



HQ Supreme Allied Commander Transformation
Purchasing and Contracting Section
Office of Budget and Finance
Norfolk, Virginia | USA



Request for Proposal

RFP-ACT-SACT-26-65

Headquarters Supreme Allied Commander Transformation's
Visualization & Gamification Solutions
in support of Cyberspace Warfare Development

<i>BIDDING INSTRUCTIONS.....</i>	<i>4</i>
1. <i>General.....</i>	<i>4</i>
2. <i>Classification.....</i>	<i>4</i>
3. <i>Definitions.....</i>	<i>4</i>
4. <i>Eligibility.....</i>	<i>4</i>
5. <i>Duration of Contract.....</i>	<i>5</i>
6. <i>Exemption of Taxes.....</i>	<i>5</i>
7. <i>Amendment or Cancellation.....</i>	<i>5</i>
8. <i>Bidder Clarifications.....</i>	<i>5</i>
9. <i>Bid Closing Date.....</i>	<i>6</i>
10. <i>Bid Validity.....</i>	<i>6</i>
11. <i>Content of Proposal.....</i>	<i>6</i>
12. <i>Proposal Submission.....</i>	<i>7</i>
13. <i>Late Proposals.....</i>	<i>7</i>
14. <i>Bid Withdrawal.....</i>	<i>8</i>
15. <i>Bid Evaluation.....</i>	<i>8</i>
16. <i>Proposal Clarifications.....</i>	<i>8</i>
17. <i>Award.....</i>	<i>8</i>
18. <i>Surge Capability:.....</i>	<i>8</i>
19. <i>Lodging a complaint.....</i>	<i>9</i>
20. <i>Proposed Candidates.....</i>	<i>9</i>
21. <i>Communications.....</i>	<i>9</i>
22. <i>Points of Contact.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Enclosure 1: Proposal Content / Checklist.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Enclosure 2: Compliance Statement.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Enclosure 3: Past Performance Information Form.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Enclosure 4: Mandatory Price Proposal Excel Spreadsheet.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Enclosure 5: Declaration of Eligibility.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>STATEMENT OF WORK.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Aim and scope.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>ANNEX B: Compliance and Best Value Criteria Matrices.....</i>	<i>30</i>

<i>Compliance Matrix</i>	30
<i>Best Value Criteria Matrix</i>	32

BIDDING INSTRUCTIONS

1. General

a. This is a **Firm Fixed Price Deliverables** contract in accordance with the HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions.

b. HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions Dated **15 January 2026** are applicable to this procurement and can be located on the ACT Website at <https://www.act.nato.int/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/HQ-SACT-General-Terms-and-Conditions-20260115.pdf> under Contractor Information.

c. Contract Award is contingent upon funding availability; Partial bidding is NOT allowed.

2. Classification

This Request for Proposal (RFP) is a NATO UNCLASSIFIED document.

3. Definitions

a. The “Prospective Bidder” shall refer to the entity that has indicated its intention without commitment, to participate in this RFP.

b. The term “Bidder” shall refer to the bidding entity that has completed a bid in response to this RFP.

c. The term “Contractor” shall refer to the bidding entity to which the contract(s) is awarded.

d. The term “Contracting Officer” designates the official who executes this RFP on behalf of HQ SACT.

e. “Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative” or “COTR” is the official who is appointed for the purpose of determining compliance of the successful bid(s), per the technical specifications.

f. The term “HQ SACT” shall refer to Headquarters Supreme Allied Commander Transformation.

g. The term “ACT” shall refer to Allied Command Transformation.

h. The term “NATO” shall refer to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

i. The term “days” as used in this RFP shall, unless otherwise stated, be interpreted as meaning calendar days.

4. Eligibility

a. This RFP is open to governmental or commercial entities;

b. Established in a North Atlantic Treaty Organization Alliance member nation;

c. Working in the required field and legally authorised to operate in the country and state in which this contract is to be performed, at the time of bidding. Has performed the desired past performance including size, cost and scope, as described in this RFP; and

d. All proposed key personnel identified to work on this requirement must be citizens of a NATO member nation.

e. To this end, bidder shall submit a signed Declaration of Eligibility as per enclosure 5.

5. Duration of Contract

a. The contract awarded shall be effective upon signature (estimated 31st of August 2026).

b. Period of Performance: contract signature (estimated 31 August 2026) to 11 December 2026 for the base period corresponding to the first Work Package (WP0), with four (4) option periods corresponding to WP1-4, sequentially, as follows.

Option Period 1 (WP1): ~ 10 weeks

Option Period 2 (WP2): ~ 12 weeks

Option Period 3 (WP3): ~ 6 weeks

Option Period 4 (WP4): ~ 12 weeks

Option periods durations are estimated and these options may be exercised solely at the discretion of HQ SACT based on satisfactory contractor performance, availability of funding, budgetary & operational requirements and Contracting Officer approval.

6. Exemption of Taxes

In accordance with the agreements, (Article VIII of the Paris Protocol, dated 28 August 1952) goods and services under this contract are exempt from taxes, duties, and similar charges. The Contractor remains liable for all taxes levied on the Contractor and on Contractor's employees, to include responsibilities to report and withhold and/or disburse income tax on payments to Contractor's employees. See paragraph 14 of HQ SACT's General Terms and Conditions for provision in its entirety.

7. Amendment or Cancellation

a. HQ SACT reserves the right to amend or delete any one or more of the terms, conditions or provisions of the RFP prior to the date set for bid closing. A solicitation amendment or amendments shall announce such action.

b. HQ SACT reserves the right to cancel, at any time, this RFP either partially or in its entirety. No legal liability on the part of HQ SACT shall be considered for recovery of costs in connection to bid preparation. All efforts undertaken by any bidder shall be done considering and accepting, that no costs shall be recovered from HQ SACT. If this RFP is cancelled, any/all received bids shall be returned unopened, per the bidder's request.

8. Bidder Clarifications

a. Prospective Bidders should seek clarification at their earliest convenience. Any explanation regarding the meaning or interpretation of this RFP, terms, clause,

provision or specifications, shall be requested in writing, to the contracting e-mail address hqsact.contracting@nato.int. Any request for clarifications must be received via email no later than **17 JULY 2026**.

b. In lieu of a bidder's conference, HQ SACT invites bidders to submit technical and contractual questions not later than **17 JULY 2026**.

c. Information in response to all inquiries / requests for clarification to a prospective bidder shall be furnished to all prospective bidders at the following link: <http://www.act.nato.int/contracting> as a Question-and-Answer addendum (Q&A). All such addendums and any necessary solicitation amendments shall be considered as an integral part of this RFP. Verbal Interpretations shall not be binding.

9. Bid Closing Date

Bids shall be received at HQ SACT, Purchasing and Contracting Office, no later than **05 AUGUST 2026, 0900 hours, Eastern Time, Norfolk, Virginia, USA**. No bids shall be accepted after this date and time. **No hard copy proposals will be accepted.** Please see Proposal Submission (paragraph 12) for more details.

