

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

**Reference:** Q&A #4

**Date of Issue:** 28 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
1. Can NATO confirm whether liability under the resulting contract is intended to rest solely with a single Prime Contractor legal entity, such that the Prime assumes full responsibility and liability towards NATO, irrespective of any consortium, teaming, or subcontracting arrangements?	<p>Responsibility for the performance of the Contract and all related liabilities rests solely with the Prime Contractor, consistent with the HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions.</p> <p>Regarding a consortium, for purposes of this RFP a consortium is a joint venture or collaboration between two or more companies, having joint and several liability. When applying as a consortium, one consortium member shall act as the main lead when communicating with HQ SACT</p>
2. Can NATO confirm whether a defined percentage level of precision or financial commitment is expected for ROM pricing, to be retained until full solution maturity and BAFO?	Pricing is expected to be refined concurrently with sprint evaluation progression and the solution maturity.
3. Can NATO confirm whether contractor responsibility and liability for data correctness is limited to the point of VV&A acceptance, after which NATO assumes responsibility for subsequent use, interpretation, modification, or reuse of the validated data?	Contractor responsibility and liability for data correctness is limited to the point of VV&A acceptance, and yes, NATO will assume responsibility for subsequent use of the validated data but may require feedback regarding changes to the data if the system does not work as expected.
4. Can NATO please clarify: - Whether any Government Property / GFE is anticipated to be provided to the Contractor; and - If so, when an indicative list and associated conditions of use, responsibility, and liability will be made available to bidders?	GFE is anticipated but will depend on the winning bidder's system and supporting infrastructure. The associated conditions of use, responsibility and liability will be made available post-award.
5. Given the anticipated multinational execution of the NexGen M&S Programme, can NATO clarify how tax and duty exemptions are intended to be applied across different jurisdictions (e.g., Canada, USA, UK/EU)?	<p>By treaty, HQ SACT is exempt from duties and taxes on <u>its</u> purchases. Please refer to HQ SACT's General Terms and Conditions, section 14 for</p> <p><a href="https://www.act.nato.int/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/HQ-SACT-General-Terms-and-Conditions-20260115.pdf">https://www.act.nato.int/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/HQ-SACT-General-Terms-and-Conditions-20260115.pdf</a></p> <p><i>HQ SACT is a tax-exempt organization. According to the NATO status agreements, performance under the contract is exempt</i></p>

	<p><i>from taxes, duties and similar charges. Where notwithstanding, taxes are imposed by national regulations, bidders will enclose separately the list and the amounts of taxes (to include the sales tax or VAT—Value Added Tax), duties, and similar charges which have been included in their bid, with a justification.</i></p> <p>For taxes levied from which HQ SACT is exempt, HQ SACT will provide the relevant tax-exempt form or otherwise coordinate, upon request.</p> <p>Please refer to question 6 regarding employment-related taxes.</p>
<p>6. Specifically, can NATO confirm whether exemption certificates or equivalent mechanisms will be available to support tax exclusive pricing for cross border workshare, and how any potentially non recoverable local taxes should be addressed?</p>	<p>Please refer to question 5 above. Regarding employment-related taxes, Contractors remain entirely liable for all taxes levied on the Contractor and its personnel, to include the responsibilities to report and withhold and/or disburse income tax on payments to its personnel. HQ SACT status does not and will not be construed as extending any exemptions for the Contractor or Contractor personnel in any regard.</p>
<p>7. Will this contract be subject to Offset / Industrial Participation requirements?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>8. Is there any opportunity to cap liability to a percentage of contract value?</p>	<p>Consistent with section 15 of HQ SACT General terms and conditions, liability is not capped based on contract value.</p>
<p>9. It is understood that obtaining applicable licenses is the responsibility of the Contractor but will NATO assist in this process where required?</p>	<p>The Bidder should include any license costs in detail in their proposal. Generally, HQ SACT does not assist in any licensing process.</p>
<p>10. Can you clarify if the defined Capability Requirements (CR), General Simulation Requirements (GSR), Programme Integration Requirements (PIR) and Non-Functional Requirements (NFR) in appendix 1 are valid for sprint 1 or they are applicable in the next sprints?</p>	<p>All the requirements listed in the Appendix 1 will be accessed to some degree and in more detail in later sprints.</p>
<p>11. Scope of the Restriction on Generative AI Tools. Please clarify the intended scope of Section 9(b) regarding proposals prepared, in whole or in part, by means of generative AI tools. In particular, please confirm whether this restriction extends to functions such as grammar or spelling assistance, automated translation, formatting support, summarisation of bidder-authored material, or AI-enabled features embedded within standard office productivity tools.</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>12. Acceptability of a Federated / Best-of-Breed Solution. Please confirm whether a federated or best-of-breed solution composed of multiple integrated products and services under a single Prime Contractor architecture would be acceptable, provided that the proposed solution is presented as one coherent NexGen M&amp;S capability and the Prime Contractor remains fully responsible for overall performance and delivery.</p>	<p>Yes, a federated/best-of-breed solution under a single Prime is acceptable and the Prime remains fully responsible for the overall performance and delivery of the awarded contract. One of the program pillars is to ensure a data-centric solution. Therefore, ensuring a common set of data (terrain, and entity parametric data, and behaviors) are common is important. Generally speaking, federated solutions take significantly longer to prepare for simulation events. This is especially important for simulation events that will include detailed analysis after the simulation run(s).</p>
<p>13. Deployment and Hosting Assumptions for Sprint 1. For the purpose of preparing the Sprint 1 Technical and Price Proposals, would HQ SACT please clarify the deployment and hosting assumptions that bidders should apply. In particular, please confirm whether bidders should assume a baseline solution aligned to on-premises private cloud, closed network, NATO-approved cloud, hybrid deployment, or another defined operating model, and whether support for NU, NS, and MS environments is expected from initial deployment or through a phased implementation approach.</p>	<p>Bidders should assume an on-premises private cloud for Price Proposals. NU, NS, and MS environments will be a phased approach and not expected for initial deployment.</p>
<p>14. Authoritative Technical Baseline for Sprint 1. Please confirm which technical requirements are to be treated as the authoritative baseline for Sprint 1 evaluation. The solicitation indicates that Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 are provided for reference purposes in Sprint 1 and will be finalised during later sprints; however, the Sprint 1 evaluation criteria refer to Capability Requirements, General Simulation Requirements, Non-Functional Requirements, and related technical expectations. Clarification of the intended evaluation baseline would be appreciated.</p>	<p>The intended evaluation baseline for Sprint 1 is the system architecture, how does the bidder intend to address the four application areas, five domains, three dimensions, common synthetic environment, and the data framework.</p>
<p>15. Treatment of the Travel Line in Enclosure 6. Please clarify how bidders are expected to complete</p>	<p>For Sprint 1 pricing, it is acceptable to enter a \$0.00 (zero dollar) amount for this line item.</p>

