

**RFP:** RFP-ACT-SACT-26-17

**Reference:** Q&A #3

**Date of Issue:** 15 May 2026

The following questions were raised with respect to subject **RFP-ACT-SACT-26-17- NexGen M&S**. Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
<p>1. 15g AP Schedule</p> <p>If Sprint 2 and Sprint 3 have 1 month between them and no evaluation period, is the assumption that if you get down-selected for Sprint 2 that you go all the way to Sprint 4?</p>	<p>No. Sprint 2 is a virtual presentation where the down-selected bidders demonstrate their capability as detailed in their Technical Proposal from Sprint 1. The Contract Award Committee and Technical Evaluation team validate the demonstrated proposed capability. Based on that evaluation, bidders may be further down-selected to participate in Sprint 3.</p>
<p>2. 4b Eligibility Pg. 6</p> <p>Bidder shall be established in a North Atlantic Treaty Organization Alliance member nation.</p> <p>Must subcontractors be from a member nation also?</p>	<p>Yes. All bidding companies, whether prime or sub-contractor, or any part of a consortium, are all required to be legally registered and operating under a member nation and their participating key personnel must be citizens of member nations.</p>
<p>3. Enclosure 3 Pg. 22</p> <p>Enclosure 3: Past Performance Information Form states, "Company is required to submit minimum of two examples of relevant past performance."</p> <p>Can past performance information examples come from subcontractors if it is relevant to the proposed approach?</p>	<p>Yes, and it should state which company performed under the reference.</p>
<p>4. Enclosure 6 Pg. 27</p> <p>Enclosure 6: Mandatory Price Proposal Template</p> <p>Does this estimate only apply to SACT's location (Norfolk, VA, USA)? Or does it apply to other NATO training locations (JFTC, Poland; JWC, Norway; other)?</p>	<p>The estimate should apply to NATO Command Structure locations.</p>

<p>5. Statement of Objectives 4.1 Pg. 39 4.1. Capability Requirements - CR4: Computer Assisted Wargames</p> <p>The Requirements Statement refers to "...wargaming process defined by Experimentation and Wargaming Branch at HQ SACT."</p> <p>Is there a specific document/reference defining this?</p>	<p>The latest published NATO Wargaming Handbook from 2023 can be found here:</p> <p><a href="https://archives.nato.int/uploads/r/nato-archives-online/7/7/b/77bc6819364cf0e859c86cff1d4ae846996bc2299d077d7982823ee6b1921869/ACT_COS_TT-7402_SER_NU1815_ENG_NHQD298489.pdf">https://archives.nato.int/uploads/r/nato-archives-online/7/7/b/77bc6819364cf0e859c86cff1d4ae846996bc2299d077d7982823ee6b1921869/ACT_COS_TT-7402_SER_NU1815_ENG_NHQD298489.pdf</a></p> <p>Should that link not be accessible:</p> <p><a href="https://paxsims.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/nato-wargaming-handbook-202309.pdf">https://paxsims.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/nato-wargaming-handbook-202309.pdf</a></p>
<p>6. Statement of Objectives 4.3 Pg. 49 4.3. Programme Integration Requirements - PIR1</p> <p>The Requirement states: "NexGen M&amp;S services shall be interoperable with other services related/dependent NATO capability programmes."</p> <p>Is there a list of specific programmes?</p>	<p>The NexGen M&amp;S solution is expected to interoperate with NCS systems and NATO Command and Control (C2) systems, as defined in NFR 9 of the SOO.</p>
<p>7. RFP, References Pg. 19</p> <p>C. NAF Website URL</p> <p>The link is broken. Can a current link to NAFv4 be provided?</p>	<p><a href="https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/organization/nato-structure/digital-policy-committee-dpc/nato-architecture-framework-version">https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/organization/nato-structure/digital-policy-committee-dpc/nato-architecture-framework-version</a></p>
<p>8. Pricing Workbook N/A</p> <p>TAB for Sprint 2</p> <p>No TAB for Sprint 2 was included. Is this intentional, or should a TAB for Sprint 2 be provided.</p>	<p>This is intentional. As Sprint 2 is a <b>virtual (online)</b> demonstration of the proposed capability detailed in Sprint 1's Technical Proposal.</p>
<p>9. RFP Pg. 23</p> <p>Font size shall be 12-point.</p> <p>Can graphics or tables use 10 pt font?</p>	<p>Yes, graphics and tables can use 10 pt font.</p>
<p>10. RFP Pg. 23</p> <p>The total page count of the proposal shall not exceed one hundred and fifty pages.</p>	<p>Yes, 11x17 will count as two pages.</p>