10. Bid Validity

a. Bids shall remain valid for a period of one hundred and twenty days (120) from the applicable closing date set forth within this RFP. HQ SACT reserves the right to request an extension of validity. Bidder shall be entitled to either grant or deny this extension of validity. HQ SACT shall automatically consider a denial to extend the validity as a withdrawal of the bid.

b. **HQ SACT will not accept supplier proposals prepared, in whole or in part, by means of generative artificial-intelligence (AI) tools, including and without limitation to chatbots, such as Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (Chat GPT), or other language generating tools. HQ SACT reserves the right to screen applications to identify the use of such tools. All applications prepared, in whole or in part, by means of such generative or creative AI applications may be rejected without further consideration at HQ SACT's sole discretion, and HQ SACT reserves the right to take further steps in such cases as appropriate.**

11. Content of Proposal

The proposal shall consist of two (2) separate documents (Technical / Price) sent via e-mail as per the instructions. No hard copy proposals will be accepted. The E-mailed documents shall be received no later than **05 AUGUST 2026, 0900 hours, Eastern Time, Norfolk, Virginia, USA**.

a. **Technical Proposal shall be a Signed PDF document and contain:**

- 1) Company description (limited to 10 pages);
- 2) A table of contents for the entire proposal (as per Enclosure #1);
- 3) The bidder's full name, address, Points of Contact, Telephone, e-mail address, Internet site;

- 4) Compliance statement (as per Enclosure#2);
- 5) Past performance (as per Enclosure #3);
- 6) Signed Declaration of Eligibility (as per Enclosure #5)
- 7) List of key personnel to provide services;
- 8) Supplementary relevant information, if applicable; and
- 9) Compliance and Best Value Criteria Matrices (as per Annex B).

b. Price Proposal shall be

- 1) **Submitted in U.S. Dollar Currency.** Contractor may request payment post award in alternate currency based on agreed conversion rate.
- 2) Prices shall be on a **Firm Fixed Price Basis**, include any relevant discount schedule.
- 3) Price proposal (as per Enclosure #4).

12. Proposal Submission

- a. Proposals shall be separate e-mail submissions to:

Technical proposal: hqsact.techproposal@nato.int

Price proposal: hqsact.priceproposal@nato.int

- b. E-mail subjects shall include the solicitation information along with company name (for example: RFP -ACT-SACT-26-65_Tech_ABC Inc. / RFP -ACT- SACT-26-65_Price_ABC Inc.). **Allow sufficient time in sending your submission should you encounter e-mail size challenges.**

- c. No verbal bids or verbal modifications or telephonic bids shall be considered.

- d. It is the ultimate responsibility of a prospective bidder prior to submission that all proposal submissions are reviewed to ensure they meet the technical, contractual and administrative specifications and that offers meet the limitations and expressed conditions.

13. Late Proposals

- a. It is solely the bidder`s responsibility that every effort is made to ensure that the proposal reaches HQ SACT prior to the established closing date and time. No late bids shall be considered.

- b. A delay in an e-mail exchange due to server or size restrictions does not constitute a delay by NATO.**

14. Bid Withdrawal

A bidder may withdraw their bid up to the date and time specified for bid closing. Such a withdrawal must be completed in writing with attention to the HQ SACT Contracting Officer.

15. Bid Evaluation

a. The evaluation of bids and determination as to the responsiveness and technical adequacy or technical compliance, of the products or services requested, shall be the responsibility of HQ SACT. Such determinations shall be consistent with the evaluation criteria specified in the RFP. HQ SACT is not responsible for any content that is not clearly identified in any proposal package.

b. Proposals shall be evaluated and awarded taking into consideration the following factors:

- 1) Successful administrative submission of bid packages as requested in paragraph 11 and as listed in this RFP.
- 2) Successful determination of compliance on mandatory criteria (Compliant/non-compliant).
- 3) **Technical factors / pricing factors rated as follows: Technical / Price = 70/30 (Best Value)**
- 4) Technical clarifications as determined may be conducted.
- 5) Acceptance of HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions.

16. Proposal Clarifications

During the entire evaluation process HQ SACT reserves the right to discuss any bid, clarify what is offered and interpret language within the bid to resolve any potential areas of concern.

17. Award

a. HQ SACT intends to award a firm fixed price services contract to the successful bidder whose proposal represents the Best Value offer to NATO. Partial awards will not be considered.

b. HQ SACT will collect information from references provided by the successful bidder on its past performance. Contractors must provide authorization to contact references or that past performance shall not be considered.

c. HQ SACT reserves the right to negotiate minor deviations to the listed General Terms and Conditions to this RFP.

18. Surge Capability:

A surge capability requirement is included to have a contract vehicle in place should emerging circumstances require a quick and temporary increase in contractor services within the scope of the existing Statement of Work. The selected supplier shall be prepared to provide additional services if needed to support this SOW. The contractor

shall be prepared to evaluate requirements and submit a price proposal for any new in scope requirement for consideration by HQ SACT. Surge proposals will be evaluated by the Contracting Officer for fair and reasonable pricing and should be developed based upon the same pricing structure as the original contract proposal. Surge requirements include, but are not limited to, required repairs identified during the annual maintenance checks, but not already accounted for and will be incorporated by formal contract modification. Requests for pricing are made on a non-committal basis and do not constitute a formal commitment by HQ SACT to contract for additional work; supplier will not be reimbursed costs for preparing price proposals or other related expenses in response to a surge request. HQ SACT surge efforts will not exceed 50% of the annual contract value or 50% of the cumulative contract value.

19. Lodging a complaint

Interested Parties should consult Appendix 1 of Procedure for NATO Competitive Procurement Policy (https://www.nato.int/content/dam/nato/webready/documents/finance/procurement-procedure_en.pdf) to learn more about applicable dispute resolution procedures. For this RFP, complaints shall be lodged by an interested party within 15 calendar days from the date when the interested party first knew, or ought to have known, about the circumstances giving rise to the grounds for the potential dispute, whichever is earlier. For complaints relating to the contract award decision, the deadline is 15 calendar days from the day following the date on which the contract award decision is communicated to the bidders.

20. Proposed Candidates

If successful, contractor company must notify HQ SACT of any special accommodations or requirements of its personnel for on-site support.

21. Communications

All communication related to this RFP, between a prospective bidder and HQ SACT shall only be through the nominated HQ SACT Contracting Officer. Designated contracting staff shall assist the HQ SACT Contracting Officer in the administrative process. There shall be no contact with other HQ SACT personnel regarding this RFP. Such adherence shall ensure Fair and Open Competition with equal consideration and competitive footing to all interested parties.

22. Points of Contact

Hqsact.contracting@nato.int

Enclosure 1: Proposal Content / Checklist

PROPOSAL CONTENT / CHECKLIST

Table of Contents

- ☐ Bidder's name, address, POC, Contact numbers, email address.
- ☐ Compliance Statement (as per Enclosure 2).
- ☐ Past Performance (including References) (as per Enclosure 3).
- ☐ List of Key Personnel.
- ☐ Technical Proposal, including the Compliance matrix (as per Annex B).
- ☐ Price Proposal (Excel worksheet – as per Enclosure 4 - provides mandatory price proposal format).
- ☐ Declaration of eligibility (as per Enclosure 5).