<p>the "Travel" line item in Enclosure 6 for Sprint 1. Section 19(b) states that travel under the subsequent contract shall not be included in the bidder's overall pricing and shall instead be provided as a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) for planning and budgeting purposes. Please confirm whether the Travel line should therefore be entered as zero, shown separately as a non-evaluated ROM figure, or handled in another specified manner.</p>	
<p>16. Sec. 6(b); Sec. 15(c), 15(e); Encl. 5; Appendix note</p> <p>HQ SACT may amend CRs/GSRs/NFRs during sprints; criteria will be progressively established; each sprint gets separate criteria; appendices are reference-only in Sprint 1 "Will NATO please clarify the controlling baseline for evaluation at each Sprint. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Which versions of the CRs, GSRs, NFRs, Appendix 1 (Capability Requirements), and Appendix 2 (C3 Policy Compliance Checklist) will govern bidder evaluation in Sprints 2, 3, and 4?</li> <li>- How will changes to these documents be formally issued and baselined for BAFO preparation?"</li> </ul>	<p>Rather than fundamental changes to requirements, the Agile Procurement process is designed to progressively clarify and refine requirement details through sprint activities and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Evaluative criteria for each Sprint will be published ahead of the next sprint.</p>
<p>17. Encl. 4; Encl. 5; SOO 6.1-6.3</p> <p>Sprint 1 requires Internal Cybersecurity Process; Sprint 3 requires self-assessments and C3 results; Sprint 4 / BAFO requires the Security Accreditation Package "Will NATO please clarify the expected cybersecurity, accreditation, and C3 compliance deliverables and evidence level for each Sprint. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is expected in Sprint 1?</li> </ul>	<p>Sprint 1 corresponds to the current phase of submission of initial proposals until bid closing date.</p> <p>Sprint 2 is a virtual presentation where the down-selected bidders demonstrate their capability of their Common Synthetic Environment and Plan, Prepare, Execute, Analyze tools. Cybersecurity will not be discussed during Sprint 2.</p> <p>Further information regarding Cybersecurity requirements will be provided following Sprint 2 for Sprints 3 &amp; 4, and BAFO.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What must be demonstrated or briefed in Sprint 2?</li> <li>- What maturity is expected for the Sprint 3 self-assessments?</li> <li>- What constitutes an acceptable Security Accreditation Package submission in Sprint 4 / BAFO?"</li> </ul>	
<p>18. NFR 4; Eligibility 4(f)-(g); SAL; SOO Security</p> <p>NFR 4 uses NU, NS, MS; eligibility and SAL use SECRET PSC/FSC, NR/NC, and accredited CIS.</p> <p>Will NATO please clarify the required security-domain mapping for NU, NS, and MS in relation to classification level, clearance requirements, FSC/PSC expectations, and accreditation requirements, including whether Mission Secret is to be treated as a distinct mission enclave, a NATO Secret implementation context, or another security construct for design and approval purposes.</p>	<p>The NexGen M&amp;S solution is expected to support deployment on NATO-owned infrastructure and NATO-approved cloud environments.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to clearly describe their proposed deployment architecture in their Technical Proposal including external dependencies and their associated assumptions.</p> <p>These requirements will not be part of the Sprint 1.</p>
<p>19. Scope; NFR 2, NFR 5; SOO 6.4</p> <p>Scope allows closed network, on-prem private cloud, NATO approved cloud, and hybrid environments; NAF artifacts required.</p> <p>"Will NATO please clarify the permitted hosting and deployment patterns for each in-scope environment. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are contractor-hosted services, NATO-approved cloud, private cloud, hybrid models, and externally managed SaaS dependencies all acceptable?</li> <li>- Do any operational-autonomy or data-sovereignty constraints apply to hosting jurisdiction, privileged access, external support, or encryption key control?"</li> </ul>	<p>The NexGen M&amp;S solution is expected to support deployment on NATO-owned infrastructure and NATO-approved cloud environments.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to clearly describe their proposed deployment architecture in their Technical Proposal, including any contractor-hosted services or external dependencies and their associated assumptions.</p>

