

IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-16 FLE(X) Q&A #1

18 December 2025

Question #	RFP Part & Section Reference	RFP Page#	Question	Submission Date	Response
1	11,a.,5, Key Personnel; Enclosure 1	p7, p11	Key personnel are required to be submitted and will be evaluated against Annex A criteria, but there is not a prescribed format or min/max on Key personnel submitted. Will you provide a format and any KP submission constraints, or is it at the discretion of the bidder?	15-Dec-25	The purpose of the Key Personnel submission is to allow the evaluation team to understand who will work on the project and assess the relevance of their experience to the problem set. Approach and format at discretion of bidder.
2	11. Content of Proposal	p6	The only constraint on submission length is "The company description portion of its technical proposal shall be limited to 10 pages." It is not clear if this includes key personnel and past performance writing. Will you please provide any clarifying guidance on what is under the 10-page cap? Barring clarification, we will operate with Key Personnel and Past Performance are not included in that page limitation.	15-Dec-25	The page limit applies solely to the company description. Key Personnel and Past Performance are not counted against the 10-page cap.
3	11.a.7) Technical Proposal... Annex A to SOW	p7, p22	The Technical Proposal instructions specify that a Compliance Matrix be submitted per Annex B to the Statement of Work (11,a,7). P22 includes an "Annex A to the Statement of Work." The Statement of Work itself is labelled Annex A as well. Will the client please confirm the correct reference for the compliance matrix?	15-Dec-25	It is acknowledged that the annex numbering in the IFIB may appear confusing. For clarity, the document structure is as follows: 1) The Invitation for International Bidding (IFIB) is the parent document. 2) Annex A to the IFIB is the Statement of Work (SOW). 3) Within the SOW, the Compliance Matrix is provided as Annex A to the Statement of Work. Accordingly, the Compliance Matrix referred to in the Technical Proposal instructions corresponds to Annex A to the Statement of Work, as included within Annex A to the IFIB. Bidders should use this Compliance Matrix to demonstrate compliance with the SOW requirements.
4	1. Bidding Instructions - General, c.	p4	What metrics, benchmarks, or success indicators are used to evaluate the effectiveness and contribution of partial solutions versus full solutions	15-Dec-25	Partial bidding refers to bidding on only one of the two research topics. Partial and full bids are evaluated using the same Best Value technical criteria, with no inherent preference for full bids. Bids will be assessed based on their ability to address the relevant research questions in the Statement of Work, and the rigor of the analytical approach, using the evaluation matrix included in the SOW. A partial award may be offered to address one of the research topics.
5	1. Bidding Instructions - General, c.	p4	Is there a process for "graduating" partial solutions to full-scale adoption?	15-Dec-25	See above
6	Annex A: SOW, Approach	p16	The SOW "The contractor shall maintain close coordination with ACT staff and designated subject-matter experts throughout the project, participating in periodic review meetings and workshops to validate findings and refine analytical priorities." For planning purposes, will NATO ACT prescribe a cadence and duration of meetings, or designate a specific ceiling on these engagements?	15-Dec-25	HQ SACT does not prescribe a fixed cadence, duration, or ceiling for coordination meetings. The intent of this requirement is to ensure effective coordination and timely validation of findings throughout the project. The cadence and format of meetings will be agreed collaboratively between HQ SACT and the contractor, based on project needs. As a reference, during previous FLE activities coordination typically included regular weekly or bi-weekly, with additional meetings scheduled as required to address specific analytical issues, reviews, or refinements. Similar flexibility is expected for FLE(X).

