

# **Headquarters Supreme Allied Commander Transformation**

**Norfolk, Virginia**



**QUESTIONs & ANSWERs #2**  
**JUNE 10, 2022 VIRTUAL Q&A TRANSCRIPT**  
**RFI-ACT-SACT-22-66**

**Request for Proposal Number:****RFI-ACT-SACT-22-66****Reference:****Q&A #2****Date of Issue:****10 JUNE 2022**

The following questions were raised with respect to subject RFI. Responses are to provide clarification.

Question	Response
Q1. In terms of NATO and each member nation specific requirements, will you aim to consider a single global system for everyone's use? Or looking to build a coalition of systems, allowing each nation member to access to a designated area, for which both NATO and the specific member nation will have the freedom to dictate the technology etc.?	A1. Leadership and stakeholders have warned against singular large systems. There is a need for access to a coalition of capabilities that may not be locally available, and select nodes may be designated to host one of many capabilities. The programme intends to develop or adopt an extensible architecture, agreed by customer, providers, and suppliers, that will facilitate interoperability and inclusions of capabilities. Furthermore, NexGen specifically addresses NATO requirements with the requirement to enhance federation with the nations. Nations will potentially be able to use NATO procured software federated with the NexGen capability. NATO and nations will have the freedom to dictate technology.
Q2. Is it correct to assume that during your RFI process you will be selecting your preferred game engine / visualisation software in isolation, or will you allow each member nation to choose their preferred technology?	A2. Specific technologies will be developed during the Capability Program Plan (CPP) phase of procurement, after an Analysis of Alternatives is complete, and after architecture is developed. Alternatives will consider combinations of existing and new technologies including visualization. Final selection of solutions will eventually happen when the host nation/s implement the CPP and Program Plans (PPs) as SoW or integration of Adopted national capabilities.
Q3. Due to the potential solution layering of nations vs. cross nation models, will you consider having the flexibility to choose different software components per each layer / environment?	A3. Flexibility is desired. The programme intends to pursue an open, modular, and extensible architecture that practices loose-coupling between architecture components as much as possible. The programme understands the existence of proprietary protocols and standards and will consider these constraints when assessing the flexibility of alternatives during the Analysis of Alternatives.
Q4. Will you consider hosting the SSE (Single Synthetic Environment) solution/s in more than one network environment (i.e. multiple clouds, air-gapped networks etc.), with the ability to ensure these solutions are communicating with each other?	A4. There are requirements to make capabilities available on multiple classifications and on networks used by stakeholders. We plan to explore this further based on RFI responses.

<p>Q5. Is there a specific domain or area that NATO is targeting initially? (Land, air, kinetic, non-kinetic?)</p>	<p>A5. There is a general requirement to maintain the ability to represent kinetic actions. At this time, there is no prioritization of kinetic actions by stakeholders. There is requirements specific to some applications areas to bolster the representation of non-kinetic effects and to represent the effects that kinetic and non-kinetic actions have on the wider domain. There are design recommendations to ensure capabilities that represent non-kinetic effects modular and add-ons for some COTS systems were mentioned. In some cases it may not be necessary to model non-kinetic actions in detail, but to simply represent the effects based on stochastic variables and probability distributions.</p>
<p>Q6. Will you send the second RFI to everyone who answered the first?</p>	<p>A6. Any subsequent RFI will be published on the ACT Contracting website: <a href="https://www.act.nato.int/contracting">https://www.act.nato.int/contracting</a> Companies are encouraged to regularly check the website and reply to RFIs.</p>
<p>Q7. On the Amended RFI, there is a date of submission for 15 July though point 4.6 of the same document indicates 17th June 7.00 AM EST. Please clarify</p>	<p>A7. The RFI submission date was 17 June. However, this has been updated to 15 July to allow additional time for responses.</p>
<p>Q8. Is there opportunity to demo existing and evolving architectures and solutions? How do we engage your team to do this?</p>	<p>A8. During analysis of the RFI responses, we may request to meet with you to gather additional information and/or to view a demo. This will most likely occur during the 2<sup>nd</sup> RFI (during the CPP) process.</p>
<p>Q9. In the response, can we have our own matrix in Excel to give us some writing room or do we have to use the PDF matrix, which gives little room for an answer?</p>	<p>A9. Please use the format that works best for you.</p>
<p>Q10. Just to understand - No page limit to the response?</p>	<p>A10. Correct, there is no limit.</p>
<p>Q11. Will the response provide to the RFI shared outside of NATO? (will company information be protected)?</p>	<p>A11. Correct, the responses will not be shared outside of NATO and will not even be shared outside of the core project team.</p>
<p>Q12. An AoA is typically based on a DOTMLP-F set of options to determine best choice of those factors. In this case you already have a material solution in mind. So what kind of alternatives are you examining from RFIs that aren't inherently solutions that would be competed in an RFP?</p>	<p>A12. During the analysis of alternatives for this project, we are exploring the solution space and analysing potential solutions based on operational effectiveness, cost, schedule and risks.</p>
<p>Q13. Will this presentation be posted?</p>	<p>A13. Yes, it will be posted to <a href="https://www.act.nato.int/contracting/rfi-act-sact-22-66">https://www.act.nato.int/contracting/rfi-act-sact-22-66</a> by June 17.</p>
<p>Q14. Are there any operating theatres that are priority? Is space of interest for example or would it</p>	<p>A14. Space has been identified as an area of interest. Priority for operational theatres is not in the remit of the programme.</p>

be de-prioritized for this effort?	
Q15. If the best solution for NATO has multiple simulation industry providers, would NATO select a simulation integrator or will industry need to partner up?	A15. This question is outside of current scope of the current RFI and state of the programme. Stakeholder requirements for the system as a whole and the scope of NexGen coupled with decisions by the implementing authority will define the future solution space.
Q16. The essence of this RFI is effectively feasibility based on the desired scope? The original RFI did not have a clear specification of requirements at the level of this presentation. Is this presentation the current level of depth for requirements definition?	A16. Refined capability requirements are being worked through an iterative dialogue with stakeholders. A further refined capability requirement set will be reflected in RFI#2. The NexGen standard brief (ppt. presentation) will be posted with the answers from the virtual Q&A (10 June 2022).
Q17. Are the lessons learned from the M&S COE efforts for CWIX going to be shared given the testing activities going on there?	A17. The programme is not currently interacting with this specific effort.