

Reference:

RFP-ACT-SACT-26-16 PART B

Q&A #1

Date of Issue: 20 March 2026

The following questions were raised with respect to subject **RFP-ACT-SACT-26-16B**. Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
1. Please confirm whether participation as a consortium under a single prime contractor, with subcontractors contributing to the study, is acceptable under this RFP.	Yes
2. Are there any formal requirements or limitations regarding the number or type of subcontractors involved?	No limitations but all subcontractors and candidates would need to be from a NATO Nation.
3. Should subcontractors be explicitly detailed within the technical proposal, including their roles and level of effort?	Yes
4. Is there any recommended or typical budget range per Statement of Work (SOW) that bidders should consider?	All previous contract awards are published on the Contracting Website under the awards section.  <a href="https://www.act.nato.int/opportunities/contracting/">https://www.act.nato.int/opportunities/contracting/</a>
5. Are single-topic bids evaluated independently from dual-topic submissions?	Each topic will be evaluated independently, and contract award decisions will be taken separately for each of the research topics.
6. Are there any preferred formats or templates for the compliance and evaluation matrices?	See Annex B
7. The SOW (paragraph 2) states that FLE(X) builds upon the outcomes of the initial FLE study conducted in 2025. Will HQ SACT provide prospective bidders or the awarded contractor with access to the conclusions, outputs, or an unclassified summary of the 2025 FLE study as a baseline reference? If so, at what stage (pre-award or post-award)?	HQ SACT cannot share the full FLE 2025 study reports outside of NATO due to classification constraints. However, key insights, lessons learned and relevant conclusions from the initial study will be used to inform follow-on FLEX work. These will be shared, as appropriate, with the awarded contractor during the execution phase (post-award), including through project meetings and guidance from HQ SACT.
8. Is the contractor fully responsible for developing the operational scenarios, or will HQ SACT / ACT staff provide scenario parameters, threat frameworks, or a scenario library as a starting point? Will the scenario set be validated by the COTR during the kick-off meeting, or is it the contractor's sole responsibility to define and justify scenario selection?	The contractor is responsible for developing the operational scenarios, in close coordination with HQ SACT. Scenario parameters, threat frameworks and key assumptions will be discussed and aligned during project meetings, including the kick-off meeting. Final scenario selection will be subject to validation by HQ SACT's project leader to ensure consistency with NATO requirements and study objectives.
9. Will HQ SACT provide any reference data sets, threat performance parameters, or	The contractor is expected to provide this from credible open-source and/or commercially available

<p>validated force data to support modelling and simulation, or is the contractor expected to rely exclusively on open-source and commercially available data? If contractor-sourced data is used, what standard of validation will be considered acceptable by the COTR (e.g., published academic sources, SIPRI, official NATO open documents)?</p>	<p>data. All data sources must be transparent, traceable and methodologically sound, and will be subject to validation by HQ SACT's project leader.  Due to classification constraints, HQ SACT may complement these with selected reference data sets up to NATO UNCLASSIFIED level, where appropriate, to support modelling and simulation.</p>
<p>10. SOW paragraph R1-3 specifies that capability options must focus on "modular, high-capacity options (TRL 7+)." Please confirm the intended interpretation: Does TRL 7+ mean systems that have already achieved TRL 7 or above as of the contract period, or systems that are projected to reach TRL 7+ within the 5-year implementation horizon referenced in R1-2? We would welcome a brief explanation of the intended purpose behind the TRL 7+.</p>	<p>The intent of the TRL 7+ requirement is to ensure that proposed capability options are sufficiently mature to be realistically deployed within the 5-year horizon referenced in the SOW. This includes systems that have already reached TRL 7+ or are credibly expected to achieve TRL 7+ within that timeframe, based on clear and justified assumptions.</p>
<p>11. The SOW lists explicit research questions (R1-5 through R1-9) with specific quantitative outputs required (e.g., decoy-to-shooter ratios, cost-exchange matrices, attrition rates). Please confirm: At the bid/proposal stage, is the contractor expected to provide preliminary answers or estimates for these research questions, or solely to demonstrate the methodology and analytical capability by which they would be answered during contract execution?</p>	<p>At the bid/proposal stage, the contractor is not expected to provide definitive answers to the research questions. Instead, the proposal should demonstrate a robust methodology and analytical approach, including how the contractor intends to address the research questions and generate the required quantitative output during contract execution.</p>