<p>Can offerors use 11x17 for tables and charts, counting each 11x17 sheet as two pages?</p>	
<p>11. SOO, para 8 Pg.16</p> <p>Place of Performance refers to "designated locations as required."</p> <p>Can the locations where performance is expected be provided?</p>	<p>For IOC, the bidder's facility and the Capability Management Office (Norfolk, VA, USA), SHAPE (Belgium), JWC (Norway), and JFTC (Poland). Additional locations will be officially announced during Sprints 2 through 4.</p>
<p>12. SOO NFR 9 Pg.42</p> <p>Interoperability with required NATO systems</p> <p>Can the list of NATO systems be provided that interoperability shall be required with?</p>	<p>The NexGen M&amp;S solution is expected to interoperate with NCS systems and NATO Command and Control (C2) systems, as defined in NFR 9 of the SOO. Although interoperability is a programme requirement, there will not be any testing in Sprint 1 and 2. Further information will be provided to down-selected Bidders. This further clarified through the Agile Procurement process (Sprints 2-4).</p>
<p>13. SOO NFR 6 Pg.41</p> <p>Relevant NATO regulatory requirements</p> <p>Can a list of relevant NATO regulations be provided?</p>	<p>Bidders are not expected to demonstrate full compliance with all applicable NATO regulatory requirements at this stage of the procurement.</p> <p>NFR 6 encompasses compliance with applicable NATO regulatory requirements relevant to the NexGen M&amp;S capability. The primary compliance framework is defined by the C3 Policy Compliance Checklist provided in Appendix 2 to Annex A of this RFP.</p> <p>Key governing documents include C-M(2015)0041-REV2 and its annexes covering C3 Interoperability Policy, Enterprise Architecture Policy, Cloud Computing, and Lifecycle Management policies, as well as the NATO Information Management Policy (CM(2007)0118).</p> <p>From an M&amp;S interoperability perspective, applicable standards include STANAG 4603, STANAG 4855, STANAG 4856, STANREC 4800, STANREC 4799, STANREC 4801, STANAG 5516, STANAG 5525, and FMN Spiral 5 specifications relevant to MSaaS and C2SIM interoperability.</p> <p>Final compliance requirements will be progressively assessed and refined throughout the Agile Procurement process in coordination with relevant NATO authorities and will be part of the final SOW document.</p>
<p>14. RFP, References Pg. 19</p> <p>D. NATO Competitive Procurement Policy      The link is broken.</p> <p>Can a current link to the subject policy be provided?</p>	<p><a href="https://www.nato.int/en/news-and-events/articles/news/2025/07/22/nato-allies-agree-new-procurement-policy">https://www.nato.int/en/news-and-events/articles/news/2025/07/22/nato-allies-agree-new-procurement-policy</a></p>