Enclosure 2: Compliance Statement

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT TO SEALED BID RFP-ACT-SACT-26-65

It is hereby stated that our company has read and understands all documentation issued as part of this RFP. Our company proposal submitted in response to the referenced solicitation is fully compliant with the provisions of this RFP and the intended contract with the following exception(s); such exceptions are considered non-substantial to the HQ SACT solicitation provisions issued.

Note: Any requested deviations/adjustments or considerations regarding HQ SACT General Terms and Conditions must be identified here - at the time of bidding - for consideration by the Contracting Officer.

<u>Clause</u>	<u>Description of Minor Deviation</u>
-----	-----
-----	-----
-----	-----

(If applicable, add another page)

Company: _____

Signature: _____

Name & Title: _____

Date: _____

Company Bid Reference: _____

Bidder's proposal must be based on full compliance with the terms, conditions and requirements of the RFP and all future clarifications and/or amendments. The bidder may offer variations in specific implementation and operational details provided that the functional and performance requirements are fully satisfied. In case of conflict between the compliance statement and the detailed evidence or explanation furnished, the detailed evidence/comments shall take precedence/priority for the actual determination of compliance. Minor or non-substantial deviations may be accepted. Substantial changes shall be considered non-responsive.

Enclosure 3: Past Performance Information Form

Company is required to submit a minimum of two (2) past performances within the last five (5) years. Company should be clear how the company met the requirements of past performance. Reference to a contract must include a detailed description of the work performed relevant to the requirements outlined in the SOW. Generic or Vague references to the contract awarded without clear connection to work performed will be disqualified

- (a) Contracting Entity:
- (b) Contract No:
- (c) Type of Contract (Firm Fixed Price, IDIQ, Requirements):
- (d) Title of Contract:
- (e) Description of Work Performance and Relevance to Current Acquisition (Type of facility, capacity, estimated patronage, summary of staff used):
- (f) Contract Dollar Amount:
- (g) Period of Performance:
- (h) Name, Address, Fax and Telephone No. of Reference:
- (i) Indicate Whether Reference Acted as Prime or Sub-contractor:
- (j) Comments regarding compliance with contract terms and conditions:
- (k) Complete Contact Information for client:
- (l) Permission to contact client for reference: Yes / No

Name/Signature of Authorized Company Official: _____

This Enclosure is designed to assist the respective company provide HQ SACT with all necessary documents/information required. For clarification, please refer to bidding instructions in part 1 of subject solicitation.

Enclosure 4a – Mandatory Price Proposal Excel Spreadsheet

Pricing shall be submitted using the excel workbook provided. Bidders may elect to submit a PDF proposal for pricing in addition to the required excel workbook.

Proposals not submitted in the proper format will not be considered.

#	Work package/Option	Deliverable	Timeline*	Price
1	WP0/Base	D0.1 - CySAS UI/UX concept package	NLT T ₀ + 9 weeks	
		D0.2 - Visual mock-ups / wireframes		
		D0.3 - Short feasibility analysis of the follow-on WP1, gamified CySAS		
2	WP1/Option 1	D1.1 - Demonstration/gamification concept package	NLT T ₀₁ + 10 weeks	
		D1.2 - Scenario Design Pack		
		D1.3 - WP2 Implementation Plan		
		D1.4 - Short feasibility analysis of the follow-on WP2, gamified CySAS		
3	WP2/Option 2	D2.1 - Runnable playable game	NLT T ₀₂ + 12 weeks	
		D2.2 - Handover Package for ACT replay, including installation/configuration instructions, technical description, source/project files		
4	WP3/Option 3	D3.1 - CyC2 UI/UX concept package	NLT T ₀₃ + 6 weeks	
		D3.2 - Visual mock-ups / wireframes		
		D3.3 - Short feasibility analysis of the follow-on WP4, gamified CyC2		
5	WP4/Option 4	D4.1 - Updated runnable playable game incorporating CyC2 workflows and multi-level roles	NLT T ₀₄ + 12 weeks	
		D4.2 - Implemented CyC2 scenario content		
		D4.3 - Updated handover package to ensure the game can be replayed by ACT		
			TOTAL PRICE	

**T₀ – effective date of the base contract = base period purchase order signature date; T_{0x} – option “x” effective date = option purchase order signature date (e.g. T₀₂ – option 2 PO signature date);*

The timelines are maximal. Bidders are welcome to propose shorter timelines, subject to them being objectively realistic in being able to meet such timelines, with the understanding that at least WP0 will be executed before the end of 2026.

Enclosure 4b –Price Proposal Equivalent Effort

ROLE	Estimated person-hours				
	WP0	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4
Project/Delivery Lead					
UI/UX & Information Visualization Lead					
Game/Gamification Writer/Designer					
Software Developer					
Other (specify)					
....					

Note: This is a deliverables contract. The estimated effort to perform the work is required for evaluation purposes only, to more easily understand the cost basis of the pricing.

Enclosure 5 – Declaration of Eligibility for NATO Competitive Procurement

Date:

Declaration of Eligibility for NATO Competitive Procurement

To: ACT Procurement Authority

Subject: Declaration of Eligibility for NATO Competitive Procurement

Reference: IFIB-ACT-SACT-26-65 Visualization & Gamification Solutions in support of Cyberspace Warfare Development.

With reference to the above-mentioned NATO Competitive Procurement (NCP) opportunity, the following *[insert Country of Origin]* vendor has expressed an interest in receiving the solicitation document:

a. Vendor Name:

b. Address:

c. Point of Contact/Title: Mr./Ms.:

d. Email Address:

e. Phone #:

2. I certify that this vendor has the necessary financial, technical and professional competence to be admitted by the Government of *[insert Country of Origin]* as a bidder were it responsible for awarding a contract of this nature. The vendor listed above is security cleared to the level of this procurement opportunity.
3. **Extension to Other NCP Opportunities¹.** In addition to the referenced project, this Declaration of Eligibility may be used for other ACT NCP opportunities and is valid for the vendor in paragraph 1 for a period of three (3) years, unless rescinded in writing by the National Responsible Authority of *[insert Country of Origin]*.

Check one:

Yes

No

¹ Note to Vendor: If “Yes” is checked, then present this Declaration of Eligibility for expressed interest in other ACT NCP Opportunities

Signature
[Name of National Responsible Authority]
[insert Country of Origin]

Statement of Work

Visualization & Gamification Solutions in support of Cyberspace Warfare Development

In support of NATO Headquarters Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (HQ SACT), Cyberspace Branch

Introduction

- 1 Allied Command Transformation (ACT) is NATO's leading agent for change: driving, facilitating, and advocating the continuous improvement of Alliance capabilities to maintain and enhance the military relevance and effectiveness of the Alliance. The main objectives of ACT are providing appropriate support to NATO missions and operations; leading NATO military transformation; improving relationships, interaction and practical cooperation with Partners, Nations and international organisations. ACT therefore leads Alliance concept development, capability development, training and lessons learned initiatives and provides unfettered military support to policy development within NATO.
- 2 The exploitation of cyberspace as a domain of operations presents an increasingly growing challenge for the Alliance, requiring new strategies, concepts, architectures, processes and capabilities to enable NATO to defend itself in cyberspace as effectively as it does in the physical domains. In this context, ACT Cyberspace Branch is responsible, among others, for developing appropriate cyberspace warfare products such as strategic outlook analysis, horizon scanning, research and feasibility studies and capability surveys. Those products inform ACT's activities in the area of concept definition and experimentation and are the source for development of forward-looking cyberspace capabilities that enable NATO operations and missions.