<p>20. Scope; NFR 4-5; SOO 5.4 Data Management Framework</p> <p>“Support for execution, both local and distributed, including a closed network, on-premises (private) cloud, NATO approved cloud and/or hybrid environments.”</p> <p>“NexGen M&amp;S shall be primarily web-enabled and remotely accessible from NATO networks...”</p> <p>“The capability solution shall incorporate... contractor-provided data, government-furnished data, commercial or open-source data, derived or synthesized data, and scenario-specific data...”</p> <p>Will NATO please clarify whether any requirements apply regarding data residency, hosting jurisdiction, third-country privileged access, remote administration, or location of storage, processing, and backup services for the proposed capability. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What constraints, if any, apply to each of these areas?</li> <li>- Do these constraints vary across NU, NS, and MS?</li> <li>- Do these constraints vary across government-furnished data, scenario data, and shared repository content?"</li> </ul>	<p>Data residency, hosting jurisdiction, privileged access, and storage requirements will be governed by applicable NATO security policies and accreditation requirements. As confirmed in previous Q&amp;A responses, testing and accreditation are expected to be on NATO-owned and operated infrastructure, and the solution is planned for deployment on NATO NU and NS networks.</p> <p>Specific constraints applicable across classification levels (NU, NS, MS) and data categories will be discussed during the Agile Procurement process in coordination with the relevant NATO security authorities. Bidders are expected to describe their proposed approach to data residency and hosting in their Technical Proposal, clearly stating their underlying assumptions and constraints.</p>
<p>21. SOO 6.1; PIR 1; NFR 9</p> <p>Security Accreditation Package requires SISRS per interconnection; interoperability with NATO systems and related programs is required.</p> <p>Will NATO please identify the known external CIS interconnections currently in scope for SISRS development, and distinguish between mandatory IOC integrations, FOC integrations, and future or</p>	<p>CIS interconnections will be discussed during the Agile Procurement process and provided to down-selected Bidders in later Sprints.</p> <p>As stated in SOO Section 6.1, a separate SISRS shall be required per each interconnection. Applicable interconnections and associated approval paths will be confirmed in coordination with the relevant NATO security authorities following contract award.</p>

