Impact Levels" and that "DISA DSO intends to leverage the Air Force Cloud One and Platform One capabilities." Does PlatformOne offer a bi-directional cross domain capability, and if not, is the development, accreditation, and deployment of a bi-directional cross domain capability within the scope of this acquisition?	Platform One does not offer a bi-directional cross domain capability. DISA DSO plans to utilize a DOD enterprise cross-domain solution. In support of that, the capabilities developed will need to be aligned with the requirements of the cross-domain solution (e.g. well-defined XML schema). Please provide information on bi-directional cross-domain capabilities that your company has experience with and bi-directional cross domain services that may be appropriate for this effort.
The Government stated that the contractor will play "a critical role interacting with key stakeholders including DOD operators, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and CBRS users within the target band." Can the government further elaborate on the desired role for the contractor in stakeholder engagements (technical experts, strategic communications, change management, agile requirements development, training, etc.)?	The contractor would provide technical expertise related to developed capabilities, obtain user/stakeholder feedback for potential inclusion into a product backlog, provide training and demonstrations, and obtain technical/operational requirements from key stakeholders.

Question	Answer
The government states, "the spectrum scheduling system will replace a calendar-based spectrum portal being employed and maintained by a SAS administrator." Will legacy data in SAS be migrated to the prototype? Will SAS expertise be required on the contractor team?	Legacy data may be migrated, but will be dependent on a cost/benefit trade-off analysis. SAS expertise will not necessarily be required on the contractor team, but may be beneficial.
Given that the Place of Performances is listed as Fort Meade, will the government require the vendor (once awarded through an acquisition as result of this sources sought) to have a facility clearance (FCL)? If so, at what level would the vendor need to have a facility clearance? (i.e. Top Secret or Secret)?	Yes; Secret
Given that the government is considering the acquisition strategy of OTA for this, would the government be open to sponsoring the vendor for a FCL?	No