

Subject: IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07 Red force support for the Layered Counter Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Initiative

Reference: Q&A Questions and Answers

Date of Issue: 19 December 2025

The following questions were raised with respect to subject **IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07 Red force support for the Layered Counter**. Responses are to provide clarification.

#	Questions	Answers
1	On page 15 in the opening paragraph for General UAS requirements, it states "One ground control station must be able to control multiple UAS for class 1 components". Can you please clarify the envisaged maximum number of UAS to be controlled by the one ground control station?	See minimum requirements in the SOW. The intent is to maximize red UAS but do with least number of controller(s) per UAS. Single ground station controlling multiple UAS is preferred.
2	On page 24, the table outlines the quantities of UAS for each WP. It appears that the total UAS desired column does not calculate correctly with the individual class quantities of desired UAS (with the exception of WP 4). Please confirm how the total UAS desired column is calculated.	Indeed, typo corrected in Amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07.
3	On page 15, in the General UAS Requirements list, point 2 states that the camera feeds and telemetry data must be made available to NATO CIS. Please confirm if this data needs to be live streamed or recorded and sent post-flight and if live, does that include every UAS involved in a 'multiple UAS' scenario?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Telemetry live feed: Required - Telemetry recordings: desirable - Video live feed: desirable - Video recordings: desirable <p>See IFIB amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07.</p>
4	On page 15 under essential and desirable UAS requirements, it states three NATO Class 1 subcomponents are to be used. It does not state how many of each subcomponent is required for each WP. Do you have a desired quantity of subcomponents for each WP?	HQ SACT does not have a specified desired quantity for each subcomponent, however a variety of Class I option is desired.
5	On page 28, serial 2 states the scoring of number of UAS per WP. This indicates that if the contractor provides more than 900 UAS for a WP, they will score maximum points. In the table on page 24 however, it states that	This criteria aims to reward bidders that can provide multiple assets for the different WP, in order to ease contract management during the total period of performance. Please note that the "desired quantities" are not binding and does not represent maximum

	the desired quantity for WP 1 is 100 UAS which means the contractor would only score 4 points from a maximum of 20 despite fulfilling the desired UAS quantity requirements stated in the table. Please confirm if the scoring criteria in serial 2 of Annex C is correct	quantities. If a bidder can propose 900 UAS for WP1 despite a desired quantity set up at 100 UAS, this bidder shall indicate so and will then receive maximum points. Bidders shall provide their maximum number of assets available for each WP. The desired quantities in the SOW are for information only. Please refer to Table X.
6	Can you please state if there is an earmarked budget for the Red Force support portion of this IFIB.	HQ SACT is not releasing additional information other than the estimated value described in the Notice of intent (https://www.act.nato.int/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/noi026007.pdf)
7	Can you please confirm if it possible to bid on whole or part of a Work Package.	Partial bidding is authorized as far as minimum quantity of UAS per component and per work package is fulfilled. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum of 50 UAS Class I per WP (Components 1 and 3) - Minimum of 10 UAS Class 2 per WP (Component 2 and 4)
8	Can you please confirm if it is possible to bid on a WP by providing UAS for certain sub-components only.	Yes, provided the minimum quantity of UAS per Component and per WP is fulfilled, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum of 50 UAS Class I per WP (Components 1 and 3) - Minimum of 10 UAS Class 2 per WP (Component 2 and 4)
9	Are there additional RFPs anticipated for LCI-X? Specifically, we have noted the RFP for red force support, but not for components related to C2, sensors, and effectors for c-UAS.	No, HQ SACT does not currently intend to contract C-UAS (Blue) capabilities. However, C-UAS capabilities are the experimentation focus of the quarterly events occurring throughout 2026 where they will be challenged by a realistic and robust UAS (Red) threat (see IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07.). Interested companies with C-UAS capabilities (blue) are encouraged to monitor HQ SACT website at the following link https://www.act.nato.int/ (select upcoming event) for more details regarding the opportunity.
10	Will there be a RFP for the blue forces?	No, see answer to question #9.
11	Page 6 states that “the company description portion of its technical proposal shall be limited to 10 pages.” However, the list of required contents (items 1–6) does not reference a company description. Can you	If a bidder includes a description of its company, such portion shall be limited to 10 pages. The technical volume is not limited to 10 pages.

	confirm whether this 10-page limit applies to Section 5 (Provision of Technical Volumes)?	
12	Pages 21-23 outline component participation in each work package, but these details appear to differ from the minimum and desired quantities listed in Table X on page 24. Could you confirm the quantity requirements per work package for each component and subcomponent?	See answers 4 and 8. Please refer to Table X in the Statement of Work for depiction of the desired numbers.
13	The subcomponents state that automated collision avoidance is a 'desirable' - however, Annex B, Tab 0, Number 12 implies it is mandatory. Please confirm	Obstacle/Collision Avoidance is a mandatory requirement. See Amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07.
14	Bid Evaluation point u. 4) indicates that “any transportation costs to the locations ... will not be a consideration for the financial evaluation”, yet the Price Proposal excel includes transportation costs (instructions of each tab note that “Transportation cost shall be considered as maximum “Not to Exceed” costs”, and further, total price for each work package includes transportation for proposed fleet). Please may the customer clarify whether or not transportation costs are included or excluded from the final tender evaluation?	The financial evaluation of the IFIB shall be based on daily operational cost per UAS, without transportation cost. Transportation cost are excluded from financial evaluation of the tender, for fair treatment among NATO nations. However, for budgeting purposes, HQ SACT requires the best fair and reasonable transportation cost from the bidders, as those transportation cost will be included in the contract (PO- Purchase Order).
15	Under Annex A, Subcomponent 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 Essential Requirements articulate that a “UAS is designed for a lifecycle cost that allows it to be considered as a consumable item”. Please may the Department clarify what this means and whether this refers to a price cap per UAS?	There is no price cap per UAS. The bidder should consider each UAS as consumable and/or attritable (as required by Component).
16	SER 13 of Tab 0 of the Annex B excel requires that “The UAS shall meet Host Nation and local regulation applicable environmental regulatory standards to include emissions, noise generated, waste discharge, as required by in the operating zone.”. In the absence of the specific locations for each Work Package, may the Department provide indicative terms for Host Nation / local regulations?	Please see answer #75 Specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution.
17	Paragraph g. of Award on Page 4 of the RFP states that Optional work packages shall be	This applies to all WPs.

	exercised at HQ ACT's discretion. Can you confirm this applies to all WPs or just to WP5?	
18	Paragraph g of Award on Page 9 states Optional work packages will be exercised at the sole discretion of HQ ACT. What period of notification will we be given stating if a WP will be exercised?	HQ SACT intends to release each WP at least 45 days before start of the period of operation.
19	<p>ANNEX A: STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW) General UAS requirements:</p> <p>ii. „The UAS shall be able to provide camera feeds by day and night“.</p> <p>a) What should be the technical solution of the camera feed – should it be provided on-line, meaning live broadcast or can it be provided as on-board video recording for later review?</p> <p>b) If multiple UAS are in the air (for example 15pcs) at the same time and conducting swarm operation as red force, should the camera feed be available for all 15 UAV in parallel; or only one or some of the UAS should be able to provide camera feed? If for all UAV-s live broadcast camera feed is necessary, the simultaneous use of corresponding number of available radio frequencies is needed and this may be in contradiction with desirable UAS requirement „decrease EM signature and congestion of the EM spectrum “.</p> <p>c) What kind of technical solution should be provided for night-time camera feed -IR, NIR, thermal or something else?</p> <p>d) If the UAS shall be able to provide camera feeds by day and night, is it correct to assume that there can be two types of UAS in which first ones carry daytime camera and second carry nighttime camera?</p>	See question #3
20	<p>ANNEX A: STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW) General UAS requirements:</p>	See question #3