<p>optional interfaces. Please also clarify whether each interconnection will require a separate SISRS and approval path.</p>	
<p>22. SOO 6.1 Accreditation</p> <p>SISRS required per each interconnection Will NATO please clarify whether each external interconnection will require a separate SISRS and separate review or approval path.</p>	<p>As stated in SOO Section 6.1, a separate SISRS shall be required per each interconnection.</p>
<p>23. SOO 6.2 Cybersecurity</p> <p>Testing must be done “in accordance with NATO cybersecurity guidelines”</p> <p>Will NATO please identify the specific NATO cybersecurity testing guidance expected to govern vulnerability assessments, penetration tests, configuration audits, and secure communications design.</p>	<p>Specific NATO cybersecurity testing guidance governing vulnerability assessments, penetration tests, configuration audits, and secure communications design will be confirmed during the Agile Procurement process in coordination with the relevant NATO security authorities.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to describe their internal cybersecurity testing and validation approach in their Technical Proposal. It will be communicated with down-selected bidders if further documentation should be required.</p>
<p>24. SOO 6.2; Sprint 1 Eval Item 13</p> <p>Testing includes VA, PT, and config audits; Sprint 1 scores planning and documentation of them</p> <p>Will NATO please clarify the minimum expected scope and depth of vulnerability assessments, penetration tests, and configuration audits for this capability.</p>	<p>HQ SACT does not prescribe a minimum scope or depth for vulnerability assessments, penetration tests, and configuration audits at this stage. For Sprint 1 evaluation purposes, Bidders are expected to describe their internal cybersecurity testing and validation processes.</p>
<p>25. NFR 5; Sprint 1 Eval Item 2</p> <p>System must be remotely accessible from NATO networks; Sprint 1 scoring rewards fully web-enabled access from all applicable networks without local installation or client-side dependencies.</p> <p>Will NATO please clarify what is meant by “remotely accessible from all applicable networks” for Sprint 1 and subsequent Sprints. Specifically:</p>	<p>As confirmed in previous Q&amp;A responses, web-enabled refers to a cloud-based or hosted system. 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, and the degree to which a solution relies on such dependencies will be considered in the evaluation of NFR 5 and Sprint 1 Technical Evaluation Criterion 2.</p> <p>HQ SACT does not prescribe specific acceptable or unacceptable access methods for individual workflows at this stage. Bidders are expected to clearly describe their proposed access architecture in their Technical Proposal, including any client-side requirements, jump host dependencies, or workflow-specific variations for user, admin, and analyst roles, and explain how their approach remains compatible with NATO network and security requirements.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are local installation or thick-client functions acceptable for any workflows?</li> <li>- Are browser plug-ins or managed-device dependencies acceptable?</li> <li>- Are jump hosts or domain-specific access methods acceptable?</li> <li>- Do the answers above differ for user, admin, or analyst workflows?"</li> </ul>	
<p>26. NFR 5; NFR 10; SOO 7</p> <p>High availability and sustained operational availability required</p> <p>Will NATO please clarify the required service levels, recovery objectives, maintenance windows, and continuity expectations for mission-critical simulation activities.</p>	<p>Specific service levels, recovery objectives, maintenance windows, and continuity expectations for mission-critical simulation activities are not prescribed at this stage. Bidders are expected to propose service levels that reflect the high availability and sustained operational availability requirements defined in NFR 5 and NFR 10, clearly stating their underlying assumptions.</p> <p>Detailed SLA parameters will be defined and agreed upon during the Agile Procurement process and formally incorporated into the Statement of Work (SOW).</p>
<p>27. Sprint 3 Eval Areas; NFR 4, NFR 6; SOO 6.2</p> <p>Sprint 3 evaluation areas include "Automated behaviours and AI-enabled agents"; NFR 4 requires comprehensive security controls; NFR 6 requires compliance with relevant NATO regulatory requirements; Section 6.2 requires compliance with all applicable NATO cybersecurity policies, directives, and standards.</p> <p>Will NATO please clarify the AI risk management and AI security frameworks expected to govern the proposed solution's automated behaviours and AI-enabled agents. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is alignment with frameworks such as the NIST AI Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0), ISO/IEC 42001 (AI Management Systems), or specific NATO Data and AI policies expected?</li> </ul>	<p>HQ SACT does not mandate alignment with specific national or commercial AI risk management frameworks such as NIST AI RMF or ISO/IEC 42001. The NexGen M&amp;S solution shall comply with applicable NATO cybersecurity policies and standards, as stated in SOO Section 6.2.</p> <p>AI-specific risk assessment and assurance requirements, including whether AI-related evidence will form part of the Security Accreditation Package or constitute separate deliverables, will be defined during the Agile Procurement process in coordination with the relevant NATO security authorities.</p>

<p>- Is AI-specific risk assessment, testing, and assurance evidence required as part of the Security Accreditation Package, or as separate deliverables?"</p>	
<p>28. SOO 6.1; SOO 6.2</p> <p>Intellectual Property</p> <p>Will NATO please provide the complete HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions dated 15 January 2026, specifically the intellectual property ownership and licensing clauses referenced in Section 1.f of the RFP?</p>	<p><a href="https://www.act.nato.int/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/HQ-SACT-General-Terms-and-Conditions-20260115.pdf">https://www.act.nato.int/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/HQ-SACT-General-Terms-and-Conditions-20260115.pdf</a></p> <p>Clause 32 of HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions concerns intellectual property. Clarifications provided as part Q&amp;A and eventual negotiations during participation in Sprints are also applicable.</p>
<p>29. 8.a. 10.a.</p> <p>"Bids shall be received at HQ SACT, Purchasing and Contracting Office, no later than 29 May 2026, 0900 hours, Eastern Standard Time, Norfolk, Virginia, USA." vs. ""The e-mailed documents shall be received no later than 13 May 2026, 0900 hours, Eastern Standard Time, Norfolk, Virginia, USA.""</p> <p>Will NATO please confirm the suspense date for proposals. We understand the down-select process however, the current schedule as worded is confusing. Please provide one concrete suspense date for FINAL submission of technical and pricing proposals.</p>	<p>Suspense date for Sprint 1 proposals has been extended to 12 June 2026, 0900 Eastern Daylight Time, to include submission of technical and pricing volumes.</p>
<p>30. 3; 5.6; 6.2; 8; Encl. 7</p> <p>""Support for execution, both local and distributed, including a closed network, on-premises (private) cloud, NATO approved cloud and/or hybrid environments."" ""The detailed fielding requirements, including specific deployment locations, infrastructure considerations, integration aspects, and scheduling, will be progressively defined during the Agile Procurement process in close</p>	<p>Contractor-hosted secure facilities and infrastructure will be acceptable for demonstrations (during Agile Procurement), but the winning bidder should plan for hosting only on NATO-approved/accredited environments after contract award.</p>

