Subject: **RFP-ACT-SACT-24-54 MODELLING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT TO PM-ADM**

Reference: **Q&A #1**

Date of   **20 MAY 2024**   Issue:

The following questions were raised with respect to subject **RFP-ACT-SACT-24-54 Modelling and Simulation Support to PM-ADM.** Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
1. The NATO RFP makes reference to the PM-ADM CRB. Where can I get a copy of the CRB?	1. The PM-ADM Capability Requirements Brief (CRB) is not releasable and all relevant information is in the published RFP.
2. Is there a minimum font type size for the proposal?	2. Times New Roman, 12 font.
3. Is there a maximum page count limit for the technical proposal, or for the technical section within the full technical proposal document?	3. While there is not a limit on pages for the technical proposal, NATO anticipates only five pages will be necessary.
4. What sort of relevant discount schedules does NATO typically receive, or even prefer, that benefits both the proposer/bidder and NATO?	4. NATO typically receive a discount schedule of NET 30. However the offerors may promote an additional discounts schedule.
5. In the spirit of fair and open competition referred to in paragraph 18 of the RFP, where can we get access to, or a copy of the PM-ADM Capability Requirements Brief referenced in the RFP?	5. The PM-ADM Capability Requirements Brief (CRB) is not releasable and all relevant information is in the published RFP.
6. In the event that access to the CRB is not provided to bidders, what is NATO's definition of the terms "foresights" and "predictions"?	6. There is no agreed NATO Term of foresight or prediction. Analysis of simulations runs are in the form of foresights and predictions. Sensitivity analysis and contrast of independent variables are examples of outputs of Simulation Based Experiments. Predictions are made on the PMESII parameters' values and reflects models in the simulation system, their parameters, their relation to the real world data and data history.
7. Reference page 13, para 2.3 – is there a preferential scenario that best covers the types of analysis NATO wishes to accomplish?	7. No preferences on the scenario. It is a part of a contractor design and PM-ADM stakeholders' validation.

8. Reference page 14, para b.2.c – who are the current PM-ADM stakeholders (this is being asked for the purpose of developing the most relevant simulation system proposal)?	8. The current PM-ADM stakeholders are IS, IMS, SHAPE and six NATO committees dealing with Crises Response. For the purpose of the project a validation team will be selected by PM-ADM programme management.
9. Reference page 14, para 3.b – can you confirm these dates are wrong, and we should assume the PoP to be 10 June 2024 – 13 Dec 2024?	9. Period of Performance is from 10 JUN to 13 DEC 2024.
10. As an example, the Department of the Air Force (DAF) has designated the Cameo M&S software tool as a standard for accomplishing MBSE and M&S work for the DAF. Has NATO, similarly, designated one or more MBSE or M&S software tools as their standard (so that we may best align our proposal submission to NATO need)?	10. NATO doesn't have "standard" M&S tools. All NATO M&S standardization products are described at: NATO M&S | NATO Simulation Standards
11. Reference page 16, para 5.a, can you provide a generic example of a return of analysis (more of a format question, than a specific scenario interest question)?	11. There is no generic example of a return of analysis, based on the project results/achievements a contractor will describe what it can be, both formal and content wise.
12. Detailed Scope Clarification: Can you provide more specifics regarding the scope of PMESII nodes and DIMEFIL actions that are expected to be modelled? Understanding the breadth and depth of scenarios will help tailor our solution more effectively.	12. There is no specific scenario. Nodes should represent nations defined by PMESII framework classified parameters; e.g. Resilience. DIMEFIL actions are pushed by nodes; e.g. Embargo, Military Air campaign. This is a part of a contractor design and PM-ADM stakeholders' validation.
13. Priority Scenarios: Are there specific scenarios or case studies that should be prioritized in the simulation model to address current NATO concerns or interests?	13. There is no specific scenario.
14. Data Model Specifications: Given that the information in the PM-ADM CRB, PMESII nodes, and DIMEFIL actions is largely conceptual, could you provide access to or examples of the logical/physical parameters and data sources that will be used to develop the Next Generation Modelling and Simulation of PM-ADM capability?	14. There are no specific logical/physical parameters or data sources at the moment. Internal logic of models in the simulation system is a part of a contractor design and PM-ADM stakeholders' validation. Comment – this is not NexGen of M&S capability.
15. Interoperability Standards: Could you specify any existing systems or platforms with which the new simulation system needs to be compatible?	15. There are no interoperability requirements.

