

RFI:

RFI-ACT-SACT-25-112 2026 Innovation Continuum

Reference:

Q&A #1

Date of Issue:

1/26/2026

The following questions were raised with respect to subject RFI-ACT-SACT-25-112 2026 Innovation Continuum Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
<p>1. Can you please confirm the primary place(s) of performance anticipated for this requirement (e.g., specific NATO facilities, member nations, or remote/virtual work)?</p>	<p>Innovation Continuum work will be conducted online with four milestone on site events located at following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPARK, • IGNITE, • GLOW, • SHINE,
<p>2. Para 4.1 says that responses shall be provided via email to the 4 POCs on page 2 of the RFI, yet Para 4.3.6 says that submissions should be done through the online questionnaire provided at the beginning of the RFI. There is no link to an online questionnaire listed anywhere in the RFI. These paragraphs appear to be in conflict. What is the means through which responses shall be submitted?</p>	<p>Please see amended document, submissions are now only via email.</p>
<p>3. Is the place of performance fixed, or does NATO anticipate multiple locations (HQ SACT, NATO agencies, or in-theatre sites)?</p>	<p>The primary sites are fixed, however there is a possibility of remote linking to additional sites during execution. This will be determined during the scoping and blueprinting phases of IC.</p>
<p>4. Do you facilitate any partnerships with Government Contractors?</p>	<p>ACT is not seeking partnerships with individual Government Contractors. However, if they are incorporated as business, they may present their solution proposals via RFI.</p>
<p>5. JEMM XML Schema Access: Since the RFI specifies interaction with the Joint Exercise Management Module (JEMM) for MEL/MIL outputs, could NATO provide a technical description, schema reference, or sample nested XML format currently used? This would confirm export compatibility and demonstrate direct integration potential.</p>	<p>There are no references to JEMM nor XML in RFI-ACT-SACT-25-112 RFI.</p>
<p>6. Acceptable Security & Classification Levels: What classification levels (e.g., NATO RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIAL) and security requirements (e.g., encryption standards, access controls) would apply to proposed solutions during the evaluation phase? Titans includes quantum-</p>	<p>Innovation Continuum operates at NU level.</p>

<p>resistant encryption and provenance tracking in its vault architecture — understanding NATO's baseline expectations would help us highlight relevant features.</p>	
<p>7. Evaluation Criteria Weighting for Automation & Scalability For the AI Audacious Training theme, how heavily are proposals weighted on automation of MEL/MIL scripting, scenario diversity generation, and scalability across multiple parallel branches (e.g., counterfactuals, multi-domain ops)? Titans is specifically built for these capabilities — clarity on weighting would allow us to emphasize the most valued aspects</p>	<p>See 7. QUALIFICATION PROCEDURE. There are no specific criteria addressing “scenario diversity”, “...</p>
<p>8. Integration with Existing NATO Tools & Data Flows Beyond JEMM, are there other NATO tools or data standards (e.g., JC3IEDM, APP-6(D), simulation federation protocols like HLA/DIS) that successful solutions would be expected to interface with? This would help us demonstrate interoperability and reduce integration risk.</p>	<p>There are no constraints, requirements on specific technology standards.</p>
<p>9. It's not at all clear what NATO could do with the learning? Does NATO have the capacity to procure any of the solutions placed forward in response to the RFI? It's a big question – as if it turns out NATO could never procure what I am able to offer, why would I commit to the cost of participating across 4 events</p>	<p>There is no RFP expected as a follow up on this RFI. It's up to the providers to determine if they see a value in collaborative efforts participation. See “3.3 Expected Benefits to Respondents”</p>
<p>10. So whilst I realise this RFI is purely that, what hope can you offer that NATO is an organisation that could one day buy what I am offering</p>	<p>See “3.3 Expected Benefits to Respondents”</p>
<p>11. we would like to confirm whether we are required to provide an NCAGE code or any other code to be assigned by the Turkish Ministry of National Defense.</p>	<p>NCAGE code is not mandatory</p>
<p>12. Technical collaboration between phases Between the Innovation Continuum phases (e.g. SPARK–IGNITE or IGNITE–GLOW), does ACT foresee opportunities for structured technical collaboration or subject-matter expert engagement (such as remote technical exchanges or design alignment sessions) to help participating organizations refine their solutions in line with NATO operational needs</p>	<p>Yes. The milestone events SPARK, IGNITE, GLOW, SHINE are closing IC phases of scope, design, validate and evaluate. All the phases are continuous in their nature, and the work is being conducted online though VISTA platform and virtual meetings.</p>
<p>13. Demonstration expectations across phases For the different Innovation Continuum phases, does ACT anticipate live or system-level demonstrations outside of the GLOW and SHINE events, or are SPARK and IGNITE intended to remain primarily concept and design-focused?</p>	<p>SPARK and IGNITE are provide conference setting to finalize the scope and design phases. There is no explicit requirement for demonstrations during those events, however it's not excluded if it helps with finalization of scoping and designing.</p>