<p>coordination with NATO stakeholders and end users. As requirements and implementation details are clarified and agreed during the sprints, the corresponding tasks, deliverables, and fielding activities will be formally captured and incorporated into the Statement of Work (SOW).""</p> <p>""The Contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that the NexGen M&amp;S capability can operate on NATO networks and shall manage the full NATO Security Accreditation process. This includes providing all information, documentation, and test results required by the NATO Security Accreditation Authority to evaluate and approval of the solution for operational use.""</p> <p>""No Communication and Information Systems (CIS) may be used for processing classified information without prior accreditation by the responsible authorities. At the level of NR, such accreditation can be under delegated authority of the responsible accreditation authority or the contracting authority in accordance with the Contract Security Clause (Annex 4) of reference A).""</p> <p>Will contractor-hosted secure facilities and infrastructure be acceptable for demonstrations and early execution, or does NATO expect eventual hosting only on NATO-approved/accredited environments?</p>	
<p>31. 1; "Technical and Architectural Scope"; 5.4; 15"</p> <p>""The NexGen M&amp;S Programme aims to transition NATO from a collection of stove-piped, application-centric simulation tools toward a coherent, modular, interoperable, and data-centric M&amp;S ecosystem""</p> <p>""Use of open/industry standards and interfaces (e.g., NATO M&amp;S</p>	<p>As confirmed in previous Q&amp;A responses, NATO will not provide baseline datasets or legacy model interface specifications during Sprints 2 and 3. Bidders are expected to use their own data frameworks and ORBAT content for Sprint 2 demonstrations.</p> <p>A PDF file containing Force Structure, setting, and scenario information will be provided to down-selected Bidders prior to Sprint 3. Additional Government Furnished Information, including any legacy system interface documentation, will be considered and communicated to down-selected Bidders during the Agile Procurement process as requirements are progressively refined.</p>

<p>standards, data schemas, and service-oriented or API-based integration).""</p> <p>""The capability solution shall incorporate the below identified data categories for the provision, integration, curation, and sustainment for the M&amp;S capabilities. The intent is to ensure credible, repeatable, interoperable, explainable and auditable simulation outcomes across operational analysis, wargaming, experimentation, and training use cases. These requirements apply to all data used by the capability, including: Contractor-provided data, Government-furnished data (GFD), Commercial or open-source data, Derived or synthesized data, Scenario-specific data generated during execution.</p> <p>The capability shall support multi-domain operations (Land, Maritime, Air, Space, Cyber) incorporating the Joint functions (command and control, intelligence, manoeuvre, fires, sustainment, and force protection) and three dimensions (physical, virtual, and cognitive) while enabling integration with external simulations where required.""</p> <p>""sprint 2"" ""sprint 3""</p> <p>To support the transition from "stove-piped tools" mentioned in Section 1.b, will NATO provide Government Furnished Information (GFI) such as data schemas, legacy model interface specifications, or API documentation for existing tools during Sprints 2 and 3 to ensure seamless interoperability?</p>	
<p>32. J3(e) SPRINT 3: Overview of Application Areas</p> <p>Automated behaviours and AI-enabled agents</p> <p>Does NATO anticipate an AI component to the M&amp;S</p>	<p>NATO anticipates that AI-enabled agents and automated behaviours will form part of the NexGen M&amp;S architecture. Bidders are encouraged to propose innovative approaches to leveraging AI within their solution. HQ SACT does not prescribe specific AI models or tools. Any AI components will be subject to NATO security accreditation requirements prior to operational deployment.</p>

<p>architecture? Does NATO expect the Contractor to leverage AI; if so what AI models/tools are already approved by NATO?</p>	
<p>33. Section 2 Background</p> <p>"NATO's current simulation capability is outsourced using national simulations. As such, simulation outputs are not available, preventing comprehensive review and analysis of completed simulation sets. As a result, NATO lacks the ability to determine more effective, efficient, and strategic operational planning for the future."</p> <p>What simulation applications/models will the contractor have access to? For example, HLA federates.</p>	<p>HQ SACT will not identify specific simulation applications or models available for contractor access at this stage. As noted in previous Q&amp;A responses, integration details including applicable HLA federates and legacy system interfaces will be provided to down-selected Bidders in later Sprints.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to propose their own simulation architecture and demonstrate how their solution can achieve the interoperability and data-centric objectives described in SOO Section 1 and Section 3.</p>
<p>34. 5.4.2 Table</p> <p>Data Management &amp; Governance (interoperability). "Support federation with external simulations"</p> <p>Will the federation run in a lab, cloud, NATO network, national network, tactical network, or hybrid environment? How are new NATO systems and federates onboarded?</p>	<p>The federation environment and onboarding processes for new NATO systems and federates will be defined during the Agile Procurement process.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to describe their proposed federation approach in their Technical Proposal, including how their architecture supports flexible deployment across multiple environment types and how new systems and federates can be onboarded</p>
<p>35. 5.6. Fielding</p> <p>The NexGen M&amp;S solution shall support a structured and phased fielding approach. The fielding concept shall consider all relevant software and hardware requirements, including system architecture, infrastructure dependencies, interoperability constraints, and cybersecurity considerations.</p> <p>What is the minimum hardware requirements (CPU, memory, GPU, and network)? If cloud based, do we control of CPU cores assignment?</p>	<p>Bidders are expected to propose their own infrastructure sizing and clearly state their underlying assumptions in their Technical Proposal and price proposals.</p> <p>HQ SACT does not prescribe minimum hardware specifications at this stage. As confirmed in previous Q&amp;A responses, infrastructure and hardware requirements will be determined during the Agile Procurement process in accordance with the proposed solution's requirements.</p>

