

**Request for Proposal Number:** **IFIB-ACT-SACT-21-01**

**Reference:** **Q&A #1**

**Date of Issue:** **3 Nov 2020**

The following questions were raised with respect to subject IFIB/RFP. Responses are to provide clarification.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
1q. Does the Authority have any issues with a submission by a small consortium of micro-SMEs, led by a prime (company)?	1a. HQ SACT is agnostic to the business relationship among “micro-SMEs” so long as there is a SINGLE entity responsible for the entire performance with which HQ SACT will enjoy privity of contract. Relationships between this prime contractor and the “micro-SMEs” are transparent to this HQ so long as the prime assumes full responsibility for performance. As a reminder, the prime and all subs must be organized in a NATO member nation, and all persons performing must be citizens or lawful residents of NATO member states.
2q. The SoW mentions a time horizon of 20 years (in association with related technologies such as AI) but does not specifically identify a time horizon for the space technology horizon scan. Is the time horizon for both studies 20 years or would the Authority wish other time horizons to be considered?	2a. 20 years is not fixed. It should be more precisely defined to up to 20 years.  Going beyond 20 years is very difficult and highly arbitrary.
3q. Should the research be limited to the space functional areas listed or is there scope for the authors to extend this?	3a. The listed, space functional areas are providing a frame to address the space domain. We don’t intend to go beyond originally defined scope.
4q. Is there a page limit for bid submissions.	4a. No
5q. Is the Authority able to provide any cost envelope guidance for the project	5a. Refer to the Notification of Intent (NOI-ACT-SACT-21.01)

<p>6q. What is the level of classification of the reports?</p>	<p>6a. (Ref Solicitation Package P. 18) All work is unclassified and contractors do not require security clearances. Deliverables will not be classified and, therefore, will not bear any classification markings.</p>
<p>7q. Do the researchers have possibilities to access JAPCC and NATO's IS and IMS for further information during the study?</p>	<p>7a. This could be arranged if/when directly would contribute to the expected project outcome.</p>
<p>8q. Which products are required in the end: Only reports or also briefings (Powerpoint), articles for journals?</p>	<p>8a. High quality reports written with academic rigours are expected to be primary deliverable.</p>
<p>9q. Where lies the Intellectual Property and ownership of the study, once completed.</p>	<p>9a. HQ SACT intends to assert ownership and copyright rights regarding the study when completed. Para 33 of the HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions governs.</p>
<p>10q. Can the researchers after delivery of the study use it for wider publication?</p>	<p>10a. HQ SACT would be open to granting licenses to researchers to republish the study in a peer reviewed academic journal, at the researcher's own expense, or to incorporate the study in a larger work to be published in a peer reviewed academic journal, at the researcher's own expense. In such case, HQ SACT requires proper credit be given to this HQ regarding the origins of the study and the reason it was prepared. HQ SACT will also retain approval authority to ensure publication in outlets which reflect HQ SACT's values and strategic priorities.</p>
<p>11q. Does the capabilities/ experience mentioned in evaluation criteria list ( see below) refer to the Company or exclusively to the experts involved in the study?</p>	<p>11a. The capabilities/experience identified in the evaluation criteria relate to the company and the proposed team as a whole. The expectation is that there will be a team of experts providing input to the final deliverable.</p>
<p>12q. In case it refers to experts background only, We intend to put together a "technical proposal" volume with the resume and justification of background experience of the experts involved in the study. Do you expect additional documents?</p>	<p>12a. See response to 11a. Resumes and justification of background experience of the proposed experts will be an important part of the overall evaluation. HQ SACT does not require further documentation as long as the technical proposal and supporting resumes/information unequivocally demonstrate the proposed team's expertise.</p>
<p>13a. In order to have the relevant expertise available for this one year study, is it acceptable to aggregate to our team, experts from external entities acting all together under the leadership</p>	<p>13a. Refer to 1a above.</p>

of [company]?	
14q. For the quotation, do you need to have a price detail or would you be satisfied with a global price?	14a. A global price is acceptable however, you are requested to identify any proposed milestone payments.
15q. As one of our center of competence in Space activity is based in Germany, we would interested to know if this study has a link with the future NATO Space Ops Center to be located in Ramstein, Germany?	15a. This study will contribute to the Alliance knowledge development and inform NATO capability development processes.
16q. From the IFIB, we have extracted the technologies as best we could. However, is there a more extensive list of what is important and in an order of precedence?	16a. In the horizon scan study there is no additional list and no order of precedence for the technologies. However it is not a comprehensive list. If other technologies are discovered as important during the study it should be considered in the study.
17q. Is there a page limit to our response? We have not noted one, and we have noted page limits in other HQ SACT bids.	17a. No
18q. We have noted that partial bids will be accepted. Request if this partiality is for each study, respectively, or will partial bids within each study also be awarded? For example, might HQ SACT award the Horizon Scanning study to multiple bidders and propose a teaming construct?	18a. Partial bidding is allowed for each study, but not within a single study.
19q. The IFIB states that the awards will be on a best value basis. To what extent or weight is cost evaluated as part of the best value against the other factors listed in the IFIB?	19a. Technical factors / pricing factors rated the following: Technical/Price = 70/30. Ref IFIB-ACT-SACT-21-01 Bidding Instructions Para 15 (c).
20q. Are there any NATO UNCLASSIFIED or any NATO non-classified documents related to this topic that would be useful to review as background information and to gather additional insights into the needs of the Alliance with respect to the information being sought after in this solicitation. And if so, can we obtain	20a. Documents related to this effort, although unclassified, are not publically releasable. We will explore options for providing some additional information.

<p>copies of these documents or even NATO document reference numbers for them.</p>	
<p>21q. Please confirm that there is not a specific rate card we need to use.</p>	<p>21a. Confirmed. There is not a specific rate card requirement.</p>
<p>22q. Will you consider modifications to the GTC's and can we submit those are part of the technical proposal?</p>	<p>22q. Yes we will consider modifications. Proposed modifications should be includes as a minor deviation on the compliance statement (enclosure 3).</p>