<p>15. SOO</p> <p>Decision Support vs AAR</p> <p>How does HQ SACT distinguish “Decision Support” functions (e.g., COA comparison dashboards, correlation of forces matrices, decision briefs) from “Analysis &amp; Debrief” (AAR/replay/reporting) for Sprint demonstrations and scoring?</p>	<p>The primary difference between Decision Support and Analysis and Debrief are different levels of detail and associated tools in their development. For example, the Operational Analysis requires greater detail about results from the simulation runs. Whereas, Decision Support needs to be faster and therefore, less precise – but sufficient enough to make timely decisions. For Computer-Assisted Exercises, the Analysis and Debrief capability is focused on providing data to the training audience about their performance and exclusively focused on the training objectives.</p>
<p>16. SOO</p> <p>Mission Control scope</p> <p>For “Simulation Control Apps” (runtime orchestration/time management) versus “monitoring/observability,” what capability is expected from bidders in Sprint 2–4? Is it acceptable for the consortium to provide runtime observability and operational dashboards (Mission Control) while orchestration/time management is provided by another component?</p>	<p>Yes, runtime observability and operational dashboards can be a separate component from time management as long as the two components are in sync.</p>
<p>17. SOO</p> <p>EXCON overlap</p> <p>In CAX support, what portions of “Exercise Control: real-time exercise control and monitoring (EXCON)” must be demonstrated as control actions versus monitoring/assessment displays?</p>	<p>The expectation is monitoring/assessment displays or dashboards for synchronization of the exercise allowing EXCON members to make decisions on exercise flow and timing of MEL/MIL. The demonstration of this capability should include implementing EXCON decisions into the simulation. The control actions may include start, pause, stop, restart, speed-up/down the simulation, and execute a MEL/MIL inject.</p>
<p>18. Data exhaust / telemetry: minimum integration set for analytics &amp; traceability</p> <p>For GSR4 (“collect, process, and visualize simulation outputs”) and Sprint evaluation emphasis on parsing / mining / export / reporting, what is the minimum required data exhaust expected for Sprint 2/3/4 demonstrations (e.g., entity state, orders, adjudication outcomes, event logs, annotations, C2 message traffic)?</p>	<p>Data Exhaust will not be evaluated for Sprint 2, only a demonstration of the Common Synthetic Environment, and the Plan, Prepare, Execute, Analyze tool. The focus of the Analyze portion will be reports. Sprint 3 will focus on the four application areas at a high level. Therefore, entity state, orders, and adjudication outcomes are the most important. Sprint 4 is a deep dive into the four application areas where the C2 message traffic and event logs will be important.</p>

<p>19. Data exhaust / telemetry: minimum integration set for analytics &amp; traceability</p> <p>Are there preferred/required integration patterns for this data exhaust—e.g., REST/graph APIs, pub/sub, file-based exchange, or HLA/DIS-mediated streams—at least for Sprint demonstrations, and do these differ from IOC/FOC expectations? For “data provenance and output traceability” (Sprint 4), what minimum provenance elements does HQ SACT expect (e.g., dataset versions, parameter sets, model versions, run IDs, seed/control variables, analyst actions)?</p>	<p>A combination of REST/graph APIs, pub/sub, file-based exchange, or HLA/DIS-mediated streams is anticipated, but are not dictating specific data exchange mechanisms. Data provenance and output traceability in Sprint 4 is important to explain the conceptual model and VV&amp;A methodology. There is no minimum provenance elements expected.</p>
<p>20. “Common Synthetic Environment (CSE)” meaning and “common” data authority</p> <p>For CSE (common terrain, behaviours, and unit database), does HQ SACT require a single authoritative data store, or is a federated approach acceptable provided configuration baselines, versioning, and traceability are enforced?</p>	<p>NATO envisions a single common synthetic environment whereby the modular components will utilize the same data framework, terrain map, and sim engine. However, a federated approach is acceptable initially provided configuration baselines, versioning, and traceability are enforced. Eventually a common data framework is expected but not enforced at this time.</p>
<p>21. “Common Synthetic Environment (CSE)” meaning and “common” data authority</p> <p>For “common behaviours/adjudication,” is HQ SACT seeking (a) shared adjudication services, (b) consistent behaviour libraries/configuration, or (c) equivalence of outcomes across federates?</p>	<p>Yes, HQ SACT is seeking shared adjudication services with common behaviors as a part of CSE.</p>
<p>22. “Common Synthetic Environment (CSE)” meaning and “common” data authority</p> <p>For “common unit database,” will NATO provide a baseline (GFD) dataset and schema, or do bidders propose initial ORBAT/unit content?</p>	<p>NATO will NOT provide a baseline dataset, only a pdf file containing Force Structure, setting, and scenario information will be provided for those selected to participate in Sprint 3. Therefore, bidders should use their initial ORBAT/unit content for Sprint 2.</p> <p>Post award, NATO will work with the contracted vendor to develop the NATO ORBAT and dataset curated between IOC and FOC.</p>