<p>36. 5.4. Data Management Framework</p> <p>"The capability solution shall incorporate the below identified data categories for the provision, integration, curation, and sustainment for the M&amp;S capabilities. [This includes] Contractor-provided data; Government-furnished data (GFD); Commercial or open-source data"</p> <p>If contractor has U.S. Government Off-the-Shelf product, such as AFSIM, will NATO assist in facilitating its acquisition, authorization, and use?</p>	<p>HQ SACT will assist in providing any documentation as US Government regulations and procedures require.</p>
<p>37. 6.1. Accreditation</p> <p>"The Contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that the NexGen M&amp;S capability can operate on NATO networks and shall manage the full NATO Security Accreditation process."</p> <p>What audit, logging, and accreditation artifacts are required?</p>	<p>The minimum required Security Accreditation Package artifacts are defined in SOO Section 6.1. Additional audit, logging, and accreditation artifact requirements will be confirmed during the Agile Procurement process in coordination with the relevant NATO security authorities.</p>
<p>38. 5.4.2 Data Management &amp; Governance</p> <p>Data Pedigree and Transparency-Classification and releasability markings</p> <p>Are there releasability restrictions on data models, terrain, scenarios, threat models, or performance parameters?</p>	<p>Yes. It is envisioned that there will be data for NU applications that is separate from data for NS applications. All applicable NATO security policies and regulations will be followed to determine releasability.</p> <p>The data used during Agile Procurement is NATO Unclassified.</p> <p>NATO will provide specific releasability guidance as needed after contract award.</p>
<p>39. Technical Evaluation Criteria serial #4</p> <p>"Bidder proposed solutions capable of importing, processing, and making data available for simulation and analysis"</p> <p>Is C2SIM, MSDL, Link 16, VMF, Cursor-on-Target, or another tactical data format required?</p>	<p>As referenced in CR 1.13 and confirmed in previous Q&amp;A responses, applicable data exchange standards include C2SIM, ADatP-3, Link 16, and OTH Gold, among other applicable STANAGs and STANRECs. These should be considered indicative rather than exhaustive.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to describe their data import and processing capabilities in their Technical Proposal, including supported tactical data formats and how their approach addresses the data management requirements defined in SOO Section 5.4. Additional data format requirements will be refined during the Agile Procurement process.</p>

<p>40. 5.4.1 Data Categories</p> <p>"C4ISR Network characteristics (latency, bandwidth)"</p> <p>What is the acceptable latency for entity updates, fire events, sensor detections, and C2 messages?</p>	<p>Specific latency and bandwidth parameters for entity updates, fire events, sensor detections, and C2 messages are not prescribed at this stage.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to propose performance parameters appropriate to their solution and clearly state their underlying assumptions. Detailed performance requirements will be defined during the Agile Procurement process and incorporated into the Statement of Work (SOW).</p>
<p>41. In Appendix 1, GSR 4.11 – what kind of third-party capabilities and data analytics are envisioned to be used with the proposed M&amp;S system, as it will have integral data analytics capability? Understanding the intent and type of third-party system will help in designing the system architecture solution.</p>	<p>NATO envisions that the NexGen M&amp;S solution will support open and standardized interfaces enabling integration with a range of third-party data analytics capabilities, consistent with the data-centric and modular architecture principles defined in SOO Section 3.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to describe their proposed approach to enabling third-party data analytics integration in their Technical Proposal, including the interfaces, APIs, and data exchange mechanisms that would support such integration.</p>
<p>42. In Appendix 1, GSR 4.14 and 4.15 – What kind of Archivist policies are being referenced, and will they have a bearing on system design? Or will this be designated at a later date, and is it expected that the data system be adaptable to multiple different Archivist policies?</p>	<p>Specific archivist policy requirements will be defined during the Agile Procurement process.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to propose a data management approach that is adaptable to multiple archivist policy configurations, consistent with the modular and data-centric architecture principles defined in SOO Section 3 and the Data Management Framework requirements in SOO Section 5.4.</p>
<p>43. In Appendix 1, GSR 5.7 – Will SHAPE J9 resilience models be provided during the AP process for use in the Sprints? What format are they in, so it can be understood better how the models would be integrated into the M&amp;S solution?</p>	<p>Details regarding SHAPE J9 resilience models, including their format and integration specifications, will be disclosed to down-selected Bidders during the Agile Procurement process. Integration with SHAPE J9 resilience models will not be part of the evaluation in Sprints 1 and 2.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to propose a modular and open architecture capable of accommodating external model integration, demonstrating how their solution can interoperate with third-party models as required by GSR 5.7.</p>
<p>44. For Enclosure 6, Pricing – For Sprint 1, can it be confirmed that only Tab 1 is to be submitted, and that this is the ROM for any work done post-contract award, and is not to account for the work done during Sprints (for which remuneration is accounted for)?</p>	<p>Only Tab 1, for Sprint 1, should be completed for this submission of price proposal.</p>
<p>45. 5. For Enclosure 6, Pricing – In the Tabs, there are cells for “Quantity”. What quantity is to be listed, given that many of these items are for services that are not quantifiable by number of units. If “Quantity” only applies to certain categories (i.e. Licences), can it</p>	<p>Bidders are requested to clearly state their underlying assumptions, including licensing models and usage parameters, when preparing their price estimations to ensure transparency and comparability.</p>