Background

- 3 Cyberspace Situational Awareness (CySA) is possibly the single most important cyberspace capability in support of NATO cyberspace operations, directly contributing to cyber resiliency and mission assurance in support of Multi Domain Operations (MDO). In this context, ACT Cyberspace Branch has developed CySA concepts and conducted several experiments during exercise Cyber Coalition to validate CySA workflows and products, notably the Recognized Cyber Picture (RCyP) and the Cyber Adversarial Picture (CyAP). While informing the acquisition of NATO Cyberspace Situational Awareness System (CySAS), this work also lays the foundation for the definition and validation of Cyberspace Command and Control (CyC2) capability requirements.
- 4 One of the key challenges related to CySAS is the visualization of information to support decision-making across various levels of responsibility – from operators and analysts to commanders. Although examples of the RCyP and CyAP have been

developed, the non-geographical, highly dynamic, and interconnected nature of cyberspace makes it difficult to effectively represent cyber information through traditional dashboards or conventional (geographically based) operational pictures, such as the Common Operational Picture (COP).

- 5 Moreover, CySAS visualizations must not only describe “what is happening”, but also support CyC2 processes and decision-making (e.g., mission planning, execution, coordination, and assessment). Against this backdrop, ACT seeks to identify and demonstrate innovative user interfaces (including dynamic and interactive representations) and gamified interactions that enable operators and stakeholders to better comprehend cyberspace and to rehearse CySAS and CyC2-related processes and products in a controlled demonstration context, thereby informing on-going warfare development efforts – e.g., concept development, experimentation, education and training).
- 6 This Statement of Work (SoW) defines the tasks and deliverables for industry support to identify and prototype visualization and gamification approaches in support of cyberspace concept development, experimentation, and capability development, with emphasis on NATO CySAS and CyC2 workflows and products. **The work is structured as one initial Work Package (WP0) and four optional follow-on Work Packages (WP1-WP4), which may be exercised at NATO ACT’s discretion, based on the outcomes of preceding work.**

Aim and Scope

- 7 The aim of this SoW is to design and iteratively demonstrate a gamified user interface concept for CySAS products (in particular the RCyP and CyAP), and – subject to discretionary ACT’s exercise of contract options – produce an interactive CySAS/CyC2 playable wargame demonstrator that ACT can replay for experimentation and concept development activities.
- 8 The following activities are in scope of this SoW:
 - 8.1 Review and extract relevant information from ACT-provided CySAS/CyC2 documentation and knowledge.
 - 8.2 Propose User Interface (UI) and User Experience (UX) designs to represent key CySAS products, notably the RyCP and CyAP, at different levels of command¹.
 - 8.3 Define dynamic interaction and gamification mechanics to support CySAS workflows, processes, and products.
 - 8.4 Develop a CySAS demonstration/gamification concept (option WP1) and a playable game (option WP2).

¹ Strategic, operational, tactical and (limited elements of) technical.

- 8.5 Expand the gamified demonstrator to incorporate CyC2 workflows and products by developing a gamification concept (option WP3) and a playable game (Option WP4), enabling experimentation and wargaming at different echelons (e.g., Component Command Cyber (CyCC), Joint Force Command (JFC), Cyberspace Operations Centre (CyOC)).
 - 8.6 Iterative engagement with ACT (and other NATO operational stakeholders) for reviews and refinements.
 - 8.7 Delivery of stand-alone, runnable demonstration packages and supporting documentation to enable ACT replay.
- 9 The following activities are out of scope of this SoW:
- 9.1 Integration with NATO operational/functional systems, networks, or real-time data feeds.
 - 9.2 Operational-grade production software, accredited software and full capability delivery; the effort is for validation and execution platforms, only.
 - 9.3 Handling/use of classified information. All products delivered by the provider must be fully releasable to NATO and all NATO Nations and shall not be above NATO UNCLASSIFIED.

Activities and Deliverables

- 10 The work is organized into five WPs: one initial WP and four optional WPs.

WP0 (Initial): CySAS UI/UX Concept for CySAS Workflows & Products

- 11 Purpose: Translate CySAS concepts into a coherent UI/UX dynamic concept representing the main CySAS products, notably the RCyP and CyAP, suitable to underpin a later interactive demonstration and playable prototype.
- 12 Tasks:
- 12.1 Review ACT-provided CySAS documentation and identify key information elements, user questions, workflows, and decision points relevant to CySAS workflows and products.
 - 12.2 Propose visualization and interaction concepts (UI/UX) for the main CySAS workflows and products, including:
 - 12.2.1 The RCyP – i.e., the fusion of network, threat and mission data providing a high-level summary of the situation in support of decision-making processes, at the different levels of command.
 - 12.2.2 The CyAP – i.e., the fusion of known information about the adversary, including activity, intent/capability indicators, and likely courses of

action, also at the different levels of command.

12.3 Define, describe and deliver wireframes/storyboards and/or clickable mock-ups showing key interfaces and human interactions.

13 Deliverables:

13.1 D0.1: CySAS UI/UX concept package (report and slide deck): rationale, persona/use cases, user flows, proposed UI/UX for RCyP and CyAP, interaction model, assumptions/constraints.

13.2 D0.2: Visual mock-ups / wireframes (export + editable source).

13.3 D0.3: Short feasibility analysis of the follow-on WP1, gamified CySAS (this deliverable shall be used to decide on the continuation of the project)

14 Acceptance criteria:

14.1 Clear linkage between CySAS documentation and the proposed RCyP/CyAP representations.

14.2 Feasibility of implementation based on realistic and available data sources, as per the CySAS information provided by ACT.

14.3 UI/UX concept and deliverables are sufficiently detailed to implement an interactive gamified system that provides a significant increase in value with respect to current products.

14.4 ACT review comments addressed and incorporated.

WP1 (Option 1): Demonstration/Gamification Concept for CySAS Workflows & Products

15 Purpose: Develop and describe a demonstration/gamification concept (not a software build) showing how the WP1 UI/UX concept would be gamified to allow an operator to “play” through CySAS decision-making, notably generating and using the RCyP and CyAP.

16 Tasks:

16.1 Confirm demonstration goals and target audience (e.g., operators, decision-makers) and define learning/experimentation objectives.