7	Annex A: SOW, Research Topic, 1. Robotics in Land Warfare: Indirect Fires	p17	What is the scope for robotic/alternative solutions—should we include only fielded systems, or also research concepts, swarming, autonomous munitions, etc.?	15-Dec-25	<p>The scope includes both fielded systems and near-term concepts, provided they are credible and realistically implementable within the stated timeframe.</p> <p>As outlined in the Statement of Work, proposed robotic or alternative solutions should generally be at TRL 4 or above and capable of informing implementable capability options within approximately five years.</p> <p>Concepts such as swarming, autonomy, or alternative delivery mechanisms may be included where they are supported by evidence-based analysis and demonstrate a plausible path to operational adoption. Purely speculative or long-term concepts without such grounding are not expected.</p>
8	Annex A: SOW, Research Topic, 1. Robotics in Land Warfare: Indirect Fires	p17	What sources or standards should be used to define artillery system and support vehicle parameters and performance characteristics for both existing and undeveloped artillery systems?	15-Dec-25	<p>Bidders may use authoritative and transparent sources to define artillery system and support vehicle parameters and performance characteristics. These may include NATO publications and standards, validated modelling and simulation data, manufacturer information, and relevant open-source defence references. The NATO reference capability for each topic will be provided by HQ SACT after the award. For undeveloped or emerging systems, well-founded assumptions or analogues to existing systems may be used, provided that all data sources, assumptions and limitations are clearly documented. The emphasis is on analytical credibility and transparency rather than adherence to a single prescribed standard.</p>
9	Annex A: SOW, Research Topic, 2. Multi Domain Precision Strike	p19	What categories or types of space and comms assets has NATO ACT deemed critical (communications, ISR, navigation, EW, etc.)?	15-Dec-25	<p>Bidders should assess those assets that are operationally relevant to enabling distributed multi-domain precision strike, as described in the Statement of Work, particularly in contested and degraded environments. The focus is on relevance to the proposed concepts rather than exhaustive listing.</p>
10	Annex A: SOW, Research Topic, 2. Multi Domain Precision Strike	p19	Which air platforms (manned/unmanned, fixed/rotary wing) are considered highest priority for initial modeling?	15-Dec-25	<p>HQ SACT has not prescribed priority platforms for initial modelling. Bidders should focus on those platforms and delivery means, across all domains, that are most relevant to the proposed multi-domain precision strike concepts, as described in the Statement of Work. The emphasis is on identifying the most effective solutions rather than on specific platform types.</p>
11	Annex A: SOW, Research Topics 1 and	p17, p19	Are there existing enemy data sets or Red force templates provided by NATO ACT, or is original research expected?	15-Dec-25	<p>HQ SACT does not provide predefined enemy data sets or Red Force templates for this study. Bidders are expected to develop appropriate Red Force representations as part of their analysis, using credible, transparent and well-documented sources and assumptions, in line with the Statement of Work. As part of the coordination process, ACT subject-matter experts may be engaged to review and assess the proposed assumptions and analysis. The emphasis remains on analytical credibility and relevance rather than the use of prescribed data sets.</p>
12	Annex A: SOW, Acceptance Criteria	p21	On Page 21 under "Acceptance Criteria" it states "ACT will accept if the delivery of the products is: 1) on time; and 2) fully in line with the requirements stated in paragraph 4 of this SoW." The SOW paragraphs are not numbered and there is not a clear, applicable reference. In addition to timeliness, are the "Analytical Focus" and "Expected Outputs" under each Research Question the acceptance criteria?	15-Dec-25	<p>In addition to timeliness, deliverables will be accepted based on whether they adequately address the research questions and are consistent with the analytical focus, expected outputs and deliverables in line with the requirements stated in the Statement of Work. Please disregard the reference to "paragraph 4".</p>

<p>13</p>	<p>Bidding Instructions</p>	<p>Para 8</p>	<p>As the documentation was published only two days ago, the current deadline for submitting clarification requests, set for coming Monday on 15 December, provides a very limited timeframe. Given the complexity and wide range of the requirements, this short duration does not allow sufficient time for a thorough review and for preparing well-considered questions. We respectfully request an extension of the clarification period. Allowing additional time would enable us and other interested parties to submit meaningful inquiries, ultimately contributing to a more transparent and effective tender procedure.</p>	<p>12-Dec-25</p>	<p>HQ SACT will continue to accept questions throughout the remainder of the month of December, however, with the holidays approaching quickly, there may be some delay in getting the responses needed therefore we ask for patience in advance patience is appreciated.</p>
-----------	-----------------------------	---------------	--	------------------	---