	<p>v. „Telemetry data shall consist of (at least) latitude/longitude, altitude, speed, heading and signal to noise ratio for the command data link and the camera data link.“</p> <p>Please explain, what does it mean „...for the command data link and the camera data link“. Right now it is unclear, what exactly should be done by the Contractor.</p>	
<p>21</p>	<p>ANNEX A: STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW) General UAS requirements:</p> <p>UAS Desirable Requirements for Class I UAV-s. „Minimum range > x miles (or as specified by the NATO airspace and mission).“</p> <p>a) Is it meant as a range for radio connection (remote communication) or the technical range (max distance) of the UAS even beyond radio connection? In case of the first option, is the use of fixed or mobile radio repeater allowed to achieve maximum radio connection distance?</p> <p>b) „or as specified by the NATO airspace and mission“ – please explain, does that mean that during execution of the contract, HQ SACT may ask and the Contractor shall provide UAV which is more capable in regards of maximum distance?</p>	<p>a. It means operational range. Repeater use is allowed but will be provided by the bidder and must meet Host Nation requirements for installation and operation.</p> <p>b. HQ SACT requires UAS capable of operational ranges as listed in the <i>Essential and desirable UAS requirements</i> section in the SOW.</p>
<p>22</p>	<p>CONTRACTUAL</p> <p>As we understand, the basis of the Price Evaluation is „daily operational price per UAS unit per component “.</p> <p>Do we understand this correctly that this is a “Lump Sum” contract and the Component/ Subcomponent total will be paid to the contractor; or Contracting Authority will choose to pay to the services actually provided (Quantity of UAS deployed * Daily Operational Cost Per UAS * Days of Operation) according to Purchase Order by the Contracting Authority?</p>	<p>Financial evaluation of the IFIB will be based on the daily operational price per UAS.</p> <p>The envisaged contract(s) is Firm-fixed price contract with unit prices from the tender and quantities defined in the Purchase Order.</p>

23	<p>„IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07 PRICE PROPOSAL“.</p> <p>The following questions are based on sheet „TAB 1- 26-07 WORKPACKAGE 1“.</p> <p>The tenderer fills in the columns D (Quantity of UAS deployed) and F (Daily Operational Cost Per UAS). The Total cost will be an automatic multiplication of these numbers and the column E (Estimated Number of days of operation).</p> <p>When we offer at column D (Quantity of UAS deployed) maximum number of Desired UAS (as per Table X) which is 50, then can we expect that the Total cost of the Component/Subcomponent will be paid to the Contractor despite how many days the WP actually lasted and how many flights were actually made (assuming the days of WP does not exceed 20)?</p> <p>When it is the abovementioned, please ignore following questions since these are applicable only in case the payment to the Contractor is not a lump-sum payment according to the offered Total sum in column G, table TAB 1.</p>	<p>Bidders shall fill in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Column D with the quantity of UAS they can propose - Column F with daily operational cost per UAS. - Column G to indicate Transportation cost <p>The number of days are indicated as per HQ SACT best estimation, not as a commitment. Once the organisation of each WP is finalised, the Contracting Officer will communicate the exact number of days of operation to awarded companies, for them to confirm availability. The Purchase Order total amount will be made based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Confirmed number of days of operation 2) Number of UAS to be operated 3) Daily Operational cost per UAS <p>Payment shall be made based on the fixed firm price contract, NET 30 days after submission of invoice and successful completion of the services, accepted by HQ SACT.</p>
24	<p>If the payment per WP is not the fixed amount number mentioned in column G, table TAB 1, what will be the bases for the contractual payment calculation?</p>	<p>The Purchase Order is a firm-fixed price contract.</p> <p>Payment will be based on the daily performance of the UAS as contracted.</p>
25	<p>For example, if out of 20 days of operation period, 5 days are unsuitable for flying or there are other circumstances independent of the service provider hindering the service (the amount of days of operation is then less than 20); or not every UAS out of 50 is used every day (for example only 25 are used per dalaucny)?</p>	<p>As firm fixed price contract, payment should be made for the quantities of UAS and number of days indicated in the future Purchase Order, unless for non-performance from the supplier.</p> <p>For instance if the supplier brings 48 UAS instead of the 50 agreed in the PO, payment will be made for 48 UAS if performing.</p> <p>Another example, if some UAS cannot fly for some days due to technical reason imputable to the bidder, lack of maintenance imputable to the bidder etc. then payment shall be reduced accordingly.</p>
26	<p>Since we as tenderer are calculating the costs for our offer according to maximum</p>	<p>There is no maximum quantities stated in the IFIB. Bidders shall indicate the maximum</p>

	<p>number of UAS to be provided (50 as per Table X) then if the actual payment is not made according to this (Total sum in column G, table TAB 1), the tenderers should have a clear understanding, what will be the base of recalculation for smaller amount of services.</p> <p>A larger volume of services allows for a better price per unit and we are aiming to offer maximum amount of Desired number of UAS, but if the volume of services can be reduced by the Contracting Authority, the price offered by the Contractor may not cover the costs, and then it will not be possible to provide the service at all.</p>	<p>quantity of UAS they can provide for each work package.</p> <p>Bidders are requested to indicate unit prices fully inclusive, except for the transportation cost which shall be presented in a separate line.</p> <p>The minimum quantity of UAS per Component and per WP are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum of 50 UAS Class 1 per WP (Components 1 and 3) - Minimum of 10 UAS Class 2 per WP (Component 2 and 4) <p>See question #5</p>
<p>27</p>	<p>Answers to these question are crucial since the price calculation is based on information submitted by the Contracting Authority. As of now, the only information we have, is the Estimated number of days of operation – 20 and maximum Desired number of UAS which is 50. We are currently missing the information about actual numbers needed in regards of flights per day, maximum number of UAS in the air at the same time and also exact Number of days of operation since the latter is marked as Estimated.</p> <p>The main cost driver for this tender is personnel, ie number of people needed for one WP and mainly the number of drone operators. To provide the best and economically most advantageous offer, specific numbers provided by the Contracting Authority would allow us to offer the best technical and economic solution.</p> <p>If the Contracting Authority wishes to have flexibility to change the extent/quantity of the service, this should be described transparently and clearly in order to provide a solution suitable for every service volume (if changed compared to currently indicated maximum volumes), including according price calculation.</p>	<p>There is no maximum quantity of UAS stated in the IFIB. Bidders shall indicate the maximum quantity of UAS they can provide for each work package.</p> <p>Bidders are free to propose mark up price reduction if a certain quantity of UAS is reached per WP. Please note however that the financial evaluation will remain based on the daily operational price per UAS.</p> <p>See question #5.</p>

	<p>One of the most useful inputs we would like to have is the maximum number of UAS in the air at the same time (for each WP) since this determines the number of drone operators we have to involve. For example, if the maximum number of UAS in the air at the same time is 10, then we can have only one operator; when the number is 50, then the number of operators is 5, raising the cost very significantly. The cost of personnel is considerably more than 50% of the total cost of the offer, so every piece of information leads to possible decrease of the human resources needed for the services, makes the offer more affordable for the Contracting Authority.</p>	
<p>28</p>	<p>EVALUATION CRITERIA vs UAS REQUIREMENTS The questions are connected to Class I UAS only</p> <p>Since there are different subcomponents of Class I UAS asked to be offered (subcomponents 1.1-1.3 in Attributable and subcomponents 3.1-3.3 in Non-attributable category, 6 all together), is the evaluation conducted without separating the different subcomponents?</p>	<p>See question #30.</p>
<p>29</p>	<p><u>Description of the problem:</u> subcomponents 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 (or 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3) are different systems: 1.1 is a multirotor and 1.2 and 1.3 are most probably fixed wing/VTOL. The different subcomponents have different technical requirements, therefore filling the file „Annex B - Compliance matrix“ with the description of only one subcomponent does not provide a clear and understandable base for evaluation.</p> <p>If we are submitting offers for all the subcomponents, should we fill in separate files of „Annex B - Compliance matrix“ for all the different categories of subcomponents („Component 1 - Attributable Class I UAS“ times 3 and „Component 3 - Non-Attributable Class I UAS“ times 3)?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