16.2 Define the game concept and core loop based on RCyP/CyAP usage.

16.3 Define gamification mechanics that explicitly map to CySAS products, including (as applicable):

16.3.1 Player roles and permissions.

16.3.2 Actions/decisions available to the player.

16.3.3 Adversary behavior representation (CyAP-driven).

16.3.4 Scoring, objectives, success/failure conditions, and progression.

16.3.5 Feedback mechanisms as the game evolves

16.4 Define the demonstration scenario package (at least one scenario) including initial conditions, injects/events, triggers, branching, and expected player choices.

16.5 Prototype at concept level: storyboard the demonstration flow and screen-to-screen interactions (may include updated wireframes, interaction diagrams).

16.6 Implementation plan for WP2: provide a technical approach to implement the playable demonstrator (tooling options, architecture, data model assumptions, schedule, risks).

17 Deliverables:

17.1 D1.1: Demonstration/gamification concept package (report/slide deck) including game narrative, player roles, core loop, rules/mechanics, mapping to RyCP/CyAP, and how uncertainty and adversary actions are represented.

17.2 D1.2: Scenario Design Pack: scenario(s), inject/event list, branching logic, and facilitator notes (concept level).

17.3 D1.3: WP2 Implementation Plan: recommended tools/stack, build approach, asset inventory, and delivery plan to reach a runnable playable demonstrator.

17.4 D1.4 Short feasibility analysis of the follow-on WP2, gamified CySAS (this deliverable shall be used to decide on the continuation of the project)

18 Acceptance criteria:

18.1 Demonstration/gamification concept provides a clear, credible method to gamify CySAS.

18.2 At least one complete scenario is defined with game flow, injects, operator decisions, and expected outcomes.

18.3 Outputs are sufficiently detailed to implement WP3 without reworking core design intent.

WP2 (Option 2): Playable Game for CySAS

19 Purpose: Implement a runnable playable game that reuses WP1 UI/UX and WP2 concept, enabling ACT to play demonstrations and use cases, using real data and real

roles, during workshops and other events.

20 Tasks:

20.1 Confirm game scope for the playable game (features, scenario count, fidelity, platform constraints).

20.2 Implement the playable demonstrator according to the WP1 concept, including:

20.2.1 Playable core loop (turn-based or real-time as defined).

20.2.2 RyCP, CyAP and other CySAS products² interactive screens and state updates.

20.2.3 Player actions and feedback effects.

20.2.4 Adversary behavior and uncertainty/confidence representation.

20.3 Scenario implementation: implement at least one complete scenario.

20.4 Packaging and handover: produce a stable build and guidance for ACT to run and replay sessions (reset/restart, configuration).

21 Deliverables:

21.1 D2.1: Runnable playable game (prototype build/package).

21.2 D2.2: Handover Package for ACT replay, including installation/configuration instructions, technical description, source/project files as required to ensure ACT can retain and replay the demonstrator over time, along with some minimal installation, configuration and user documentation.

22 Acceptance criteria:

22.1 The game implements the WP1-approved gamification concept and uses the WP1 UI/UX approach for the RyCP/CyAP.

22.2 CySAS workflows and use cases are playable end-to-end.

22.3 The game is stand-alone, and ACT can run/play the game without any external support, infrastructure or connectivity to non-NATO networks or systems, using the provided handover documentation.

WP3 (Option 3): CyC2 UI/UX Concept for CyC2 Workflows & Products

23 Purpose: Translate Cyber Command and Control (CyC2) concept into a coherent dynamic UI/UX proposal for gamification, representing the main CyC2 roles,

² These products include Cyber Key terrain (CKT), Cyber Prioritized Service Lists (CyPSLs), etc., which in general, for the purposes of the gamified system, are subsets of the RCyP and do not represent a risk in terms of development.

workflows, and products, suitable to underpin a later interactive game and playable prototype.

24 Tasks:

24.1 Review ACT-provided CyC2 information; identify key information elements, user roles, and workflows relevant to CyC2 workflows and products, at the different levels of war.

24.2 Propose visualization and interaction concepts (UI/UX) for the main CyC2 workflows and products, including:

24.2.1 Mission model, dependencies and risk propagation (from CySA).

24.2.2 Courses of Action and comparison.

24.2.3 Targets and effects.

24.2.4 Force management.

24.2.5 Orders and execution dashboards.

24.2.6 Assessments and reports.

24.3 Produce wireframes/storyboards and/or clickable mock-ups showing key screens and interactions.

25 Deliverables:

25.1 D3.1: CyC2 UI/UX concept package (report or slide deck): rationale, persona/use cases, user flows, proposed UI/UX for CyC2, interaction model, assumptions/constraints.

25.2 D3.2: Visual mock-ups / wireframes (export + editable source).

25.3 D3.3 Short feasibility analysis of the follow-on WP4, gamified CyC2 (this deliverable shall be used to decide on the continuation of the project)

26 Acceptance criteria:

26.1 Clear linkage between CyC2 documentation and proposed UI/UX representations.

26.2 Feasibility of actual implementation based on realistic and available data sources, as per the CyC2 information provided by ACT.

26.3 UI/UX concept is sufficiently detailed to implement an interactive demonstrator and provides a significant increase in value with respect to available products.

26.4 ACT review comments addressed and incorporated.

WP4 (Option 4): Playable CySAS/CyC2 Game

27 Purpose: Based on WP3, extend the WP2 playable game beyond CySAS and to include CyC2, enabling NATO to “play” cyberspace decision-making and C2 at multiple levels (e.g., JFCs, CyOC, and other relevant levels). Building on CySAS, the game shall incorporate CyC2 workflows and products supporting mission planning, execution, and assessment.

28 Tasks:

28.1 Review ACT-provided CyC2 documentation; identify key information elements, user questions, workflows, and decision points relevant to CyC2 workflows and products.

28.2 CyC2 scope definition and echelon model: confirm target echelons/roles, responsibilities, and decision rights (e.g., JFC, CyOC, component/mission teams), and how information flows between them.

28.3 Define and model CyC2 workflows and key products/artifacts for:

28.3.1 Mission planning (objectives, constraints, authorities, resources, Course of Action development).

28.3.2 Mission execution (tasking, coordination, dynamic re-tasking, risk management, deconfliction).

28.3.3 Mission assessment (effects assessment, battle damage/effects estimation analogues, mission outcomes, lessons learned).

28.4 Extend the WP2 UI/UX and game mechanics to represent CyC2 roles, interactions, and decision points while maintaining consistency with CySAS workflows and products.

28.5 Implement gameplay enabling play at various levels (separate player roles or facilitated play), including cross-level dependencies, reporting, and approval loops.

28.6 Implement an scenario that explicitly exercises CyC2 planning, execution, and assessment, and integrates adversary reactions and uncertainty.

28.7 Packaging and handover: deliver a stable build and updated documentation enabling ACT to play replay CyC2-enabled sessions.

29 Deliverables:

29.1 D4.1: Updated runnable playable game incorporating CyC2 workflows and multi-

level roles.

29.2 D4.2: Implemented CyC2 scenario content (including end-to-end planning/execution/assessment scenario) with reset/replay configuration.