<p>23. Web-enabled definition and client-side dependencies</p> <p>Sprint 1 evaluation rewards fully web-enabled access; what does HQ SACT consider “client-side dependencies” that would downgrade scoring (e.g., browser plugins, local agents, thin clients), and what is acceptable on NATO networks?</p>	<p>Client-side dependencies are understood as any software components, plugins, agents, or installations required on the end-user device to access or operate the solution. The degree to which a solution relies on such dependencies will be considered in the evaluation of NFR 5.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to clearly describe any client-side requirements in their Technical Proposal and explain how their approach remains compatible with NATO network and security requirements.</p>
<p>24. Data Management Framework (SOO 5.4): artifact expectations in Sprint 1</p> <p>For Sprint 1 assessment of the Data Management Framework (and criterion coverage for data import/processing), does HQ SACT expect sample artifacts (e.g., example data dictionary/schema excerpt, sample pedigree/assumptions report), or is an approach description sufficient at this stage?</p>	<p>For Sprint 1, the approach description is sufficient.</p>
<p>25. Data Management Framework (SOO 5.4): artifact expectations in Sprint 1</p> <p>SOO 5.4 includes data categories spanning ORBAT, weapons/effects, environment, behaviour logic, sustainment, C4ISR, scenario context, and governance (pedigree, configuration management, interoperability, VV&amp;A artifacts). Can HQ SACT confirm which subset will be used in Sprint 2 evaluation scenario(s) so bidders can prioritise integration for the demonstration?</p>	<p>Sprint 2 evaluation criteria will be provided for those bidders that were selected in Sprint 1.</p> <p>Sprint 2 will focus on ORBAT, weapons/effects, environment, behaviour logic, sustainment, C4ISR, scenario context. Pedigree, configuration management, interoperability, VV&amp;A artifacts are NOT a part of the Sprint 2 evaluation.</p>
<p>26. Data Management Framework (SOO 5.4): artifact expectations in Sprint 1</p> <p>For data markings (“classification and releasability markings”) and multi-level deployment (NU/NS/MS), what minimum metadata model does HQ SACT expect bidders to implement for Sprint demos vs post-award?</p>	<p>HQ SACT does not expect classification and releasability markings for the Sprints but will request these markings post-award before FOC.</p>