	<p>If this is the case – the evaluation criteria are described as exactly the same for all subcomponents despite having different technical requirements. For example the criteria # 4 „Flight/Loiter time“ – 10 points will be omitted to the system reaching more than 75 minutes. For subcomponent 1.1 this is almost unreachable number since small multirotor UAV-s have typical endurance time >15min (like expressed also in Essential UAS requirements). Aiming for the maximum amount of points for subcomponent 1.1 in this criteria would mean implementing an expensive battery pack and also integrating a very capable (and therefore costly) radio communication system, which are in contradiction with the Essential Requirement „UAS is designed for a lifecycle cost that allows it to be considered as a consumable item“. The same issues arise in connection with criteria # 5 and 6.</p>	
<p>30</p>	<p>Since no division of different subcomponents of Class I UAS are provided for each WP, how should the tenderer approach the numbers when compiling the technical offer?</p> <p>Description of the problem: For example, as per „Table X“, for WP3, 500pcs Attributable Class I UAS is needed. For evaluation purposes we as a tenderer are able to provide for WP3 450pcs subcomponent 1.1 UAS, 25pcs subcomponent 1.2 and 25pcs subcomponent 1.3 UAS. But it is unknown, how many of different subcomponents are actually needed for WP3 by the Contracting Authority. For evaluation purposes, the tenderer can show that 500pcs can be provided but if the actual division between the subcomponents is not asked, the tenderer/contractor may not be in position to actually deliver desired amount of specific amount of subcomponents for WP3. If for example 250pcs subcomponent 1.1 UAS and 250pcs subcomponent 1.3 UAS is</p>	<p>HQ SACT indeed does not provide minimum quantities at subcomponent level.</p> <p>The minimum quantities of UAS will be calculated at Component level.</p> <p>The technical evaluation criteria will apply at Component level. However the financial evaluation will be conducted at subcomponent level.</p> <p>There will be a Best Value for Money ranking per sub-component.</p>

	<p>actually needed for the operation, instead of tenderers 450/25/25 division as offered for evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The information about division of the different subcomponents also heavily influencing the price proposal since subcomponent 1.1 (or 3.1) is a couple of times cheaper system and more easily operable (less operators needed) than subcomponent 1.2 or 1.3 (or 3.2 and 3.3) UAS.</p> <p>The current structure of offering prices and providing technical data may allow for some manipulation, for example when filling in „Annex B - Compliance matrix“ with the data of subcomponent 1.3 UAS (offering minimal number of these in fail „IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07 PRICE PROPOSAL“) but providing pricing for maximum amount of subcomponent 1.1. This is doable only in case there is no obligation to submit separate files „Annex B -Compliance matrix“ for each subcomponent and the evaluation is not conducted separately for each subcomponent.</p>	
<p>31</p>	<p>EVALUATION CRITERIA SERIAL # 2, Criteria: „The number of UAS per component that the Contractor can provide and operate simultaneously“.</p> <p>The sentence „The number of UAS per component that the Contractor can provide and operate simultaneously“ – what is meant by that? Specifically, what is meant by „operate simultaneously“?</p> <p>For example, we see that for WP4 900pcs Class I UAS is desired. Shall the term „operate simultaneously“ mean that all 900 UAS are airborne at the same time and are actively operated, or does it mean something else?</p> <p>According to the fail „IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07 PRICE PROPOSAL“ TAB 4 the „Estimated Number of days of operation“ during WP4 is 20, therefore would it be correct to assume that each WP day only some of the 900 UAS are used? Could you please clarify what is the maximum number of UAS that need to be airborne at the very same time?</p>	<p>Yes, "operate simultaneously" means that the desired number of UAS are flown at the same time with the minimum number of bidder provided operators to control them.</p> <p>See Table X for minimum and desired UAV numbers.</p>
<p>32</p>		

	<p>EVALUATION CRITERIA SERIAL # 2, Criteria: „The number of UAS per component that the Contractor can provide and operate simultaneously“.</p> <p>The desired amount of UAS for each WP is determined in „Table X“ but this evaluation criteria does take into account different needs of UAV in different WP´s. For example: for WP1, Class I combined desired number of UAS is 150 (C1:50pcs+C3:100pcs according to „Table X“). According to this evaluation criteria, maximum points of 20 will be omitted to company who provides more than 900 UAS. If 150pcs Class I UAS is desired for WP1, why should the tenderer provide more than 900 UAS for WP1 (in order to get maximum amount of points) if these are not actually needed?</p> <p>In practical terms, should the tenderer be able to provide for each WP 900 UAS even if this number is the maximum number for the WP4 only? Or is it ment that if the tenderer is able to cover 900 UAS for WP4, then despite providing less UAS for other WP´s (but still achieving the amount mentioned in „Table X“ as „Desired UAS“), the tenderer will be omitted maximum points?</p> <p>In conjunction with this, should the file „IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07 PRICE PROPOSAL“ be filled in with the number 900 for each WP (because this the maximum the company can offer according to criteria: „The number of UAS per component that the Contractor can provide and operate simultaneously“) or should the column D be filled in with actual and realistic numbers (shown as „Desired UAS“ in „Table X“)?</p>	<p>Table X provides the best estimation of desired quantities per WP at the present time.</p> <p>See answer #5.</p> <p>The Bidder shall indicate in the financial price proposal the maximum number of UAS they can propose.</p>
<p>33</p>	<p>SERIAL # 5, Criteria: „Operational range“</p> <p>Is it meant as a range for radio connection (remote communication) or the technical range (max distance) of the UAS even beyond radio connection? In case of the first option, is the use of fixed or mobile radio repeater allowed to achieve maximum radio connection distance?</p>	<p>See answer to question #21 a.</p>

34	<p>The excel file „IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07 PRICE PROPOSAL“ All Workpackages in connection to Class I</p>	There is no question.
35	<p>For each subcomponent under „Component 1 - Attributable Class I UAS“ there are two lines (16 and 17) in columns D and F to be filled in by the tenderer. Is it mandatory to fill in both lines?</p> <p>When the second line can be deleted by the tenderer, please ignore the following questions.</p> <p>How to calculate the values of the position „Quantity of UAS deployed“ (column D)? If we offer the maximum number of UAS expressed in „Table X“, should we also fill in the second cell (D17) and provide values for the smaller number of UAS? And if so, what number(s) we shall provide? For example: we can offer for WP1 50pcs (which is the number of Desired UAS) Attributable Class I UAS. So the number to be inserted into cell D16 is 50 as it is the maximum that the Contracting Authority is asking for. What number should we insert to the second yellow cell (D17)? Do we have to fill it randomly, should we leave it unfilled or should we insert the number taken from column „Minimum UAS required“ in Table X? If latter, in some WP´s there is no minimum number (for example C1: Attributable Class I), in this case what number should be inserted?</p> <p>Or is it meant that into „Component 1 - Attributable Class I UAS“ the tenderer can insert into cells C 16 and C17 two different objects (for example two multirotor UAS versions from different manufacturers)?</p> <p>Is it possible that the contracting authority will prefill the cells in column D in order for the tenderer to precisely follow the prerequisites of the contracting authority?</p> <p>Remark: subcomponent 1.1 is an under 2kg multirotor UAS, the production or purchase of which even in large quantities is rather easily achievable in quite a short time period;</p>	<p>The lines “itemize as necessary with description of proposed UAS” are meant to be used by the bidders to indicate the model of the proposed UAS / name of proposed UAS.</p> <p>It is not mandatory to fill in both lines. On the other hand, if a bidder can propose more than 2 types of UAS per subcomponent, the bidder is authorised to duplicate additional lines.</p>