29.3 D4.3: Updated handover package to ensure the game can be replayed by ACT.

30 Acceptance criteria:

30.1 The demonstrator enables play at multiple levels of war and the associated headquarters (e.g., CyCC, JFC and CyOC) with clearly defined roles, decisions, and information flows.

30.2 The implemented scenario supports mission planning, execution, and assessment and integrates CySAS products (RCyP/CyAP) throughout.

30.3 ACT can run and replay the CyC2-enabled demonstrator independently using the provided handover documentation and package, in stand-alone manner and without connectivity to external (non-NAT) networks, systems or data sets.

Schedule/milestones

31 The following table shows expected project milestones. The provider shall propose any changes to the plan for discussion and agreement (if applicable) during kick-off meeting.

Work Package	Milestone	Description	Timeline
WP0 (base)	M0.1	Kick-off of WP0 (initial)	T0 (contract signature)
	M0.2	Delivery and review of draft deliverables for WP0.	T0+4 weeks
	M0.3	Delivery and review of updated draft deliverables for WP0.	T0+6 weeks
	M0.4	Delivery and review of final deliverables for WP0.	T0+9 weeks
WP1 (option 1)	M1.1	Activation of WP1 (option 1) and kick-off	T0 (beginning of WP1)
	M1.2	Delivery and review of draft deliverables for WP1.	T0+5 weeks
	M1.3	Delivery and review of updated draft deliverables for WP1.	T0+8 weeks
	M1.4	Delivery and review of updated draft deliverables for WP1.	T0+10 weeks

Work Package	Milestone	Description	Timeline
<u>WP2 (option 2)</u>	M2.1	Activation of WP2 (option 2) and kick-off	T0 (beginning of WP2)
	M2.2	Delivery and review of draft deliverables for WP2.	T0+6 weeks
	M2.3	Delivery and review of updated draft deliverables for WP2.	T0+9 weeks
	M2.4	Delivery and review of final deliverables for WP2.	T0+12 weeks
<u>WP3 (option 3)</u>	M3.1	Activation of WP3 (option 3) and kick-off	T0 (beginning of WP3)
	M3.2	Delivery and review of draft deliverables for WP3.	T0+3 weeks
	M3.3	Delivery and review of updated draft deliverables for WP3.	T0+5 weeks
	M3.4	Delivery and review of final deliverables for WP3.	T0+6 weeks
<u>WP4 (option 4)</u>	M4.1	Activation of WP 4 (option 4) and kick-off	T0 (beginning of WP4)
	M4.2	Delivery and review of draft deliverables for WP4.	T0+6 weeks
	M4.3	Delivery and review of updated draft deliverables for WP4.	T0+9 weeks
	M4.4	Delivery and review of final deliverables for WP4.	T0+12 weeks

Estimated Effort

- 32 The estimation of effort required to complete the works in the scope of this SoW is the sole responsibility of the bidding contractors. To facilitate understanding of the provider-estimated effort, the bidder shall complete a table like the one below with the estimated person-hours per role and WP. Roles below are provided for illustration purposes, only, and shall be modified based on the proposed provider roles:

ROLE	WP0	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4
Project/Delivery Lead					

UI/UX & Information Visualization Lead					
Game/Gamification Writer/Designer					
Software Developer					
Other (specify)					

- 33 While ACT has not allocated a fixed budget amount nor a firm period of performance, subject to procurement regulations and timelines, ACT would expect WP0 and WP1 to be completed by end of 2026, preliminarily estimating a level of effort associated to a workload of 2 full-time persons, distributed as needed among the project required roles.

Essential Requirements

- 34 To increase the likelihood of success, the provider shall meet or exceed the following essential requirements (see compliance and best value criteria matrices below). Bidders shall demonstrate compliance with at least two relevant reference projects completed within the last 24 months (prime or key subcontractor) and show evidence of previous work related to the requirements of this contract.

34.1 Operational/strategic wargaming focus, including related to cyber operations (not “technical network defence”): Demonstrated experience delivering wargames/serious games that represent military operations effects and dependencies (not network/security-operations tools), including authorities, attribution challenges, escalation dynamics, legal/policy constraints, and cross-domain integration.

34.2 Commercial-grade game design and playable digital prototype delivery: Demonstrated ability to apply commercial game design concepts and technology to develop modelling and simulation tools, UI/UX visualization, and digital wargame/interactive prototypes (e.g., clear core loop, player roles, feedback/scoring/objectives). Key personnel shall include a senior game design lead with ≥10 years’ experience delivering commercial or serious game products.

34.3 Research-driven scenario & narrative development: Proven capability to produce high-quality scenario packages using a methodology that combines rigorous research/analysis with compelling narrative scenarios, including initial conditions, injects/events, triggers, branching, and facilitator notes. Evidence shall include at least one scenario package delivered to a government/defence customer.

34.4 Adversary behavior & uncertainty representation (unclassified, explainable): Demonstrated capability to model adversary behavior and

uncertainty/confidence using deterministic/rules-based modelling and/or explainable AI/automation grounded in unclassified threat-modeling and doctrinal logic. Solutions must not require large training data sets and must be deliverable using unclassified / NATO UNCLASSIFIED inputs only.

- 34.5 Repeatable, distributable game demonstrator with facilitator customization: Proven ability to deliver a standalone, runnable demonstrator suitable for distributed use, designed for rapid iteration and replay, and providing facilitators a way to create/modify/upload scenarios without reliance on the original development team and without specialist technical knowledge.
- 34.6 Defence/government customer experience + reusable handover: At least 4 projects in the last 5 years supporting defence/government wargaming/experimentation/PME/training. Proven delivery of a handover package enabling the purchaser to run and replay independently.

Other Considerations

- 35 The following tools will be used to ensure project execution compliance with NATO requirements and continuous inter-organization alignment, while limiting the risk of the execution:
- 35.1 Formal appointment of a Project Manager (PM) from both ACT and the provider, as the single PoC for each entity for project scope, management, quality assurance, and evaluation.
- 35.2 At the request of ACT's PM, invitation to other NATO stakeholders' representatives (e.g., from the NATO Allied Command Operations, NATO Joint Force Commands, Communications and Information Agency (NCIA)) to participate in workshops and to discuss supplier products, should those require coherence with those organizations' areas of responsibility. This participation could be replaced with a list of questions/comments from those organizations to be discussed during the appropriate technical workshops.
- 35.3 Formal delivery acceptance, per product and product draft required after each draft as well as prior to project closure.
- 36 The provider may request additional information to be furnished by ACT prior to any of the kick-off or progress meetings, which ACT will provide if adequate and available, and consistent with need-to-know and releasability policies. The provider may request additional information required for the execution of the activities at any time in between meetings. In these cases, ACT speed of response will be "best possible." ACT will supply the relevant documentation and support required to complete the tasks within the agreed deadlines, specifically when it applies to sufficient documentation / support to understand the existing requirements and solutions that are in place. Review, feedback and acceptance of all draft and deliverable documents and outputs will be provided in a timely manner, as agreed between the parties during the detailed project

plan development at the kick-off-meeting.

