NATO UNCLASSIFIED

RFI:

RFI-ACT-SACT-25-25-Next Generation Wireless

Reference:

Q&A #1

Date of Issue:

25 April 2025

The following questions were raised with respect to subject **RFI-ACT-SACT-25-25-Next Generation Wireless.** Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
1. Can we have the two specifications that are part of the questionnaire which are STANAG 5030 (NATO Restricted) and STANAG 4724 (NATO Unclassified), so that we may properly assess our capabilities against the requirements?	Please use this link[1] to view all NATO standards and search by STANAG number. The metadata of all NATO standards are publicly available. However, to view and download unclassified NATO standards, you must log in to the NSO protected site, to download classified NATO standards, you must access the NSO site on the classified network or contact your national authority.
2. What is the maximum desired length of the RFI response (in addition to completing the excel questionnaire)?	There is no maximum desired length of response However, the excel questionnaire will be the main reference for analysis of alternatives and other documents will be reviewed as deemed necessary. If your answer does not fit in the spreadsheet cell, you can use other cells. If you want to provide an answer in a different format which does not fit well in a spreadsheet you can send additional documents as well.
3. What are the desired coverage (distance, area, etc.) parameters for a shore-based system to reach ships at sea?	For Beyond Line of Site (BLOS): Greater than 50nm. For Maritime Line of Site (MLOS): Less than 50nm.
4. Is there interest in 4G/5G solutions only? Would there be interest in optical, microwave (mW), or high-altitude pseudo-satellite (HAPS) connectivity options?	4G/5G are potential solutions. However, mW and HAPS options/solutions are welcome. The solutions proposed are not limited to the waveform.
5. Using the 700 Mhz spectrum would allow for longer range, albeit slower speeds. Is there any interest in using this spectrum for this case?	Yes, there is interest in knowing what solutions might be available in the 700 Mhz range.

6. How does this tie into scalability of the NATO Latvia trial that OUSD supported (Digital Backbone Experimentation, aka DiBax)? Is there an attempt to solve a problem or fill a gap that was identified during this project?	The experimentation conducted in Latvia during 2024 was supporting possible Maritime Line of Site (MLOS) capabilities. There was no problem or gap fill that was specifically identified from DiBax.

[1] https://nso.nato.int/nso/nsdd/main/standards

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

7. Is there a desire to address ship-to-ship connectivity? Are you looking for a capability that can hop between multiple surface vessels to extend coverage?	The ship-to-ship connectivity is outside the scope of this specific (NATO) capability. However, one should consider a potential future integration/expansion taking advantage of similar (National) capabilities, like IMT/5G bubbles deployed for intra-task group purposes.
8. What is the difference between a P-node and an E-node in the diagrams? P-node is not defined	The P-node and E-node concepts are described in the STANAG 5637. A P-Node is an edge node of a Coloured Cloud, which is connected via PCN-2 to one or more E-nodes. E-Nodes are nodes of a Protected Core Segment and support PCN1, PCN-2 or both.
9. In the questionnaire (Appendix 1) requirement assessment question #6 says 3-30MGHZ spectrum. Can you clarify the correct spectrum?	The correct spectrum is 3-30 MHz
10. Is the HQ SACT team interested in hearing from providers who do not directly supply equipment, such as enabling services, design and analysis, as part of this RFI?	Yes, we are interested in hearing from providers who can respond to the questions in the RFI (even partially).
11. When responding to the white paper the Excel response document does not address the many aspects covered in the paper, for example, many of the referenced standards, STANAGs and terms are not applicable to IMT/3GPP technologies can another format be used to respond?	Yes, please provide a response in PDF format that best responds to the white paper. There are no STANAGs for IMT/3GPP currently. STANAG 5665 is currently in development, however, the standards for IMT are promulgated by 3GPP and that is more than enough for the time being. On the other hand, to ensure interoperability, NATO intends to produce a Target Architecture and Service Instruction. This means, we (NATO) must define how we should deploy and configure standardized technology − for our specific

	applications − to ensure a common understanding and minimize interoperability risks. This is critical and it is where we will put part of our focus and energy. Obviously, to do it properly, it is sensible to engage with academia and industry to learn the art of possible.