	<p>the opposite of which is subcomponent 1.3 - Single Rotor, Fixed Wing or Fixed Wing Hybrid VTOL are not produced in such amounts as small multirotor UAS and the delivery time or production time for these systems are much longer than for the small multirotors.</p> <p>In conclusion, our suggestion in regards of Class I would be to divide the information to be provided via „Annex B - Compliance matrix“ into six different parts (subcomponents 1.1/1.2/1.3/3.1/3.2/3.3) in order to maintain transparency and equal treatment of all tenders when different subcomponents are offered by the same tenderer for Class I subcomponents; also the evaluation process should be conducted separately with the same goals in mind.</p> <p>If both the presentation of information and the evaluation process remain as they are currently, this may affect the achievement of an objective and reasonable result for the contracting authority.</p>	
36	If awarded, will the contractor retain ownership of any remaining UAS and support equipment upon completion of the contract?	Yes, it is Contractor Owned-Contractor Operated.
37	Is the desired number of UAS per Work Package listed in Table X the quantity of UAS to be in the air at the same time?	Yes.
38	Will electrical power be available for UAS ground control stations and battery charging, or will the contractor need to generators or some source of power in the field during the work package?	<p>IFIB is for UAS a service.</p> <p>Bidders are responsible to ensure that they would have independent power sources and the means of operation available. While the electrical power is the responsibility of the bidder, it may be available from the Host Nation.</p>
39	Is there any information available on what type of swarming maneuvers or flightpaths are desired for the work packages?	Manoeuvre profiles should mimic threats on modern battlefields. Specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution.
40	Is there any information available on the operational tempo for the work packages? Particularly, is it known how many UAS flights there will be per day and how much	Specific fly windows will be released per event, as objectives are incorporated into the scenario. Specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution. Bidder should

	time there will be between flights? The goal of this question is to determine how many batteries per platform will be needed to support the work package.	anticipate several hours between fly windows to allow for UAS recovery and charging operations.
41	Will the location where the work packages occur be secured so that base stations and equipment can be left in-place overnight or between periods of operation?	Specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution, pending Host Nation coordination. Bidders should assume they will have to provide their own storage and/or security.
42	For the Evaluation Criteria, "The number of UAS per component that the Contractor can provide and operate simultaneously," is the number the quantity of UAS in the air at the same time?	Yes.
43	For the Evaluation Criteria, "Flight operations ready from a cold start," is this for a single UAS or a swarm? If it is for a swarm, can you provide the number of UAS that would be in the swarm? Also, is it assuming that a ground control station has been setup previously and it would be like turning everything on and getting a UAS in the air, or is it setting up everything from storage, including the ground control station?	Cold start criteria apply to single UAS and swarms. Single UAS and swarms are viewed as a single weapons system that must be flight operations ready. Swarm numbers are not defined in this IFIB. For this evaluation criteria, "Minimum" numbers as defined in Table X can be considered approximate swarm numbers. However, larger numbers as indicated by "desired" numbers would be preferable. The assumption is correct; ground stations will be set up prior to execution.
44	How much space will be available to setup and prepare UAS platforms for flight operations? And are there any restrictions on where the Contractor's ground control station or personnel can be during flight operations?	Specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution, pending Host Nation coordination.
45	Concerning range, is a mile considered a Statute Mile of 5,280 feet or a Nautical Mile of 1,852 meters?	Nautical miles.
46	Clause 18 (b)(c) of the HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions states the Contractor will be liable for "excess costs" are you able to advise the maximum value this could be, or is it uncapped?	Article 18 is "Termination by Default" It is uncapped.

47	Is it possible to submit Offer only for Subcomponent 1.2. and Subcomponent 3.2.?	Yes, provided the minimum quantity of UAS per component and per work package is fulfilled.
48	How and when exact number of UAS needed under each Subcomponent for every WP will be known? Currently minimum number of UAS to be offered for each WP is known only for the whole Component.	See answer#7, #8 and #18 . Specifics for subcomponents will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution, pending Host Nation coordination.
49	It is stated in the 'General UAS Requirements' that UAS shall be able to provide day and night video feed. Should also attritable UAS under Component 1 be equipped with day and night camera or it is possible to offer solution 'as cheap as possible'?	See question #3
50	Shall UAS offered under Subcomponent 1.2. and Subcomponent 3.2. also be equipped with automatic collision avoidance? That is normally feature for smaller FPV drones operated in tight spaces. Can this requirement be fulfilled with defined automatic 'no fly zones' for locations where personnel and equipment is located?	All UAS operations will adhere to local safety and airspace procedures. All components must be under bidder control 100% of the time. Obstacle/Collision Avoidance is a mandatory requirement. See Amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07.
51	In order to reduce number of operators is it possible to operate multiple UAS simultaneously using 'formation mode'?	Yes. However, UAS formations must be able to mimic threat profiles provided by HQ SACT. See update to Table X.
52	When flying simultaneously shall video feed from all UAS be available?	See question #3.
53	What minimum information shall be included in list of key personnel?	This is left to the discretion of the bidder but the following information are desired: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Position/ role within the company (CV) - Nationality - Security clearance if available - Any other relevant information for consideration
54	Should the cost of personnel involved in WP be included in cost of systems or cost for transportation and deployment?	Cost of personnel shall be included in the daily operational cost per UAS. Not in the transportation cost.

55	<p>Component / Sub-component Eligibility – To submit an offer for a Component, is it mandatory to meet <i>all</i> of the sub-component requirements listed under that Component?</p>	<p>No, Bidder can submit an offer for a Component without having to propose all sub-components, as far as minimum quantities per component are reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum of 50 UAS Class I per WP (Components 1 and 3) - Minimum of 10 UAS Class 2 per WP (Component 2 and 4)
56	<p>Operational Scenarios – Could you please clarify the specific operational scenarios in which Attributable and Non-attributable UAS will be employed across the Work Packages?</p>	<p>Specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution, pending Host Nations coordination.</p>
57	<p>Table X – Work Package 1 Components – In <i>Table X</i>, WP1 is described as including only Components 3 and 4; however, the table also displays values for Components 1 and 2. Could you please clarify whether this is intentional or an editorial inconsistency?</p>	<p>It is a typo and corrected in the Amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07..</p>
58	<p>Calculation of UAS Quantities – Work Package 2 – How should the total number of drones for WP2 be calculated? (Minimum vs. desired values, attrition rate application, and simultaneous operation quantities.)</p>	<p>See Table X of SOW.</p>
59	<p>Scoring of UAS Quantities (50–100 range) – In the evaluation matrix, what is the awarded score when the number of available UAS falls between 50 and 100?</p>	<p>It is a typo and corrected in the Amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07..</p>
60	<p>Annex-4 – Endurance Scoring (Class I & II) – When both Class I and Class II UAS are present within a Component, should the endurance score be based on the system with the longest endurance, or is another method expected?</p>	<p>Annexes C, D, E, F will score the respective Component separately.</p>
61	<p>Annex-5 – Range Scoring (Class I & II) – Similarly, for operational range scoring, should we evaluate ourselves using the platform with the maximum range among the offered UAS?</p>	<p>Annexes C, D, E, F will score the respective Component separately.</p>

62	<p>Annex-6 – Maximum Altitude Scoring (Class I & II) – Should the altitude score be calculated according to the UAS with the highest achievable operating altitude?</p>	<p>Annexes C, D, E, F will score the respective Component separately. The criteria’s range is based on the requested altitude range. The maximum points does not necessarily correspond to the highest achievable operating altitude. Maximum points are for the outlined flight envelop (altitude) requirements.</p>
63	<p>Simultaneous Operations Requirement – What is the expected number of UAS that must be able to operate simultaneously during the execution of each Work Package?</p>	<p>See Table X. UAS minimum requirements are the amount expected to fly at the same time.</p>
64	<p>Is it possible to extend the bid submission date by 2 weeks?</p>	<p>HQ SACT agreed to extend the submission deadline to 12th January 2026. Bids shall be received at HQ SACT, Purchasing and Contracting Office, no later than 12 January 2026, 0900 hours, Eastern Time, Norfolk, Virginia, USA</p>
65	<p>General: Are we correct in assuming that the executing party of the service is not required to obtain a specific Light UAS Certificate (LUC) or equivalent authorization to conduct BVLOS operations during the trials, and that the airspace will instead be reserved or otherwise secured by the contracting authority for the duration of the tests?</p>	<p>Yes, your assumption is correct. The exercises will be conducted in controlled air space. Bidders will execute according to all host nation range regulations and all flight safety requirements.</p>
66	<p>SOW: We have noted that Components 3.x are described as “non-attributable,” yet the SOW includes the same statement as for attributable Components 1 and 2: “UAS is designed for a lifecycle cost that allows it to be considered as a consumable item.” This combination could potentially be interpreted ambiguously. May we kindly ask for further clarification on that?</p>	<p>Attributable UAS have the same requirements as Non-attributable UAS. Attributable UAS will be engaged and damage/destruction is expected. This is not necessarily true of non-attributable UAS.</p>
67	<p>SOW: Could you please clarify the intended role of Components 3.x during the exercises? Are ISR capabilities expected to be provided as part of the scope for these components?</p>	<p>Components 3.x will mimic known threats, but will not be expected to be attributable. No ISR (Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance) tasking foreseen.</p>

