RFP: | RFP-ACT-SACT-23-44 - Political Military – Assisted Decision Making (PM-ADM) Proof of Concept/Demonstrator

Reference: | Q & A #1

Date of | 09 June 2023 | Issue:

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

Questions	Responses
1. We are looking forward to working on this RFP and we would like to ask if there is any possibility to extend the deadline by a couple of weeks.	1. Due to internal timelines, we do not plan any extension for the submission of bid.
2. Would a consortium approach be acceptable for you ?	2. Companies are allowed to submit proposals inclusive of support from subcontractors (or partners dependent on the prime's relationship) as it's an internal business decision. HQ SACT will only engage with the prime contractor. Reference section 4 "Eligibility" for additional details.
3. How many users are expected to use the prototype? How many users are expected to use the solution in operation?	3. The proof of concept will support up to fifteen concurrent users.
4. Shall the prototype be interfaced to existing systems or platforms (User management, exchange gateway, existing analytics, etc.)?	4. The proof of concept will be on a contractor computer and accessible over the unclassified internet to NATO users. It will not be interfaced to NATO systems.
5. Could you provide more information on the conceptual model that will be used for knowledge capitalization? Is it already existing or based on existing standard (i.e. MIM model)? Shall it be captured based on operational discussion? Ideally can we have examples of classes and their attributes and relationships?	5. A potential conceptual model is in development at ACT. It is an extension of previous models used for US R&D programs. It is not meant to be prescriptive, but to help articulate the capability desired. Essentially, it is an operational net assessment (ONA) model across all PMESII domains where DIMEFIL actions cause effects affecting nodes and thus networks, cascading throughout the ONA. Some of these nodal state changes impact NATO interests directly or indirectly.

6. "Technical factors / pricing factors rated the following: Technical / Price = 70/30." How is calculated the price factor? What is the formula?	6. The technically compliant proposal with the lowest price receives the full 30% (30 points) for pricing. Subsequent technically compliant proposals receive points for pricing based on the percentage difference from the lowest price.
7. Is the price factor calculation based on the Base Period only? Or is it as well based on the Period 1 and Period 2?	7. The price factor calculation is based on the total of Base plus Option Period 1 and 2.
8. §4.h.3 of SoW The last sentence is not finalized, could you finalize it: "This process may be enhanced by "	8. "human intervention if necessary. At this point the system scans NATO interests to determine if the threat measures of merit are approaching or exceeding the maximum allowable values. If so, this triggers an alert to users that an interest is at risk, which triggers the assessment activity to ascertain the danger to NATO. The users analyse the data to confirm the risk, its cause and likely outcome. Then the users assess the vulnerabilities to find the optimal mitigation courses of action. These are distilled to a presentation for the North Atlantic Council (NAC), after which a decision is reached with consensus."
9. Could it be possible to have access to a sample of NATO's interest data? Or a visualization of NATO interest schemas? Shall the conceptual model contain mandatory attributes to cover NATO's specific interest?	9. The definition of NATO's interests is still in discussion. For the purposes of the proof of concept, we are using three unclassified representative interests: (1) Territorial Integrity, (2) NATO's ability to operate freely on its own territory, waters, and airspace, and (3) NATO member nations ability to obtain sufficient energy resources.
10. §5 of the SoW: Can you clarify the error rate of 15%, on what does it apply? Which metric is used to evaluate it? Can you provide an example of the six links relevance criteria?	10. Data identified as pertinent to NATO interests and ingested into the datastore will show by its linkages that it demonstrably is pertinent in six links to an interest. As no process is perfect and as we are using new technologies, we assess that an error rate of no more than 15% of data ingested will subsequently be shown to not be pertinent is reasonable at this point in development.
11. When performed in person, where shall the training be located?	11. NATO HQ Brussels and SHAPE in Mons.

12. What is the contribution of the NCIA Software Factory? Is it intended that we provide assets that shall be added to this Software Factory? What would be the provided assets on NATO side?	12. None. No. N/A.
13. SoW §4.f: Do you plan to provide already captured impact and effect rules or shall they be captured and formalized by the provider based on operational discussion during the project?	13. The latter.
14. SoW §4.h: What is the expected number of use cases to be evaluated during the project. How many sources do you plan to collect (i.e. number of twitter accounts, number of BBC/CNN feeds, number of collection keywords) for each use case? What is the expected volume of collected data per use case (in number of posts, documents or Mb) per day?	14. The higher level use case is in the diagram and written description in the RFP. The SOW contains various actions that support lower level use cases. Data sources types are also listed. The concern is not with a specific number of twitter accounts or a specific threshold for the amount of data scanned but the precision and recall, relevant to the interests provided in question 9.
15. Annex B : Requirements Matrix: Key personnel attending briefings at SACT HQ must have NATO SECRET security clearance. Is there a minimum security clearance required for persons working on the development of the solution and not attending to briefings at SACT HQ?	15. No.
16. The RFP states in §12 that the technical proposal and the price proposal shall be sent separately. The RFP describes in §11 a content of the proposal, including Table of contents, Bidder's information, Compliance statement, Past performance, Technical & Price volumes, compliance matrix. We detect discrepancies between §11 and §12. Which part of the content listed in §11 shall be sent as part of the technical proposal? Which part shall be sent as part of	16. All items in §11 shall be sent with the technical proposal with the exception of the price proposal. The price proposal shall be in accordance with Enclosure 3.

the Price proposal? If any part is not in the technical or price proposal, how should it be sent?	
17. No template is given for the Price proposal, shall the price proposal consist in and be limited to the price table given in § Enclosure 3?	17. Yes.
18. No Template is given for the technical proposal, is the chapter structure free? Shall it follow strictly/be the Requirements Matrix? Shall it follow the structure of the SoW?	18. The SOW.
19. What is the minimum and/or maximum of pages that Technical proposal is limited to? If not what would be your recommendation?	19. It is up to each offeror to determine the minimum length that presents their ideas effectively and efficiently.
20. Can you please clarify whether ACT will consider a request to extend the bid closing date?	20. Due to internal timelines, we do not plan any extension for the submission of bid.
21. In Annex B: Scored Criteria. In what form each of these six (6) proofs shall be provided? Who needs to be the provider of these proofs?	21. The proof is the offerors' documentation of their accomplishments satisfying the sub-bullets in the right column.