<p>be identified which line items it pertains to?</p>	
<p>46. In the Bidding Process, under Para 15 and the remuneration process – is the Remuneration Schedule “and up to and will not exceed” number to be put against verifiable expenditures, or is it a flat rate?</p>	<p>It is flat rate.</p>
<p>47. Is it NATO’s intent to have solutions that are wholly automated (ie. No sim operators during exercises like the STEADFAST series), or is it just to minimize the number of sim operators within the bounds of what is technologically feasible?</p>	<p>NATO's intent is to minimize the number of simulation operators required within the bounds of what is technologically feasible, while ensuring that NATO personnel retain the ability to carry out all activities.</p> <p>Bidders are encouraged to propose solutions that maximize automation and usability, reducing operator burden without compromising operational control and oversight.</p>
<p>48. For the demos in Sprints 2-4, is there a preferred NATO battle management system(s) that ACT would like demonstrated as part of the capability?</p>	<p>No specific NATO battle management system is prescribed for Sprint 2 demonstrations. As confirmed in previous Q&amp;A responses, there are no external NATO system integrations planned for Sprints 1 and 2.</p> <p>Bidders may be asked to demonstrate interoperability with NATO C2 systems in Sprints 3 and 4, and further details will be provided to down-selected Bidders prior to those Sprints.</p>
<p>49. For travel for Sprints 3 and 4, can it be clarified if the in-person, on-site work at ACT HQ will be only the 2-3 days for the demonstrations, and the rest of the work done at the bidder’s facilities; or will all work in the periods of Sprint 3 (T0+5 to T0+6 (approx. 1 month)) and Sprint 4 (T0+6 to T0+10 (approx. 4 months)) be done on-site at ACT HQ? This was addressed partially in Q&amp;A 1, but it was not explicitly clear if the work outside of the demo days was to be on- or off-site.</p>	<p>Only the demonstrations at Sprint 3 and 4 will be done at the ODU HUB, Norfolk, VA, U.S. Work outside the demonstrations is to be completed at the bidder’s facilities.</p> <p>Work outside of the demo days (2-3 days) is off-site</p>
<p>50. For EW and Cyber effects in the synthetic environment, is it NATO’s intent to have the actual systems of the training audiences affected if events in the synthetic environment would have affected them, or if action would need to be taken for them to have noticed the effect? One example is, if there is an Electronic Attack in the synthetic environment, is the intent to have the effects simulated or replicated on training audience CIS systems?</p>	<p>There is no current intent for the simulated effect to be replicated on CIS as it relates to EW and Cyber.</p>

<p>Another example is for an Offensive Cyber Operation – it there an intent for the CIS systems of the training audiences to be affected by OCO as part of the M&amp;S solution?</p>	
<p>51. In the RFP-ACT-SACT-26-17 document, MSG-195: The Modelling and Simulation as a Service (MSaaS) Technical Reference Architecture is referenced. However, I have not been able to locate or access this document through the CSO (sto.nato.int) portal.</p> <p>In addition, we are trying to obtain the document titled “Architecture Body of Knowledge (ABoK).” Our search led us to the TIDE portal; however, I do not have login credentials and was unable to find a registration link.</p> <p>Could you please advise on how we may access these two documents? If they are not restricted, would it be possible to share them with us via email?</p>	<p><a href="https://publications.sto.nato.int/publications/STO%20Technical%20Re%20ports/STO-TR-MSG-164-VOL-II/\$STR-MSG-164-Vol-II-ALL.pdf">https://publications.sto.nato.int/publications/STO%20Technical%20Re%20ports/STO-TR-MSG-164-VOL-II/\$STR-MSG-164-Vol-II-ALL.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="https://eabok.org/">https://eabok.org/</a></p>
<p>52. In the Technical Evaluation Criteria, under Ser 10 Operational Planning – it is stated that in support of OPP, plan development is one of the sub-processes to be supported. Is it expected that the M&amp;S system support the writing of any orders products as part of plan development (and if so, can it be specified what parts would be supported from outputs from simulation support)?</p>	<p>It is desirable for the M&amp;S system to support the writing of orders products as part of plan development.</p>
<p>53. Can it be confirmed that the Ex Planning process that the solution is supposed to address begins with Stage 1, and will include the generation of Exercise Specifications by ex planners based on inputs such as MTEP and SAGE? Or should it be assumed that the system will begin planning with Stage 2 with EXPEC that are already generated?</p>	<p>Yes, NATO is seeking the solution to support the Ex Planning process starting in Stage 1 and beyond.</p>