68	SOW: Could you please clarify the intended role of Component 4 during the exercises? Are ISR capabilities expected to be provided as part of the scope for these components?	Components 4 will mimic known threats, but will not be expected to be attritable. No ISR (Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance) tasking foreseen.
69	Table X: Could you please indicate the proportion of the aggregated amount that is attributable to the sub-components of C1.x and C3.x or is this a bidders choice?	See answer # 55
70	Annex B: The Evaluation Criteria requirement #2 states "The number of UAS per component that the Contractor can provide and operate simultaneously".	Correct.
71	How many of the provided UAS component types are realistically expected to be operated simultaneously in the WPs?	All UAV types and requirements outlined in Table X are expected to operate simultaneously. See amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07.
72	Annex B - Evaluation Criteria requirement #2 for Component 1 and 3: The case "between 50 and 100" is not covered. How would this be scored?	See answer to question # 59
73	Annex B - Evaluation Criteria requirement #2 for Component 3: Is the provided self assessment scoring range up to "more than 900" still to be used? The desired amount in Table X is max. 150 in WP5.	See answer to question # 5
74	Annex B - Evaluation Criteria requirement #2 for Component 4: Is the provided self assessment scoring range up to "more than 100" still to be used? The desired amount in Table X is max. 25 in WP1/2.	See answer to question # 5
75	Operational & Logistics (Q75,76,77,78) Specific Location for Pricing: The SOW defines the Place of Performance for Work Packages 1–4 generically as "North-Eastern Europe". To ensure accurate Firm Fixed	For planning purposes, Bidders should consider the following tentative locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WP1 Romania - WP2 Latvia - WP3 Latvia

	Price bidding for transportation, could HQ SACT specify the host nation(s) or a representative location for these Work Packages?	<p>- WP4 Latvia</p> <p>For WP 5 , for transportation costs and customs, duties, and taxes, bidders should base their costs on travel and import to an EU, contiguous, NATO nation. If a non-EU or non-contiguous NATO nation is the chosen location, successful bidders will be provided the opportunity to modify their bids for HQ SACT consideration.</p>
76	<p>Customs and Importation:</p> <p>The SOW states the Contractor is responsible for "customs, including compliance, documentation, duties, taxes". Will SACT provide a NATO Form 302 (Customs Declaration) to facilitate duty-free temporary import of the UAS equipment into the host nations?</p>	<p>No, HQ SACT will not provide NATO Form 302 nor facilitate imports or exports. This contract is to provide "Fleet as a service." Thus, all regulatory and compliance and standards, and all costs related thereto, are the responsibility of the bidder (to include the identification of the applicable regulatory and compliance standards).</p> <p>HQ SACT encourages bidders to research national requirements that may offer tax and/or duty concessions for temporary imports.</p> <p>See answer #75 for location.</p>
77	<p>Turnaround Time for Massed Launch:</p> <p>The SOW requires personnel to enable "launch of massed UAS... with a minimum of 4 hours notice". Could you define the expected volume of a "massed launch" (e.g., 10, 50, or 100 simultaneous UAS) to ensure we resource the ground support staff correctly?</p>	<p>You can refer to desired UAV requirements in Table X., Amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07..</p>
78	<p>Work Package Dates:</p> <p>The schedule indicates Work Package 1 operations begin on 23 March 2026. Given the contract award is anticipated on 30 January 2026, this leaves a mobilisation window of less than 60 days. Can HQ SACT confirm these dates are fixed, or is there flexibility for the initial deployment?</p>	<p>Please refer to Amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07..</p>
79	<p><u>Technical & IT Requirements (Q79, 80, 81, 82)</u></p> <p>Collision Avoidance Discrepancy:</p>	<p>Obstacle/Collision Avoidance is a mandatory requirement. See amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07.</p>

	<p>○ The SOW lists "Sense-and-avoid or collision-avoidance logic" as a Desirable requirement for Component 1.</p> <p>○ However, Annex B (Grading Matrices) lists "automated collision avoidance" as a General Compliance criteria (Compliant/Not Compliant)..</p> <p>○ Question: Please confirm if collision avoidance is a mandatory pass/fail requirement for eligibility, or if it remains a scored/desirable capability.</p>	
80	<p>STANAG 4817 Maturity:</p> <p>The SOW references a "(draft) STANAG 4817 format" for telemetry. Will the schema provided in Annex H be the final frozen version for this contract? If the standard evolves during the contract period, will software updates be considered an allowable cost modification.</p>	The telemetry scheme will not evolve as the standard is now considered as final for promulgation.
81	<p>NATO CIS Handover:</p> <p>The requirement states video feeds must be made available to NATO CIS.</p> <p>What is the specific technical handover interface required at the Ground Control Station (e.g., RJ45 Ethernet, SDI, HDMI) and the required streaming protocol (e.g., RTSP, UDP, COT)?</p>	See answer #3
82	<p>Spectrum Management:</p> <p>The SOW mentions "Data mesh capabilities" to decrease EM signature</p> <p>Will HQ SACT or the Host Nation provide frequency allocations for the exercise, or is the Contractor solely responsible for securing spectrum usage rights in the host country?</p>	HQ SACT will work with the bidder and the Host nation for EM spectrum allocation/approval.
83	<p><u>Contractual & Administrative (Q83,84)</u></p> <p>Insurance Verification: We are required to provide proof of insurance within 3 business days of the award. Since insurers often require the exact location of operation to bind coverage, and the location is currently generic ("North-Eastern Europe"), will a general policy covering the NATO AOR (Area of Responsibility) be accepted for the initial submission?</p>	<p>Yes. General commercial policies are acceptable for the initial submission.</p> <p>Once the precise location is known and provided to successful bidders, successful bidders will have five (5) business days from release of each work package to provide the requisite certificate of insurance.</p> <p>See updates in Amendment 2, IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07</p>

84	<p>Definition of "Attritable":</p> <p>The SOW defines "Attritable" as designed for a lifecycle cost allowing it to be a "consumable item". Is there a specific unit cost threshold (in USD) that HQ SACT uses to define "attritable," or is this classification at the discretion of the bidder based on their operational model?</p>	<p>There is no unit cost threshold for attritable UAS. Attritable UAS will be engaged and damage/destruction is expected.</p>
85	<p>Regarding the Work Packages</p> <p>WP1: Components 3 & 4 WP2: Components 1,3, 4 WP3: Components 1,2,3,4 WP4: Components 1,2,3,4 WP5: Components and operations dates to be determined by event. Specifics to be finalized and coordinated with Bidder no later than 60 days prior to the start of operations. See Table X for quantities and attrition rate requirements.</p> <p>For WP 1-4, do all Components & Sub-components have to be offered for being eligible to win?</p>	<p>See answers to questions #7 and #8.</p>
86	<p>Regarding the Components</p> <p>Do all Sub-components of each Component have to be offered for being eligible to offer a Component belonging to a Work Package?</p>	<p>See answers to questions #7 and #8.</p>
87	<p><i>The primary challenge lies in balancing the required massive scale (up to 1,000 desired UAS in WP 4) with the extreme logistical and liability risks, particularly concerning the attrition (destruction) of assets.</i></p> <p>Attrition, Liability, and Contractual Risk (Highest Priority)</p> <p>The core ambiguity is the financial and legal consequence of the specified Attrition Rate for both 'Attritable' and 'Non-Attritable' components.</p> <p>Original Question</p> <p>The government has outlined CUAS training for NATO but hasn't clarified the type of CUAS being kinetic or non-kinetic</p>	<p>The latter is correct.</p>