- 37 The provider will only use the above documents and information for the purposes of the execution of this contract and will immediately return or destroy all copies of the documentation once this purpose is fulfilled.
- 38 Disclosure of, and access to the above documentation or information to provider's personnel will solely be made on a need-to-know basis.
- 39 The provider and/or their personnel will not, without prior authorization from ACT, release to third parties any of the above documentation or information, its subject matter or any other aspect thereof.
- 40 This provision will remain in effect after the completion of the project and will cease to apply to any particular piece of information or documentation once that information or documentation becomes public knowledge other than through an act, default, or omission of the provider.

Type of Contract and Period of Performance

- 41 Type of Contract: This is a product-based, firm-fix-price contract in accordance with the General Terms and Conditions; as such, all employer responsibilities for the contractor performing under this contract shall lie with the contractor company.
- 42 The Period of Performance will be defined and confirmed in the Purchase Order (PO) issued by ACT. For planning purposes, the work is structured as a base period (WP0) and up to four option periods (WP1–WP4³), with the following indicative durations, commencing from the date(s) specified in the PO:
 - 42.1 WP0 (base): nine (9) weeks from Kick-off / PO effective date (as specified in the PO).
 - 42.2 WP1 (option 1): ten (10) weeks from the effective date of the corresponding PO;
 - 42.3 WP2 (option 2): twelve (12) weeks from the effective date of the corresponding PO;
 - 42.4 WP3 (Option 3): Six (6) weeks from the effective date of the corresponding PO;
 - 42.5 WP4 (Option 4): twelve (12) weeks from the effective date of the corresponding PO.
- 43 ACT project sponsor approval is required to deviate from the milestones identified above. Any (no-cost) extension to the period of performance shall be subject to ACT approval after careful consideration of the justification.

³ Option periods will be exercised solely at the ACT's discretion and will commence only upon written notice of option exercise.

Place of Performance and Travel

- 44 Place of Performance for the indicated activities shall be at the discretion of the provider, at his own preference and cost. Location of project meetings shall be via VTC, unless prior agreement is reached to conduct them in a different location.
- 45 No infrastructure or purchaser furnished equipment shall be provided to the awarded company, which will be responsible for all necessary tools and logistics necessary to execute the work, including handling and transmitting NATO documentation up to NATO UNCLASSIFIED.
- 46 Travel to conduct the activities in support of this SoW is not expected.

Information Security

- 47 The provider will have access and work with not classified and NATO UNCLASSIFIED documentation, only. The provider and personnel allocated to the activities in this SoW shall comply with NATO policy when accessing and handling any NATO furnished information (up to NATO UNCLASSIFIED).

Intellectual Property Rights

- 48 Specific information to IPR is articulated in the General and Special Terms and Conditions that support this contract. All furnished materials associated assets and documents (Intellectual Property) will be the property of ACT unless otherwise agreed in writing with the parties.

Releasability and Export Control

- 49 The products or services under this SOW will need to be releasable NATO. The provider will make all required efforts to obtain necessary authorizations from Government, Industry or any other owner of the information to disclose. Nothing herein requires the provider to provide information to ACT that is subject to Export Control Laws, IPRs or any other constraints prior to receiving the applicable authorizations.

Annex B: Compliance and Best Value Criteria Matrices

Contractor technical proposal will be assessed based on criteria mentioned in Compliance and Best Value Criteria Matrices. The Contractor must demonstrate their experience and expertise in the subject matter.

The technical evaluation will be done in two steps. Contractor technical proposal will be first evaluated against the Compliance Matrix to be assessed as Compliant/Non-Compliant, and second against the Best Value Criteria Matrix to assess the technical score that the contractor obtains used afterwards to establish Best Value score based on the Technical/Price 70/30% criterion.

Being “NOT COMPLIANT” in any of the criteria categories in the compliance matrix will result in the bidder’s proposal being “Technically Non-Compliant” unless otherwise specified. A zero (“0”) score in any best value criterion where “Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder” is indicated will result in the bidder’s proposal as being “Technically Non-Compliant”.

Compliance Matrix

#	Item	Compliant / Non-compliant	Page, Paragraph and Line Number Reference where Bidder meets criteria.
1.	Contractor is headquartered in a NATO nation and all personnel supporting this contract (including subcontractor’s personnel) must be a citizen of a NATO member nation. If individuals have dual citizenship that includes a non-NATO nation, their citizenship must be provided. Contractor shall be legally authorized to operate in NATO member nations at the time of the bidding.		
2.	Contractor is to provide a minimum of two past performance citations (for work within the past five years) to show that it has successfully completed work that is similar to or directly traceable to the requirements outlined in this SOW.		
3.	Key personnel citizen of NATO member nation with valid passport		

	with no travel restrictions. (Nationality must be indicated to include other citizenships)		
4.	Contractor's key personnel possess demonstrated proficiency in English as defined in STANAG 6001 (Standardized Linguistic Profile (SLP) 3333 - Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) or equivalent.		

Best Value Criteria Matrix

PART I – PREVIOUS RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (30 Points)

#	Performance Indicator	Score	Evidence Expected	Explanation of how bidder meets criteria (or reference to section/paragraph in the proposal)	Awarded Score
1	Has the bidder successfully designed, developed and delivered at least one interactive military wargame or serious game demonstrating operational or strategic cyberspace missions (rather than technical cyber defense or SOC training)? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 6	Customer reference, contract, screenshots, acceptance evidence, bidder role		
2	Has the bidder successfully developed visualization solutions supporting operational decision-making through complex, data-rich military mission pictures (rather than conventional business dashboards)? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 4	Screenshots, project description, customer reference		
3	Has the bidder designed user interfaces supporting military planning, execution or assessment workflows involving multiple users, roles or headquarters?	0 or 3	Reference projects and system description		
4	Has the bidder delivered at least one project modelling military decision-making, command relationships, authorities or operational workflows instead of purely technical processes?	0 or 3	Project documentation and customer reference		
5	Has the bidder developed serious games or simulations where player decisions directly influence operational outcomes through branching scenarios, injects or dynamic events?	0 or 2	Demonstration material and scenario documentation		
6	Has the bidder produced research-driven operational scenarios including injects, triggers, branching logic, facilitator guidance and expected outcomes for defense or government customers?	0 or 2	Scenario package or customer reference		
7	Has the bidder demonstrated experience modelling adversary behavior, uncertainty, confidence or probabilistic decision support using deterministic methods or explainable AI suitable for defense applications?	0 or 2	Technical description and customer evidence		
8	Has the bidder previously delivered standalone software demonstrators capable of operating without cloud services, external connectivity or contractor-hosted infrastructure? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 3	Installation guide, architecture description, customer acceptance		
9	Has the bidder delivered products that included complete source code, editable assets and sufficient documentation to enable independent operation and maintenance by the customer? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 2	Handover package and acceptance evidence		
10	Has the bidder successfully completed at least two projects during the previous four years that are directly relevant to the activities described in this Statement of Work, either as prime contractor or key subcontractor? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 3	Contract references identifying bidder's role and delivered capability		
	TOTAL SELF-ASSESSMENT SCORE FOR PART I				