<p>27. VV&amp;A and Conceptual Model: templates, standards, and analytics-layer VV&amp;A</p> <p>For Sprint 1 criterion requiring “VV&amp;A methodology and conceptual model,” does HQ SACT have preferred NATO standards, templates, or expected content structure to reduce interpretation risk across bidders?</p>	<p>HQ SACT does not prescribe specific templates or a mandatory content structure for the VV&amp;A methodology and conceptual model at this stage.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to describe their approach in accordance with applicable NATO M&amp;S standards and policies, as referenced in SOO Section 5.5.</p> <p>Bidders are encouraged to clearly articulate their conceptual model and VV&amp;A methodology in their Technical Proposal, demonstrating how their proposed solution meets the defined functional, performance, and operational requirements.</p>
<p>28. VV&amp;A and Conceptual Model: templates, standards, and analytics-layer VV&amp;A</p> <p>For consortium solutions where analytics tooling (e.g., dashboards, measures, debrief products) is separable from simulation models, how does HQ SACT intend bidders to present VV&amp;A for analytics outputs (metric definitions, derivation validation, reproducibility), distinct from VV&amp;A of the underlying models?</p>	<p>Traceability and transparency of the derived analytics is sufficient for the analytic tools separate from the simulation model.</p>
<p>29. Operations Planning (CR2) decision support: “must show” OPP steps and outputs</p> <p>For “COA analysis using correlation of forces matrix” (Sprint 3 characteristics), can HQ SACT clarify the expected form (e.g., NATO standard template, specific inputs/outputs, required data sources, links to CSE/ORBAT)?</p>	<p>Bidders shall use their own format.</p>
<p>30. Operational Analysis &amp; Strategic Studies (CR3): DOE/Monte Carlo/batch expectations</p> <p>The CR3 criterion emphasises large-scale repeatable experimentation, batch runs, Monte Carlo support, DOE/sensitivity analysis, experiment configuration and results management. Can HQ SACT clarify whether these must be native in the bidder solution, or may be achieved via integrated external compute/analytics services so long as experiment baselining,</p>	<p>The compute/analytic services need to be a component or part of the NexGen infrastructure. Yes, this may be achieved via integrated external compute/analytics services if experiment baselining, provenance, and repeatability are ensured.</p>

<p>provenance, and repeatability are ensured?</p>	
<p>31. Operational Analysis &amp; Strategic Studies (CR3): DOE/Monte Carlo/batch expectations</p> <p>For evaluation purposes, what is the expected order of magnitude for batch experimentation (runs, variables, time constraints) during Sprint 3/4 demonstrations vs IOC?</p>	<p>Sprint 3&amp;4 will evaluate the ability to conduct DOE/Monte Carlo/batch runs.</p> <p>Post award, the order of magnitude will be dependent on the study requirements.</p>
<p>32. CAX (CR1) alignment and CAW (CR4) adjudication/replay products</p> <p>CR1 references alignment with JWC/JFTC processes and end-to-end CAX exercise process; can HQ SACT identify the key artifacts/workflows that will be used to judge conformance (e.g., specific process checkpoints, products, or representative templates)?</p>	<p>Evaluation Criteria for Sprints 2/3/4 will be provided to bidders selected to participate in those sprints.</p>
<p>33. CAX (CR1) alignment and CAW (CR4) adjudication/replay products</p> <p>For CAW, where evaluation includes adjudication/neutral control, post-game analysis, visualisation products, and multi-site collaboration, what are the minimum demonstration expectations for the “analysis/report” deliverables (e.g., replay timeline, decision log, outcome traceability, inject/effect attribution)?</p>	<p>Minimum demonstration expectations for the analysis/report deliverables will be addressed in the evaluation criteria that will be provided to bidders selected to participate in Sprints 2/3/4.</p>
<p>34. NAF v4 architecture artifacts and level-of-detail by sprint</p> <p>SOO requires NAF compliance, and Sprint 3 deliverables include “NAF v4 Compatible Architecture Artifacts.” For Sprint 1, what level of NAF-style architecture description is expected (high-level container/context vs formal OV/SV/SOV products), and is any specific tooling/format preferred?</p>	<p>High-level container/context is requested, and no specific tooling or format is preferred for Sprint 1.</p>
<p>35. Consortium administrative compliance (single legal entity)</p>	<p>RFP # 11, h, states, “Evidence of authority on behalf of the consortium by the Contractor shall be</p>