	<p>that UAS could be exposed to and should the contractor assume that even for Component IV non-Attritable UAS could be lost due to either CUAS kinetic or non-kinetic actions by NATO forces.</p> <p>Expanded Questions & Demands</p> <p>Compensation for Attrition (C1 & C2): For the Attritable Components (C1 & C2), the contract must clearly state who bears the financial burden of UAS lost or destroyed up to the specified Attrition Rate (up to 25% in WP 4).</p> <p>a. Clarification Required: Will NATO compensate the Contractor for the replacement cost of platforms lost/destroyed, or is the Contractor expected to absorb this cost, factoring it into the base pricing/flight hour rate? The latter significantly increases bidder risk.</p>	
<p>88</p>	<p>Kinetic vs. Non-Kinetic Threat: Given the C-UAS context, we need confirmation on the <i>nature</i> of the threat exposure.</p> <p>a. Confirmation Required: Will the Red Force UAS be intentionally targeted by kinetic effectors (e.g., missiles, bullets, nets)? If so, are there designated safe zones or flight profiles that protect the non-Attritable assets (C3 & C4)?</p>	<p>Yes, red force should expect to be targeted.</p> <p>The non attritable forces are not intended to be targeted.</p> <p>Bidders are responsible for all other costs associated with deploying and retrieving their assets subject to range regulations.</p> <p>There may be special risks associated with the intended operation and use of the assets. It is the Bidder's responsibility to retrieve its assets following the operation (if required). The types and coverages of the insurance policy will vary with the nature of the bid, such as the type, number, and value of the assets. It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure that insurance coverage is adequate.</p>

<p>89</p>	<p>Guarantee for Non-Attritable Assets (C3 & C4): Despite the "Non-Attritable" designation, C3 and C4 assets are used in WPs with and attrition rates.</p> <p>a. Guarantee Required: Can the Government provide a contractual guarantee that C3 and C4 UAS will be operated exclusively in scenarios that preclude kinetic engagement, ensuring their recovery rate from physical destruction or catastrophic non-kinetic failure (e.g., irreversible cyber/jamming loss of control)?</p>	<p>See question 88.</p> <p>HQ SACT does not provide contractual guarantee in case of lost, destroyed, or damaged assets.</p>
<p>90</p>	<p>Location, Export/Import, and Insurance (Logistical Complexity) The tight timelines for deployment and the requirement for specific liability coverage are impossible to meet without defined locations upfront.</p> <p>Original Questions Enabling service requirements for contractor UAS Section G. The government has not disclosed training location only that training will occur within NATO. However, as export/import requirements are required for EU and NATO countries (those that are not within the EU) which will take processing time. Further without knowing the location the government will need to accept the highest transport cost/relocation costs without locations being identified.</p> <p>j. Insurance and Indemnification: EU and Non-EU countries have different UAS laws and regulations which impact insurance cost. It is unrealistic to provide insurance coverage within the prescribed period without knowledge of locations. Can the government confirm operations are within Military restricted airspace?</p>	<p>See Question #83.</p> <p>HQ SACT plans to hold the four events at military ranges and thus within designated airspace of the Host Nation.</p> <p>HQ SACT will notify Bidders of the event locations, providing the nation, city, and name of the range to be used, as soon as identified and not later than 45 days before execution.</p>

	<p>Expanded Questions & Requirements</p> <p>Firm Location Deadline: Since export licenses, import duties, and customized insurance certificates depend on the final Host Nation (HN) and specific operating site (e.g., military range vs. public airspace), the Contractor requires a firm deadline.</p> <p>a. Requirement: The Contractor requires the specific Host Nation, deployment location, and confirmation of airspace classification (e.g., restricted military airspace) no less than 60 calendar days prior to the Phase 1: Integration & Deployment date for each Work Package.</p>	
<p>91</p>	<p>Transportation and Cost Risk: The RFP demands the Contractor cover all transportation, customs, duties, and taxes. Without a location, bidders must assume the most expensive, non-EU, non-contiguous NATO nation.</p> <p>a. Clarification Required: Will the Government agree to a firm, fixed-price adjustment mechanism for transportation, insurance, and customs costs, based on the final disclosed location, to prevent over-bidding for the worst-case scenario?</p>	<p>See answer #75.</p> <p>For transportation costs and customs, duties, and taxes, bidders should base their costs on travel and import to an EU, contiguous, NATO nation. If a non-EU or non-contiguous NATO nation is the chosen location, successful bidders will be provided the opportunity to modify their bids for HQ SACT consideration.</p>
<p>92</p>	<p>Indemnification Scope: The indemnification clause is exceptionally broad ("indemnify and hold harmless NATO HQ SACT from any and all claims, liabilities whatsoever, losses, damages... regardless of fault...").</p>	<p>With respect to its General Terms and Conditions (dated 21 NOV 2025), provision #15, Indemnity, and for this contract only, HQ SACT expressly excludes claims arising from the negligence, gross negligence, or</p>

	<p>a. Clarification Required: Will the Government limit the "regardless of fault" clause to exclude claims arising from the gross negligence or willful misconduct of NATO forces, particularly concerning the intentional or unintentional kinetic loss of Non-Attritable UAS?</p>	<p>intentional misconduct of HQ SACT and its officers, employees, or agents.</p>
<p>93</p>	<p>Operational Tempo and Resource Management (Cost & Personnel) Accurate cost modeling relies on defined usage metrics (Flight Hours) and the required logistical footprint (Launch Sites and Personnel). Original Questions Work Packages 1,2,3,4, 5: The government has provided dates however no allocated FLT hours have been given. This is required for spare package management and personnel requirements. Can the government describe the number of UAS sites that will be needed to be simultaneously manned for fit operations? This required for spares personnel management. Expanded Questions & Deliverables Guaranteed Minimum Flight Hours (FH): The current schedule only provides a two-week operational window (Phase 2). a. Requirement: The Government must provide an estimated/guaranteed minimum number of Flight Hours (FH) per component per Work Package. The Contractor's pricing structure will be based on FH (e.g., /FH) which dictates required personnel shifts, spares</p>	<p>For UAS sites, specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution, pending Host Nations coordination.</p> <p>For planning purposes, specific fly windows will be provided for each event as coordinated with HQ SACT, Host Nation, Event POCs. Bidder can expect 2 to 3 fly windows during execution weeks lasting up to 2 hours each.</p>

	consumption, and maintenance load.	
94	<p>Simultaneous Launch Site Requirements: The required number of Ground Control Stations (GCS) and maintenance crews is directly tied to the number of simultaneous operational sites.</p> <p>a. Requirement: Please specify the maximum number of geographically distinct UAS launch/recovery sites that will need to be simultaneously operational for any given period. This will inform the required number of GCS, maintenance teams, and Liaison personnel for the duration of Phase 2 operations.</p>	See answer #93.
95	<p>Mass Launch Capability: For WPs 3 and 4 (500 and 1,000 desired UAS, respectively), the logistics are enormous.</p> <p>a. Clarification Required: What is the maximum number of UAS expected to be airborne at the same moment for a single "massed incursion" exercise event? This dictates GCS capacity, frequency deconfliction, and crew size for the mass launch (XX hours notice).</p>	All UAVs numbers outlined in Table X are expected to be airborne and operate simultaneously.
96	<p>Technical Specifications and Data Interoperability (Integration Risk) Successful integration depends entirely on meeting the STANAG interface requirement.</p> <p>Technical Questions</p>	See answer 80