PART II – CAPACITY TO SUCCESSFULLY FULFIL THIS CONTRACT (20 Points)

#	Performance Indicator	Score	Evidence Expected	Explanation of how bidder meets criteria (or reference to section/paragraph in the proposal)	Awarded Score
11	Does the proposed project team collectively demonstrate all disciplines required to execute this contract, including project management, military operational analysis, UI/UX design, software development, game design, scenario development and systems integration? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 4	Organization chart, CVs, role descriptions and allocation of responsibilities		
12	Does the proposed Project Manager demonstrate previous experience successfully managing defense or government software development projects of comparable complexity and multidisciplinary scope?	0 or 2	CV, project references and customer evidence		
13	Does the proposed Game Design Lead demonstrate at least five years of experience developing commercial or serious games, including interactive simulations involving multiple users, decision-making processes and operational workflows? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 3	CV, portfolio, reference projects		
14	Does the proposed team include personnel with demonstrated knowledge of military command-and-control concepts, operational planning processes and cyberspace operations sufficient to understand ACT documentation without extensive customer coaching? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 2	CVs, publications, previous projects or military experience		
15	Does the bidder demonstrate sufficient personnel availability and organizational capacity to execute the required Work Packages within the proposed schedule while supporting ACT workshops, reviews and iterative refinements?	0 or 2	Resource plan, loading charts, project schedule		
16	Does the bidder present a realistic project management methodology including configuration management, quality assurance, issue tracking, schedule control, risk management and change management?	0 or 2	Project Management Plan or equivalent methodology		
17	Does the bidder demonstrate the ability to protect NATO-furnished information, comply with NATO UNCLASSIFIED handling requirements and maintain appropriate information security throughout contract execution? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 2	Security procedures, corporate policies, quality certifications		
18	Does the bidder demonstrate that all software development tools, frameworks and third-party components required to execute the project are already available and will not create licensing, export control or delivery risks for NATO?	0 or 1	Technology stack, license statement, Bill of Materials		
19	Does the bidder demonstrate sufficient internal software engineering capability to independently implement all proposed functionality without reliance on unidentified subcontractors or future recruitment?	0 or 1	Organization chart, subcontractor list, staffing plan		
20	Does the bidder demonstrate the organizational capability to provide ACT with timely technical support during reviews, demonstrations, workshops, acceptance testing and project handover throughout all Work Packages?	0 or 1	Support approach, communication plan, governance model		
	TOTAL SELF-ASSESSMENT SCORE FOR PART II				

PART III – TECHNICAL QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED SOLUTION (30 Points)

#	Performance Indicator	Score	Evidence Expected	Explanation of how bidder meets criteria (or reference to section/paragraph in the proposal)	Awarded Score
21	Does the proposal demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the objectives, operational context and intended outcomes of this Statement of Work, rather than simply restating the requirements? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 5	Technical proposal		
22	Does the proposed solution clearly support the visualization and understanding of the Recognized Cyber Picture (RCyP) and Cyber Adversarial Picture (CyAP) at multiple levels of command, including strategic, operational and tactical decision-making? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 5	Architecture description, mock-ups, UI concepts		
23	Does the proposed gamification approach directly reinforce CySAS workflows, military decision-making processes and experimentation objectives rather than focusing primarily on entertainment features? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 4	Gameplay description, workflow mapping		
24	Does the proposal provide an intuitive, innovative and operationally relevant user interface that simplifies the understanding of complex cyberspace information and relationships?	0 or 3	Wireframes, storyboards, UI mock-ups		
25	Does the proposed solution include realistic modelling of adversary behavior, uncertainty, confidence levels and likely courses of action using deterministic or explainable techniques appropriate for NATO experimentation?	0 or 3	Technical description, modelling approach		
26	Does the proposal demonstrate a technically sound software architecture capable of supporting all planned Work Packages while minimizing technical debt and future redevelopment?	0 or 3	System architecture diagrams, technical design		
27	Does the proposal present a coherent methodology for iterative development, incorporating ACT reviews, stakeholder feedback and progressive refinement throughout the project lifecycle?	0 or 2	Development methodology, schedule		
28	Does the proposal demonstrate a realistic approach for transforming ACT documentation into usable scenarios, visualizations and playable demonstrations while preserving military accuracy and operational credibility?	0 or 2	Methodology, process description		
29	Does the proposal include credible technical risk identification together with practical mitigation measures addressing schedule, technology, integration and usability risks?	0 or 1	Risk register, management approach		
30	Does the proposal demonstrate innovation likely to provide significant operational value beyond existing visualization approaches while remaining technically achievable within the proposed schedule and budget?	0 or 2	Innovation section, technical proposal		
	TOTAL SELF-ASSESSMENT SCORE FOR PART III				

PART IV – LONG-TERM VALUE, SUSTAINABILITY AND NATO INDEPENDENCE (20 Points)

#	Performance Indicator	Score	Evidence Expected	Explanation of how bidder meets criteria (or reference to section/paragraph in the proposal)	Awarded Score
31	Can the complete solution operate entirely within NATO networks without Internet connectivity, cloud services, remote licensing servers, contractor infrastructure or external service providers? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 5	System architecture, deployment description, software bill of materials		
32	Will ACT receive all source code, editable project files, configuration files, artwork, scenarios, documentation and other technical assets necessary to modify, extend and maintain the solution independently? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 4	Handover plan, Intellectual Property statement, list of deliverables		
33	Can NATO personnel create, modify, import, export and maintain scenarios, injects, game parameters, visualizations and supporting content without software development expertise or contractor assistance? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 3	Demonstration of authoring tools, administration interface, user documentation		
34	Does the proposed solution minimize dependence on proprietary technologies, commercial licenses or third-party products that could limit NATO's future use, modification or distribution of the capability?	0 or 2	Technology stack, licensing statement, software inventory		
35	Does the solution support import and export of operational data, scenarios and outputs using open, documented and widely supported formats (e.g. JSON, CSV, XML, Markdown, DOCX, PDF and common image/video formats)?	0 or 2	Interface specification, data model, technical documentation		
36	Does the bidder provide comprehensive technical, installation, administration, configuration and user documentation sufficient for ACT to deploy, operate, maintain and evolve the capability without contractor support? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 2	Documentation plan, document index, sample documentation		
37	Is the proposed software architecture sufficiently modular, extensible and configurable to allow future NATO experimentation, incorporation of additional CySAS/CyC2 products and evolution of operational concepts without significant redevelopment?	0 or 1	System architecture, modular design description		
38	Can the complete capability be replayed, reset, reconfigured and reused by ACT across multiple experimentation events, workshops and concept development activities without requiring contractor intervention? Zero points in this criterion disqualifies the bidder.	0 or 1	Demonstration concept, replay procedures, administrator guide		
	TOTAL SELF-ASSESSMENT SCORE FOR PART IV				

	TOTAL SELF-ASSESSMENT SCORE				
--	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Note: There is no intermediate score for each individual requirement. The technical proposal either receives the corresponding points for fulfilling the requirement or it receives 0 points for not fulfilling it.