<p>Given the consortium structure, please confirm whether evidence of the single judicial personality and the irrevocable Power of Attorney must be included at Sprint 1 submission, and whether HQ SACT has a preferred structure/format for this evidence to avoid non-compliance.</p>	<p>enclosed and sent with any Bidder's response to this RFP. Failure to furnish proof of authority may be a reason for the RFP response be declared non-compliant."</p> <p>There is no specified format.</p>
<p>36. Consortium administrative compliance (single legal entity)</p> <p>Please confirm any additional expectations for consortium member eligibility documentation beyond the stated Declaration of Eligibility (DoE) requirement for prime and subcontractors/partners by bid deadline.</p>	<p>All consortium members shall adhere to the eligibility requirements specified in # 4 of the RFP.</p>
<p>37. Please confirm that each consortium selects its own scenario for the selection process rather than there being a proscribed one.</p>	<p>Sprint 1/2 will not require a specific scenario.</p> <p>A directed NATO scenario will be provided prior to Sprint 3 for demonstration/evaluation in Sprint 3 and 4.</p>
<p>38. Is the assumption correct, that if successful then the winning consortium will be responsible for maintenance of data currency through the life of the contract and that NATO will provide appropriate / necessary data access where required?</p>	<p>The assumption is correct; the winning consortium will be responsible for maintenance of data currency through the life of the contract and that NATO will provide appropriate / necessary data access where required.</p>
<p>39. At what stage of the process will NATO provide access to/require integration with NATO Secret and Mission SECRET datasets? What is the nature of this access envision to be: cloud-based or on-prem?</p>	<p>Integration with NATO/Mission Secret datasets will occur post award. Testing and accreditation will be on NATO- owned and operated infrastructure.</p>
<p>40. Pricing Workbook: In order to properly price software licensing, etc, it is necessary for offerors to know the number of expected users.</p> <p>Please provide the number of users NATO expects to access the solution</p>	<p>The number of expected users will vary between IOC and FOC. IOC expected number of users is 100, and FOC is up to 1000 users.</p>
<p>41. Pricing Workbook: In order to support the estimation of travel for providing support to exercises, etc, it is necessary for</p>	<p>CAX, CAW, OP, and OA are conducted at various locations in Europe, and US with distinctive number of participants. Bidders are expected to make certain assumptions with pricing details. HQ SACT will provide further clarifications during the Agile Procurement process.</p>

<p>offerors to know the number of exercises, locations, etc.</p> <p>Please provide the number of exercises to be supported per year as well as the locations and number of participants in each exercise that require support.</p>	
<p>42. Pricing Workbook: In order to price sustainment, O&amp;M, training, program management after delivery within the pricing workbook, the period of performance is required. Answers to Questions 12, 24, and 25 noted on the NATO website conflict with the duration of the program.</p> <p>Please provide the expected period of performance that offerors should price their solution for.</p>	<p>Base period of performance is contract award through FOC (estimated June 2027 – December 2029) with additional five (5) 12-month option periods.</p>
<p>43. RFP Amendment 1 Section 5.1; page 43</p> <p>To successfully scope the training requirements defined within section 5.1 it is necessary for offers to know if training products and materials will need to be produced in multiple languages.</p> <p>Please clarify the training products and materials will be provided in English or if multiple languages are required and if so, please provide the required languages.</p>	<p>Initially, training products and materials will be required to be English.</p>
<p>44. RFP Amendment 1 Section 5.1; page 43</p> <p>Section 5.1.a requires delivery of instruction at designated NATO locations, but does not indicate if instructors are required to be bilingual.</p> <p>Please clarify if the instructors are required to instruct only in English or if they are required to be bilingual. If bilingual, which languages are they required to know.</p>	<p>Instructors will be required to instruct in English.</p>