	<p>STANAG 4817 Interface Control Document (ICD): Referencing a "(draft) STANAG 4817" with only "Example messages" is insufficient for system integration.</p> <p>a. Requirement: The Government must provide a formal Interface Control Document (ICD) for the NATO CIS/Telemetry interface (preferably a non-draft version of STANAG 4817 or a formal SACT-specific ICD) no later than the contract award date to allow for timely integration.</p>	
97	<p>GCS Multi-UAS Control: The RFP prefers one GCS control multiple Class II UAS.</p> <p>a. Clarification Required: What is the minimum required control ratio (e.g., 1 GCS to 4 UAS) for Class I, and what is the desired control ratio for Class II components?</p>	<p>See question #63</p> <p>HQ SACT seeks the lowest number of GCS possible in order to reduce the necessary personnel required to deliver the events.</p>
98	<p>Operational Ceiling: The altitude requirements (e.g., C2 ft AGL to ft AGL) conflict with the NATO standard for Class I (typically below ft AGL).</p> <p>a. Confirmation Required: Will the UAS be operating under special flight exemptions or Letters of Agreement (LOA) with the Host Nation, confirming permission to exceed typical Class I regulatory ceilings for red force activities?</p>	<p>Yes, UAS will fly in accordance with Host Nation flight safety requirements and range restrictions.</p> <p>See answer #65 and #90</p>
99	<p>Internal RFP Discrepancies (Immediate Correction Needed) These errors directly impact the bid's technical scope and evaluation strategy</p>	<p>Table X component numbers are to be used. Non-attributable Class II are not intended to be used in WP 3 and 4.</p>

	<p>and require immediate correction by HQ SACT.</p> <p>Original Questions</p> <p>Table X and WP package: Table X Component IV is only required for WP 1,2, & 5. However WP 1 - 4 list all components. Can the government clarify?</p> <p>ANNEX F: EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR COMPONENT 4: Non- Attributable Class II UAS: Serial 2 - Points for 12 and 14 lists more than 50 or 100UAS however the maximum number of UAS in table x required is 25. Please clarify?</p> <p>Serial 8 - Max points is for UAS comms link of +40 Miles but the minimum required range for Component 4 is listed at 100 miles. Please clarify why a contractor would provide a 100 miles comms link when the grading is +40 miles.</p>	<p>=> See updates in Amendment 2, IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07</p> <p>=> see answer #5</p> <p>=> See updates in Amendment 2, IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07</p>
<p>100</p>	<p>Expanded Demand for Correction</p> <p>Table X vs. Narrative Component Conflict: The narrative description of Work Packages (e.g., WP 3 lists C1, C2 only) contradicts Table X, which allocates minimum/desired quantities for all four components (C1, C2, C3, C4) across nearly all WPs.</p> <p>a. Demand: The Government must issue a formal clarification or amendment reconciling the component requirements for each Work Package (WP 1 through WP 4) to ensure the correct assets are provisioned.</p>	<p>See updates in Amendment 2, IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07</p>
<p>101</p>	<p>Evaluation Criteria (Annex F) Discrepancy: The evaluation criteria for</p>	<p>See answer # 5.</p>

	<p>Component 4 must align with the required quantities.</p> <p>a. Demand: The maximum scoring brackets in Annex F (Serial 2, 12, 14) must be corrected to reflect the actual maximum desired quantity of 25 (Table X) for Component 4. Bidders cannot be expected to bid on units if only are desired.</p>	
<p>102</p>	<p>Performance Requirement vs. Evaluation Scoring Mismatch: Component 4's essential range requirement (miles) is much higher than the maximum scoring bracket (miles).</p> <p>a. Demand: The scoring in Annex F (Serial 8) must be revised to credit and prioritize a range of miles, making the essential requirement the minimum threshold for scoring, or the essential requirement must be reduced to miles. Bidders will naturally optimize toward the scoring criteria, not the unrewarded essential requirement.</p>	<p>See answer # 99 and updates in Amendment 2, IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07</p>
<p>103</p>	<p>High-Risk "Gotchas"</p> <p>Recovery Methods and Operational Tempo (The "Gotcha")</p> <p>The systems rely on non-runway recovery (Parachute/Skid/VTOL landing), which is incompatible with the high-tempo, massed-launch scenario described.</p> <p>RFP Requirement: Mass Launch (WP 3 & 4): Need to launch "massed UAS" within 4 hours notice.</p> <p>Airframe Risk/Gotcha</p>	<p>See answer to question # 93. Specific fly windows will be provided for each event as coordinated with HQ SACT, HN, Event POCs. Bidder can expect 2 to 3 fly windows during execution weeks lasting up to 2 hours each.</p>

	<p>Recovery Cycle Time: Catapult launch and parachute/skid/VTOL recovery require significant ground crew effort, time for packing/resetting, and a dedicated, clear recovery area. This greatly limits the sortie rate (flights per day/crew).</p> <p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT What is the required minimum Sortie Rate (flights per day per single airframe) for Class I and Class II assets? This is critical for crew sizing and determining the number of airframes needed to meet the total required Flight Hours (FH).</p>	
<p>104</p>	<p>RFP Requirement: The contractor has "full recovery... responsibility of its UAS."</p> <p>Airframe Risk/Gotcha: Recovery Logistics For parachute/skid landings in a dense military exercise environment, recovery teams may face long wait times or denied access to the landing zone, slowing the re-flight cycle.</p> <p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT: Will NATO guarantee dedicated, immediate recovery access to the designated operational/landing area upon notification of landing for non-Attritable assets (C3 & C4) to maintain the required sortie tempo?</p>	<p>HQ SACT cannot guarantee access at this time. Coordination with HQ SACT, Exercise POCs and Host Nation for each event will refine fly windows, access and recovery operations.</p>
<p>105</p>	<p>RFP Requirement: These are "Attritable" (consumable).</p> <p>Airframe Risk/Gotcha: Accidental Loss (C3 & C4): If The C3/C4 VTOL/Fixed-Wing aircraft (which may be long-endurance, high-value assets) are exposed to non-kinetic effects (jamming/spoofing) during a mass C1/C2 event, recovery could be jeopardized.</p> <p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT:</p>	<p>See answer to question #88.</p>

	<p>Will the operational plan guarantee geographical or temporal separation between C1/C2 high-attribution runs and C3/C4 non-Attributable runs to mitigate the risk of accidental loss of high-value platforms due to area denial or collateral C-UAS effects?</p>	
<p>106</p>	<p>Technical and Data Interface Compliance The STANAG 4817 requirement is non-negotiable for integration, and the general requirements might conflict with specific propulsion type.</p> <p>RFP Requirement: Telemetry: Data must be provided in (draft) STANAG 4817 format to NATO CIS.</p> <p>Airframe Risk/Gotcha: Integration Time: If The existing GCS software is not currently STANAG 4817 compliant, developing, integrating, and testing this interface with NATO CIS (Phase 1: Integration) is a massive, high-risk technical task.</p> <p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT: What is the precise format and method of data transfer (e.g., specific protocol like DDS or custom TCP/IP) required for the STANAG 4817 telemetry feed? Is there an approved Contractor-provided software/hardware interface NATO recommends for this integration?</p>	<p>The data transfer method for STANAG 4817 use HTTP POST with a JSON content. These messages will have to be sent to a NATO webservice over a VPN link. More technical details will be provided after contract award.</p> <p>See answer # 80</p>
<p>107</p>	<p>RFP Requirement: General UAS Requirements: The UAS shall be operated in a "fully remote-control way."</p> <p>Airframe Risk/Gotcha: Hydrogen Fuel Cell Logistics: Fuel cell operation is specialized, requiring H2 logistics (storage/transport) and specific safety protocols that differ significantly from battery or JP-8 systems.</p>	<p>HQ SACT will not provide storage. Bidder will be responsible for the H2 logistics chain.</p>

