

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION RFI-ACT-SACT-24-76

Responses to Questions

The following constitute responses to questions received by **15 July 2024**.

1. To offer a solid TCO we will base our design on four (4) networks/sources per working position. Can you confirm this is acceptable?

RESPONSE- NATO Secret, Mission Secret, NATO Unclassified, NATO Restricted and public network are possible security environments/sources.

2. To offer a solid TCO we will assume two (2) monitors per working position in our design. Can you confirm this is acceptable?

RESPONSE - Assumption with a minimum of 2 monitors is acceptable.

3. Is the solution intended to be used for systems with all classifications concurrently?

RESPONSE- The access of multiple-independent levels of security by one workstation would be a pragmatic solution.

4. There is a discrepancy regarding the cloud technology. On one hand the RFI requires the connectivity and interoperability to a cloud and compatibility to FMN, on the other side NATO does not provide a description of the cloud to be used by NATO / FMN. NU/NR cloud enterprise – ACO – private cloud,. episodic network – persistent MN.. combat cloud with nations.

RESPONSE - In the immediate and short term the solution being deployed on non-cloud computing private environment with the possibility of migrating the solution to a private operational cloud environment in the future.

5. Are you reflecting on ongoing work in the C3 taxonomy, including cloud technology? See previous response.

RESPONSE - In the immediate and short term the solution being deployed on non-cloud computing private environment with the possibility of migrating the solution to a private operational cloud environment in the future.

6. Can HQ SACT please define the time periods meant by 'immediate', 'medium' and 'longer' term capability development?

RESPONSE - There is no NATO agreed definition, but for CIS software intensive capabilities, an indicative set of timelines include: up to 12 = immediate, 13-18 months=medium, and 18 months + = longer terms.

7. 6.1.1 states that *'HQ SACT will follow nondisclosure principles and possibly conclude an NDA with other entities involved to protect submitted information from further disclosure'*. Can an NDA be provided and signed prior to submission? If not, what level of confidentiality / distribution can we expect?

RESPONSE - We do not typically draft/sign NDAs in advance of a submission simply due to the volume typically received per RFI. HQ SACT carefully safeguards submissions and will use and share the information only for the purposes stated in the RFI. In this case, information will be reviewed by staff officers from both ACT and SHAPE and may be shared

with internal leadership in both organisations. If required to be shared as part of a larger Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) action, HQ SACT would consider concluding an NDA.

8. Can HQ SACT please provide the approximate budget range for any possible solution?

RESPONSE - This is not the purpose of the RFI as it is not a procurement instrument, but one to gain requirements and insights. HQ SACT cannot provide a budget range as a consequence.

9. If a bespoke solution is to be made, can architectures from previous solutions be referenced and how much of the eventual solution build is expected to be detailed in the RFI?

RESPONSE - Reference to architectures from previous solutions could be a useful approach in terms of exposing successful solutions to respond to this RFI.

10. Will the solution be expected to be a modular system?

RESPONSE - Yes this construct would be consistent with NATO policy.

11. In what order of importance are the Commanders' Critical Information Requirements ranked?

RESPONSE - The CCIR are identified by the commander as being critical to facilitating timeline information management and the decision making-process that affect successful decision making. The CCIR ranking would be mission specific and the order of importance ranking cannot be provided.

12. My primary question is whether a providers synthetic sensor/intelligence data generation capabilities could support NATO ACT experimentation and validation efforts, particularly related to the RFI in question.

RESPONSE - Synthetic sensor data generation capabilities could be examined to assess the degree to which those capabilities support future experimentation and capability delivery.

13. How much is this RFI and the underpinning future capability linked to the PM-ADM PoC scope?

RESPONSE - The RFI will complement and inform ongoing efforts for the enhancement of data-driven decision making to include capability programmes under development and execution.

14. Please let me know what you think about this suggestion and what more I can do to help you with this work?

RESPONSE - As per the RFI, all companies are requested to complete the spreadsheets with the responses to the questions.