<p>45. RFP Amendment 1 Section 5.1; page 43</p> <p>To successfully support and scope the online training requirement defined within Section 5.1.b more information is required regarding the Learning Management System (LMS) to host the online courseware.</p> <p>Is NATO providing the LMS or should offerors propose hosting an LMS as part of their pricing submission.</p>	<p>NATO will provide the LMS as part of the Joint Advanced Distributed Learning (JADL) using Moodle. Vendors are expected to provide courseware content.</p>
<p>46. RFP Amendment 1 Section 5.1; page 43</p> <p>Section 5.1.b requires delivery of remote, interactive online training. More information is needed regarding interactivity levels to fully scope this requirement.</p> <p>Are offerors to determine the Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI) level for each online training produced.</p>	<p>This requirement will be further refined during the Agile Procurement Process. Bidders should use their suggested online training approach for initial proposal.</p>
<p>47. RFP Amendment 2 Section 5.1; page 44</p> <p>Section 5.1.d requires delivery of a train the trainer program and does not indicate if trainers are required to be bi or multi-lingual.</p> <p>Please clarify if the train the trainer program will be provided in English or if multiple languages are required and if so which languages.</p>	<p>The trainer program should be conducted in English.</p>
<p>48. Questions and Answers Reference: Q&amp;A #1, we have a question related to the contract duration:</p> <p>- Answer #12 states that “HQ estimates a 5-year period of performance from contract award...” whereas answer #24 states that “Initial contract will be for 2 years with 8 years of optional periods.” and answer #34 states that “From contract</p>	<p>Base period of performance is contract award through FOC (estimated June 2027 – December 2029) with five (5) 12-month option periods.</p> <p>The estimate is for the total contract, base plus options.</p>

<p>award to FOC, the anticipated duration is 2 Years”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the base period of performance 2 years or 5 years?</li> <li>2. Does the 5-year estimate refer to the base period, or to a subset of the optional periods combined with the base?</li> <li>3. Does the estimated value of 100M-150M EUR apply to the base period only (2 or 5 years?), or does it cover the full contract duration including optional periods? Is it intended to cover the period until the FOC? Is there a hard stop on the limit of budget?</li> </ol>	
<p>49. To be able to submit a price for Sprint 1, we require some further information beyond the specification of a Rough Order of Magnitude. The Bidders Conference suggested that Price wouldn't be part of the evaluation of Sprint 1, but that the 70:30 split was still applied at all sprints. Please can the Authority confirm:</p> <p>How the Commercial aspect of the bid is to be evaluated at Sprint 1?</p> <p>The relative weightings of the Technical and Commercial aspects of the submission for Sprint 1?</p> <p>How they will ensure that there is a level playing field in the evaluation, and how submitted prices will be evaluated on a like-for-like basis against comparable scope?</p> <p>How the overall Sprint 1 submission will be evaluated (covering the combination of Technical and Commercial aspects) and subsequently used to determine the 5 successful bidders to progress to Sprint 2?</p>	<p>Price will be evaluated and is weighted at 30% of the total evaluation score, technical will comprise the remaining 70%. Neither a true price reasonable analysis nor a cost realism analysis will be conducted at Sprint 1. The ROM will be evaluated to determine the affordability, financial viability, and whether the proposed capability solution provides the best value.</p> <p>There is no weighted scoring related to the price submission in Sprint 1. The weightings of the technical aspects are included at the end of the RFP, Annex C.</p> <p>The pricing template included with the RFP is intentionally simplistic and generic to level the playing field.</p> <p>Details of Sprints 2, 3, and 4 and their evaluation factors will be distributed to those down-selected bidders.</p> <p>Bidders are requested to clearly state their underlying assumptions when structuring their price proposals to ensure transparency and comparability.</p> <p>Please leverage Enclosure 6 Price Proposal to submit that information.</p>
<p>50. Question for RFP 26-17: For page count purposes, does an</p>	<p>An 11X17 foldout page will count as two (2) pages.</p>