	<p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT: Will NATO provide a safe storage area/bunker for hydrogen fuel cells and the necessary refueling/ recharging infrastructure (e.g., ground power/utility access) at the deployment locations, or is the contractor responsible for the entire, self-contained H2 logistics chain?</p>	
<p>108</p>	<p>RFP Requirement: Telemetry Data: Requires signal to noise ratio (SNR) for command data link.</p> <p>Airframe Risk/Gotcha: Proprietary Links: If the SNR metric for specific secure data link (especially the high-end link needed for a long-range C4 asset) is proprietary or difficult to extract, it may violate the telemetry data requirement.</p> <p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT: If the contractor cannot provide the exact SNR of the command link, will a reliable metric of signal strength (e.g., RSSI or link quality percentage) be acceptable, provided it is continuously recorded?</p>	<p>A link quality percentage or RSSI is sufficient.</p>
<p>109</p>	<p>Classification and Performance Discrepancies The airframe specifications need careful alignment with the RFP's specific component requirements to ensure a compliant bid.</p> <p>RFP Requirement: C1 vs C2 Weight: Class I max weight is 25 kg. Class II has no minimum weight but size requirements</p> <p>Airframe Specs: The 50 lbs (22.7 kg) max gross weight puts the fixed wing in the upper bounds of Class I (C1/C3), but its capability (8 hrs,</p>	<p>Requirements are closely aligned to NATO CUAS standards and intended to mimic known threats on modern battlefields. Size and mission profiles are "prioritized." IE Weight for class II surrogates is less important than size and mission profile.</p>

	<p>10 lbs payload) suggests a larger, more capable Class II mission profile.</p> <p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT: For the 50 lbs/22.7 kg Fixed Wing and VTOL platforms, can HQ SACT confirm the preferred classification (Class I Component 3.3 or Class II Component 4), based on the mission profile (range/endurance) being prioritized over the weight standard?</p>	
<p>110</p>	<p>RFP Requirement: C2/C4 Altitude: Enroute altitudes of at least \$1500\$ ft AGL and not over \$5000\$ ft AGL.</p> <p>Airframe Specs: The airframes have \$8+\$ hours of endurance, suggesting they will spend significant time en route.</p> <p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT: Is the Contractor permitted to operate C2/C4 assets at altitudes higher than \$5000\$ ft AGL during transit (outside the exercise box) to comply with Host Nation civilian air traffic regulations, provided they descend for the operational window?</p>	<p>Yes, pending final confirmation with the Host Nation. Specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution.</p>
<p>111</p>	<p>RFP Requirement: C4 Wingspan: Minimum wingspan of 6.6feet.</p> <p>Airframe Specs: The 4.4 meter (14.4 ft) wingspan for the fixed wing easily meets this, but The VTOL (which you state has "same basic specs") may not meet the \$6\$ ft length or \$6.6\$ ft wingspan requirement if it is a multi-rotor design.</p> <p>Expanded Question for HQ SACT: Will HQ SACT grant an exception to the strict physical dimensions (Length/Wingspan) for the VTOL platform if it is bid as Component 4, provided it meets or exceeds the required endurance, speed, and altitude performance?</p>	<p>No. The minimum size has been selected to replicate current battlefield threats. To reduce the size will likely present a different challenge to sensors and effectors.</p>

<p>112</p>	<p>Work Package and Evaluation Discrepancy (The Initial Foundational Errors) These points represent structural conflicts within the RFP that could lead to the bid being rejected or incorrectly evaluated.</p> <p><u>Original Question</u> Table X and WP package: Table X Component IV is only required for WP 1, 2, & 5. However WP 1 - 4 list all components. Can the government clarify?</p> <p><u>Re-Framed Demand</u> Demand for Component Mix Reconciliation: The Government must issue a formal amendment reconciling the component requirements for each Work Package (WP 1 through WP 4) to ensure the narrative scope (SOW) perfectly matches the quantified requirements (Table X).</p> <p><u>Rationale & Impact on Bid</u> You must know exactly which of the two high-value platforms (Fixed Wing C3/C4 or VTOL C3/C4) is required for which event to allocate scarce resources and bid accurately.</p>	<p>See amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07.. Specifics will be provided NLT than 45 days from event execution.</p>
<p>113</p>	<p><u>Original Question</u> ANNEX F Discrepancy (Quantity): Serial 2 - Points for 12 and 14 lists more than 50 or 100 UAS however the maximum number of UAS in table x required is 25. Please clarify?</p> <p><u>Re-Framed Demand</u> Demand for Evaluation Metric Correction: The scoring brackets in Annex F (Serial 2, 12, 14) must be corrected to align with the maximum desired quantity of 25 for Component 4.</p> <p><u>Rationale & Impact on Bid</u> Bidding on 100 units to meet a faulty scoring metric for a requirement of 25</p>	<p>See amendment 2 IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-07. See answer #5</p>

	would massively and unnecessarily inflate the price proposal.	
114	<p><u>Original Question</u> ANNEX F Discrepancy (Range): Serial 8 - Max points is for UAS comms link of +40 Miles but the minimum required range for Component 4 is listed at 100 miles. Please clarify why a contractor would provide a 100 miles comms link when the grading is +40 miles.</p> <p><u>Re-Framed Demand</u> Demand for Scoring Alignment: The scoring in Annex F (Serial 8) must be revised to prioritize and credit a range of miles.</p> <p><u>Rationale & Impact on Bid</u> The superior 8-hour endurance and corresponding long-range capability must be rewarded in the scoring. If not, the bid is penalized for exceeding the minimum requirement.</p>	See answer #102
115	<p>Financial & Contractual Risk Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Type: Can HQ SACT confirm the anticipated contract type (e.g., Firm Fixed Price (FFP), Time and Materials (T&M), or Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ))? 	See answers to questions #22, #23, #24, #25
116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fuel Cell Cost Recovery: Will the Government allow for separate, direct cost invoicing for all consumables related to the hydrogen fuel cell systems (e.g., fuel cell swaps, hydrogen supply logistics) outside of the standard per-Flight-Hour rate? 	No.
117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optional Work Packages: Will the subsequent Work Packages (WP 2-5) be awarded based on performance in the preceding WP, 	Release of optional work packages shall remain within HQ SACT discretion, based on funds availability, continued operational

	or are they entirely independent contract options?	need, and satisfactory performance of the bidder.
118	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment Schedule: Will payment be structured as a lump sum upon completion of Phase 3, or will milestone payments be made upon successful completion of Phase 1 (Integration) and Phase 2 (Operation)? 	<p>See answer #22, #23, #24</p> <p>Payment shall be made based on the fixed firm price contract, NET 30 days after submission of invoice and successful completion of the services, accepted by HQ SACT.</p> <p>Payment schedule is after completion of Phase 3.</p>
119	<p>Command & Control and Spectrum Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spectrum Allocation: Will NATO guarantee specific, deconflicted radio frequency (RF) bands for the Contractor's command and control (C2) links outside of the bands targeted by NATO's C-UAS jamming systems during the exercise? 	See answer to question #82.
120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Link Security: For non-commercial encryption (if commercially available encryption is insufficient for the C4 platform), is NATO prepared to grant temporary certification or provide NATO-standard encryption modules for integration? 	No, commercial encryption is sufficient
121	<p>A. Geofencing & Fail-Safes: Can NATO specify the maximum allowable reaction time (latency) between the UAS violating a geofence/fail-safe parameter and the system's mandatory autonomous execution of the Return-to-Home (RTH) procedure?</p> <p>Personnel and Security Requirements</p> <p>B. Security Clearance: While clearance is "desirable" for the Liaison, is a formal security clearance (e.g., NATO Secret or equivalent national clearance) a <i>mandatory</i> requirement for any technical or flight operations</p>	<p>A. A latency of 5 seconds is the maximum limit</p> <p>B. See question #53.</p>

	personnel who may require access to NATO CIS or classified exercise planning documents?	
122	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Contractor-Owned Equipment: Will the Contractor's IT infrastructure (Clause i) and Ground Control Stations (GCS) be subject to a NATO-mandated security inspection or penetration test prior to connection to NATO CIS?	No.