<p>14. Integration expectations during validation and experimentation For solutions progressing to the GLOW and SHINE phases, what level of integration with existing NATO C2 / C4ISR systems is expected? Specifically, is interface-level or simulated integration considered sufficient for experimentation, or is deeper operational integration anticipated?</p>	<p>Both interface level and/or simulated integration are options with the preference for the interface.</p>
<p>15. Are submissions/responses addressing more than one Theme permitted?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>16. If submissions address more than one Theme, should the themes be consolidated into one submission/response or should there be a separate submission/response for each theme?</p>	<p>The submissions should bring an innovative solution or solutions list with the themes assigned to each of them where possible.</p>
<p>17. Given the timeline provided in section 3.2 of the RFI, the SPARK event takes place less than four weeks after RFI responses are due. Will ACT be providing guidance/making decisions prior to the SPARK event? If not, when can responses to the RFI be expected?</p>	<p>ACT will do their best to conduct selection board the soonest. Still to assure early inclusion of the solutions in IC 26 cycle, SPARK will offer remote connection options for the selected solutions.</p>
<p>18. Follow-on Selection Process: The Qualification Procedure (Para 7) outlines the evaluation criteria. Could you clarify the expected timeline and process for selecting organizations after the submission deadline for the GLOW Event (validation) and SHINE Event (evaluation)? Will the down-select criteria include a mandatory technical demonstration or a live code review of the proposed solution?</p>	<p>The selection criteria don't include a mandatory technical demonstrator nor live code review.</p>
<p>19. Prototyping and Experimentation Phases: At which stage are selected industry partners expected to deploy a working prototype or platform capability for testing and experimentation with NATO staff? Is this primarily confined to the GLOW (validation) and SHINE (evaluation) events?</p>	<p>Correct. It is GLOW and SHINE.</p>
<p>20. SPARK (Scoping) Event Clarity: Could you provide additional detail on the expected format and participant level for the SPARK Event (24-26 February 2026)? Are industry respondents anticipated to present their RFI response, or participate in collaborative working groups to refine requirements? What is the desired skillset/seniority for industry attendees?</p>	<p>Yes, the industries are expected to present their solutions at SPARK. Further to simplify scoping ideally an industry provides business and technology level working expertise.</p>

<p>21. Experimentation Environment: What is the required technical environment for the hands-on demonstration and experimentation phase? Specifically: Are industry partners expected to provide demonstrations within a NATO-provided secure network (e.g., a test enclave), or is the use of a vendor-managed, dedicated test environment permitted? What, if any, NATO-specific APIs or integration points will be made available to test for seamless integration/interoperability with existing NATO systems, which is a key evaluation criterion (Para 7.f)?</p>	<p>ACT with NCIA support will provide cloud based experimental environment with an option to integrate RFI solutions.</p> <p>The systems provided in experimental environment will be determined in the scoping and design phases.</p> <p>The integration criteria from point 7 refers to system openness, and dynamic reconfiguration.</p>
<p>22. Registration: Do we need to be a registered NATO vendor or partner in order to participate in the Innovation Continuum? If so, what kind of accreditation or registration is required?</p>	<p>There is no formal accreditation or registration required.</p>
<p>23. DZYNE Technologies respectfully requests clarification regarding acceptable submission formats for RFI-ACT-SACT-25-112. Section 4 of the RFI notes that respondents may include product brochures, illustrations, photographs, and URL links to technical documentation. Could please confirm whether a short, non-classified video, or a secure URL link to such a video, may be included as part of the submission to demonstrate system functionality? If permitted, are there any format or duration constraints?</p>	<p>Video link, rather than video file, may be included in the submission.</p>