<p>11X17 foldout page count as 1 or 2 pages?</p>	
<p>51. In rfp026017_pricing.xlsx, there is not a tab to provide any explanation of pricing. Can a Bidder add a tab to the Excel file, or can we leverage Enclosure 6 Price Proposal to document our pricing methods and any details relevant to allow NATO ACT to understand how the ROM was developed?</p> <p>An example of why we'd recommend this is that currently, there is not a place to explain software costs by product or quantity. If you have two or more COTS packages or different quantities and prices there is not a place to explain this in rfp026017_pricing.xlsx or Enclosure 6 as they are currently constructed.</p>	<p>Bidders are requested to clearly state their underlying assumptions when structuring their price proposals to ensure transparency and comparability.</p> <p>Please leverage Enclosure 6 Price Proposal to submit that information.</p>
<p>52. We respectfully request the removal of the clause prohibiting the use of generative AI tools.</p> <p>This restriction creates an unnecessary barrier to competition by increasing bid costs for all participants. It prevents the use of standard business tools for ancillary tasks such as grammar checks, translation, and the creation of graphics and illustrations. This disproportionately disadvantages bidders of all scales who leverage modern tools to compete effectively and at pace.</p> <p>We affirm that the core intellectual content and solution within our proposal will be entirely our original work.</p> <p>To promote fair competition, efficiency, and accelerated delivery, we ask that this clause be removed.</p>	<p>This is a standard requirement that is included in all NATO solicitations. It cannot be removed.</p> <p>For such ancillary tasks such as grammar checks or translations, it is permissible. It is not permitted to create or generate general content / CVs / Etc.</p>
<p>53. Please can NATO ACT provide access to "JWC SOP 800 Exercise Planning" document</p>	<p>This SOP may be provided in later sprints, the main reference for CAX is BiSC 75-3.</p>

<p>that is referenced in the tender in Capability Requirement CR 1?</p>	
<p>54. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID GSR 2.7, please may you provide access to documentation on the processes used in point 3 "Aligned with wargaming process defined by Experimentation and Wargaming Branch at HQ SACT and modelled by the NexGen M&amp;S architecture" and point 4 "aligned with processes for strategic studies, operational analysis, and operational planning".</p>	<p>The latest published NATO Wargaming Handbook from 2023 can be found here: <a href="https://archives.nato.int/uploads/r/nato-archives-online/7/7/b/77bc6819364cf0e859c86cff1d4ae846996bc2299d077d7982823ee6b1921869/ACT_COS_TT-7402_SER_NU1815_ENG_NHQD298489.pdf">https://archives.nato.int/uploads/r/nato-archives-online/7/7/b/77bc6819364cf0e859c86cff1d4ae846996bc2299d077d7982823ee6b1921869/ACT_COS_TT-7402_SER_NU1815_ENG_NHQD298489.pdf</a></p> <p>NATO Defence Planning Process can be found here: <a href="https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/introduction-to-nato/nato-defence-planning-process">https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/introduction-to-nato/nato-defence-planning-process</a></p>
<p>55. In rfp026017_apdx1, please may you confirm what the C2 databases referenced in ID CR 1.15 are in scope? Please may you provide relevant information and documentation to support our design of the integration?</p>	<p>CR 1.15 is NexGen M&amp;S shall improve the ability to import required C2 databases to simulations, and vice-versa as directed by JWC/JFTC. Integration will not be part of the evaluation in Sprints 1 and 2. Additional details will be given to those Bidders down-selected for Srint 3.</p>
<p>56. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 1.16 "NexGen M&amp;S should enable simulation outputs to be communicated to the Intel community via INTEL-FS.", please can you share the specific data format and output requirements?</p>	<p>Integration will not be part of the evaluation in Sprints 1 and 2. Additional details will be given to those Bidders down-selected for Srint 3.</p>
<p>57. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 2.7, please can ACT provide standards and specifications relating to the TOPFAS system that will allow providers to understand the specific integration requirements?</p>	<p>Integration will not be part of the evaluation in Sprints 1 and 2. Additional details will be given to those Bidders down-selected for Srint 3.</p>
<p>58. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 1.3, is there an existing ORBAT database that will be provided as a Government Furnished Asset or is this to be provided by the Tenderer solution?</p>	<p>A pdf file containing Force Structure, setting, and scenario information will be provided for those selected to participate in Sprint 3. A database will not be provided.</p>
<p>59. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 1.11, are there existing non-proprietary formats currently is use or particular formats in mind?</p>	<p>The system needs to provide exported reports in ".xml" or ".csv" format.</p>
<p>60. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 1.12, are there existing Commercial tools currently in use or particular tools in mind?</p>	<p>There are no particular commercial tools used for AAR.</p>