<p>54. Operations Planning (CR2) decision support: "must show" OPP steps and outputs The Sprint 1 CR2 criterion enumerates OPP steps (mission analysis through plan development) and highlights traceability/auditability/reporting/replay. Which OPP steps are considered "must demonstrate" during Sprint 2/3 to remain competitive, versus "desirable later"?</p>	<p>Not applicable to Sprint 1</p>
<p>55. Operations Planning (CR2) decision support: "must show" OPP steps and outputs  The Sprint 1 CR2 criterion enumerates OPP steps (mission analysis through plan development) and highlights traceability/auditability/reporting/replay. Which OPP steps are considered "must demonstrate" during Sprint 2/3 to remain competitive, versus "desirable later"?</p>	<p>Not applicable to Sprint 1</p>
<p>56. Operations Planning (CR2) decision support: "must show" OPP steps and outputs  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>Not applicable to Sprint 1</p>
<p>57. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 3.13 "NexGen M&amp;S shall provide tools and libraries for analysts to conduct analysis and visualize data.", Please may you confirm what types of analysis are required and what 'libraries' means in this context?</p>	<p>In this context the M&amp;S system should provide an integrated environment that enables Operational Analysts to set up a baseline scenario and conduct experimentation by changing parameter settings, workflows, input data and / or assumptions. The system should generate a range of outputs that answer precise analytical questions and enable the analyst to generate evidence-based recommendations without requiring specialist software engineering support. Analysts must be able to modify assumptions, experiment configurations, and parameter settings without altering source code. The system should preserve assumptions, model versions, experiment configurations, data sets and analysis workflows, and statistical methods to ensure traceability, reproducibility, and scientific defensibility of results.</p> <p>1. Types of analysis can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptive Analysis e.g.: engagement outcomes, attrition rates, detection counts, resource consumption; through</li> </ul>

	<p>methods such as aggregation, event counting, timeline reconstruction; trend analysis e.g. Campaign progression, Territorial control, Operational degradation, Tempo evolution, Escalation analysis, Logistics depletion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparative Analysis: compare alternative force structures, concepts, technologies, Courses of Action (e.g., COA A vs COA B), Platform comparisons, compare different ISR architectures, Alternative logistics structures, Sensor effectiveness comparisons; through methods such as Multi-run comparison, side-by-side visualization, Baseline vs variant assessment, Delta analysis.</li> <li>• Sensitivity Analysis to understand how outcomes change when assumptions or parameters vary: Parameter variation, Environmental uncertainty, Threat uncertainty.</li> <li>• Uncertainty Analysis to quantify uncertainty and probabilistic outcomes through stochastic methods to introduce controlled randomness (e.g., weather, human decisions, sensor errors, adversary behavior).</li> </ul> <p>2. Libraries refer to reusable analytical components, methods, models, toolsets, templates, and data-processing capabilities that support Operational Analysis activities. For example, Libraries can include metric Libraries predefined for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs): Mission success probability, Force survivability, C2 responsiveness, Freedom of maneuver, ISR coverage effectiveness, Time-to-objective, Logistics sustainability.</li> <li>• Measures of Performance (MOPs): weapon accuracy, sensor detection rate, Data throughput, Communication latency, Platform endurance.</li> <li>• Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) as: mission success rate, detection probability, ISR coverage, sortie generation rate, survivability metrics.</li> <li>• Visualization Libraries, operationally relevant visualization templates: Common Operational Picture (COP) displays, kill chains, operational timelines, heatmaps, force overlays, network diagrams, dashboards, charts.</li> <li>• Statistical Libraries: Monte Carlo modules, Regression functions (to identify and quantify relationships between variables), Confidence interval calculations (to estimate the range within which the result is likely to exist), Distribution analysis (to study probability distributions, variability patterns, and operational uncertainty).</li> <li>• Data Processing Libraries, tools for: data cleaning, filtering, aggregation, synchronization, transformation.</li> </ul>
<p>58. In the definitions found in the SOO's Annex B-Terms, Definitions, Abbreviations and Acronyms, a scenario is defined as "the comprehensive background story describing the historical, political, military, economic, cultural, humanitarian and legal events and circumstances that have led to the current exercise crisis or</p>	<p>Not applicable to Sprint 1</p>

<p>conflict, and for this purpose it is articulated and supported through operational graphics, Order of Battle, Terrain Box (Upper Right and Lower Left) and MEL/MIL". In the SOO under Para 3, Sub-para Functional Scope, it identifies "tools and services for scenario generation" as one of the items within the scope. In STANREC 4801 NATO Modelling and Simulation Handbook for Training and Exercises, in Annex B Table 4: M&amp;S Input/Output at EP Meetings, when it comes to MELMIL writing and scenario development, the M&amp;S team are not directly involved in development of scenario and MELMIL products.</p> <p>a. Can the following be better defined: As part of the M&amp;S system, is the solution expected to have the functionality to generate scenarios as defined in Annex B, to include the ability to generate MEL/MIL documents (e.g. Injects), Higher HQ OPORDS (for the PTA to ingest as part of their planning)?</p>	
--	--