16. System Performance Metrics: What are the expected performance metrics for the simulation system in terms of speed, accuracy, and scalability?	16. There are no specific performance metrics given.
17. Deliverable Formats and Standards: How should the deliverables, particularly the reports and dashboards, be formatted? Are there NATO standards or templates that need to be followed?	17. There are no standard related to dashboards. It is a part of a contractor design and PM-ADM stakeholders' validation.
18. Validation and Acceptance Criteria: Could you clarify the criteria for the validation of the simulation system? How will NATO determine if the deliverable meets the project requirements?	18. Section 6 (page 17) in the RFP describes acceptance criteria. Validation method will be selected by COTR and PM-ADM stakeholders based on a simulation system used in the project and M&S paradigm that is native to the simulation system.
19. Stakeholder Engagement: Who are the key stakeholders involved in this project, and what is the expected frequency and mode of communication for ongoing project updates and decision-making?	19. Ref to point 8 in this Q/A. A contractor will engage with the project stakeholders via COTR. Each product/deliverable requires acceptance, as per point 18 in this Q/A. A project management approach, including reporting and communication will be agreed during the kick off meeting. VTC is preferred way to communicate.
20. Change Management: What is the process for managing changes to the project scope or deliverables after the project has commenced?	20. The COTR will provide the Contracting Officer with the changes to the deliverables. As long as the changes are within scope, the Contracting Officer will request a cost proposal from the vender for the proposed changed items. Once agreed to a modification to the contract will be executed. Proposed changes to scope will require a new contract solicitation.
21. Page 14: ANNEX A Item 3.b: It is understood that "The contract period of performance is from 22 MAY to 29 NOV 2024." The phrase is mismatching the correct performance period, is that right?	21. Period of Performance is from 10 JUN to 13 DEC 2024.
22. Page 15: ANNEX A Item 4: Can HQ SACT provide Subject Matter Experts and/or NATO documents and related data to support the identification of DIMEFIL actions, PMESII parameters, and their interrelations at the beginning of the WP#1 (Design of a simulation system use to support PM-ADM)?	22. HQ SACT will not provide SMEs/NATO documents/data.

23. Page 15: ANNEX A Item 4.b.1: Who are the mentioned PM-ADM Stakeholders?	23. Ref to point 8 of this Q/A.
What type of decisions will those stakeholders make via the model?	A simulation system doesn't exist. Model/models development is a part of a contractor design. Therefore no examples can be given. However, it is expected to support NATO Crisis Response System (currently under revision).
It is understood that the HQ SACT will coordinate the participation of those stakeholders to the validation event(s), is that right?	A contractor will engage with the project stakeholders via COTR. For the purpose of the project a validation team will be selected by PM-ADM programme management. COTR will coordinate any activity relevant to the project validation team.
24. Page 19: ANNEX B Item #4: This requirement states "The simulation system is open to modification through well-defined API." What type of modifications (such as variable /parameter value changes for what-if analysis purposes as stated in WP#3.1) are foreseen here?	24. Serial #4 complaint item is not related to the modification mentioned in what-if analysis (WP#3.1). There is no requirement to have already implemented API for the independent variables modification/set up. This is a part of the contractor design and implementation effort.
25. I wanted to inquire whether this one stands in relation to the RFI ACT SACT 23-134. Is it the 'follow-on' RFP to that RFI or to any other previous RFI, RFP, etc.?	25. RFI 13-134 served to gather information related to the current both materiel and non-materiel solutions, and combinations thereof, across the DOTMLPFI spectrum that contribute to PM-ADM Programme. This RFP is dealing with modelling and simulation support to PM-ADM Programme.
26. Is the mentioned M&S support capability a core part of the PM-ADM programme? Or is it more loosely attached and managed by other ACT stakeholders/sections?	26. Refer to the Annex A Chapter 1. Introduction at page 13 of the RFP and Amendment, there is no M&S capability programme mentioned.
27. I wanted to inquire about the short contract duration, also compared to the last RFP for PM-ADM. Could you please elaborate on why this short duration has been chosen, whether the developed capability will be used or included in other projects later-on, or whether this is more intended to be a one-off tech demo?	27. This RFP is a demonstration of state of the art of a simulation support to strategic decision making process. A demonstration doesn't guarantee inclusion of any technology into the PM-ADM programme solutions.
That question comes a bit from a point of view of data integration. PM-ADM in its current concept tends to rely on a large number of sources and considerable amount	Data/sources will not be provided. Ref to point 22. This is a demonstration about a simulation systems capacity to execute simulation based experiments and delivering foresights and predictions. There is no

of data. The same would be true for a related M&S capability. Integrating that data and its NATO-bespoke structure would compose a major effort of such a project as envisaged with the RFP, but time for integration and testing is rather short. Without the right data, an M&S capability could be 'simulated', but with limited confidence in its results and 'real-use' applicability. The issue of data and sources is not considered abundantly in the RFP. How should we interpret this? Can you say more about data requirements? Will ACT provide that data? Or should the final product be rather of a conceptual nature, with limited use of real or simulated data, in the sense of a proof-of-concept and mock-up?	requirement on data. Connection to real data is optional not requested.