

Attachment A. Answers to Clarification Requests

INVITATION FOR BID

IFB-CO-14974-BMD

Amendment 2

SERIA LNR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Amd #
A.1	IFB Sections 3.1.5, 3.1.7, (PDF Page 30) and 3.2.6 PDF page 32)-	Some of the documentation submitted with the bid will include cost data, technical data, and potentially other sensitive information that is critical to the competitive ability of each individual company, and should be marked as proprietary in the header/footer. Please provide clarification of the requirement 3.1.7 and the inclusion of markings or references to lead to identification of the bidder (including company logo or name).	Purpose of Section 3.17 is to hide the identity of the (at least Prime) Bidders to the evaluators as much as possible (especially for the Technical and Price evaluation team). I suggest to remove proprietary markings in headers/footers and identify any proprietary in a separate document as part of the Admin Package. Bidding documents will only be used for evaluation purposes. Any documents which will later be part of the awarded contract can contain logo and proprietary markers in header/footer, if required.	1
A.2	ANNEX C	Annex C Bid Guarantee – Standby Letter of Credit states two amounts: 1. We, (issuing bank) hereby establish in your favour our irrevocable standby letter of credit number {number} by order and for the account of (NAME AND ADDRESS OF BIDDER) in the original amount of € 300,000.00 (Five Hundred Thousand Euro). We are advised this Guarantee fulfils a requirement under Invitation for Bid CO-14974-BMD dated _____. Please confirm that the Standby Letter of Credit be in the original amount of €300,000.00 (Three Hundred Thousand Euro)	NCI Agency confirms the amount of 300,000 EUR as Bid Guarantee. Annex C is corrected in Amdt 1.	1
A.3	IFB Annex F	Cross Reference - Traceability Matrix Section 2. Supportability rows two and three refer to Bidding Instructions 3.6.5. Please confirm that the Bidding Instruction reference should be 3.5.5 as there is no 3.6.5?	NCI Agency confirms that reference is 3.5.5 Bidding Instructions have been corrected in Amdt 1	1

SERIA LNR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Amd #
<u>A.4</u>	<u>Instructions - Amd 1 - Annex F (Page 3)</u>	<p><u>Response T.3 clarified that the Draft System Transition Plan (STP) should be considered as part of Supportability under IFB Instruction 4.5.4. Should the traceability matrix in Annex F be similarly updated to show the STP evaluation criteria to be part of Supportability rather than Management?</u></p>	<p><u>NCI Agency confirms that Draft System Transition Plan (STP) should be considered as part of Supportability under 4.5.4. In the Traceability Matrix in Annex F, Suitability of Transition Plan to support parallel operation of ITB 5 and ITB 6, has been removed from Management section to Supportability section.</u></p>	<u>2</u>
<u>A.5</u>	<u>Instructions - Amd 1 - Annex F (Pages 3 & 4)</u>	<p><u>Will the Cross Reference - Traceability Matrix be updated to change the 3.6.5 references to 3.5.5?</u></p>	<p><u>NCI Agency confirms that correct numbering is 3.5.5. The Bidding Instructions Annex F has been updated.</u></p>	<u>2</u>
<u>A.6</u>	<u>Instructions - Amd I - 3.2.1 (Page 3-2) and 3.2.6.3 (Page 3-3)</u>	<p><u>Instruction 3.2.1 states that the Table of Contents (1 PDF file) and Executive Summary (1 PDF file) are to be provided as separate files. However, 3.2.6.3 indicates that the Table of Content and the Executive Summary should be part of Section 1: Engineering, Section 2: Management, and Section 3: Supportability.</u></p> <p><u>Please confirm that the Table of Contents and the Executive Summary should be provided as separate files (as specified in 3.2.1), and repeated in each part/section of the Technical Volume.</u></p>	<p><u>NCI Agency confirms that the Table of Contents and the Executive Summary should be provided as separate files (as specified in 3.2.1), and repeated in each part/section of the Technical Volume.</u></p>	<u>2</u>

Technical				
Serial NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Amd #
T.1	IFB Section 3.2 Instructions Table, Volume III Technical (PDF page 31)	IFB states "Draft PMP (with 1 MPP file as attachment, Microsoft Project 2010, Version 14.0). Please clarify that the intent is to include a separate PMP file or just the MPP?"	There are two files: A draft PMP document with the content defined SOW Section 3.7 AND project schedule as MPP file. It is assumed project schedule is already covered in PMP. However, a separate mpp file is requested.	1
T.2	IFB Section 3.2.6.3 Volume III (PDF page 32)	IFB states "IFB-CO-14974-BMD Official Bid for Company Name, Volume III- Technical, Part 4- Section 3: BOE and Draft PMP." Please clarify that the PMP should instead be the MPP?	Draft PMP with 1 MPP file as attachment. See response to T.1	1
T.3	IFB Sections 4.5.2.4 (PDF page #52) and 3.5.5.2.2 (PDF page 42).	IFB 4.5.2.4 lists Engineering evaluation criteria for the draft System Transition Plan (STP), however IFB 3.5.6 does not include the draft STP as part of the Engineering Proposal Package. Note that IFB 3.5.5.2.2 does include the STP as part of the Supportability Proposal (3.5.5). Should IFB 4.5.2.4 be moved to be part of Supportability evaluation criteria under 4.5.4?	Correct. Draft System Transition Plan (STP) should be considered as part of Supportability under 4.5.4. Bidding Instructions have been corrected in Amdt 1	1

Technical				
Serial NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Amd #
T.4	SOW-213, -219, -225, -234. (PDF pages 58, 60, and 61)	SOW-213, SOW-219, and SOW-225 indicate that the SRR, PDR, and CDR shall be conducted "at the Contractor's facility", however SOW-234 states that "all joint technical reviews shall be conducted at a Purchaser facility". Should we assume that SOW-234 takes precedence?	No. SRR, PDR, CDR and FAT TRR shall be conducted at Contractor's Facilities. KCK, PCR, PMR, TRRs excluding FAT, PSA and FSA shall be conducted at Purchaser's Facilities. Please note that, due to COVID-19 restrictions, some of the meetings defined above might need to be conducted virtually. SOW has been corrected in Amdt 1	1
T.5	SOW-245 (PDF page 63)	SOW-245 states "The PDR shall confirm that All system-level functional and performance requirements baselined at SRR and SFR have been:...", however no reference to "SFR" or explanation of its meaning is present in the rest of the IFB. Should we assume that the reference to SFR is in error and can be ignored?	Correct. SFR to be ignored. SOW - 245 has been corrected in Amdt 1	1
T.6		Will it be possible for the company who wins the BID to reach the source codes of the BMD ITB Build 5?	No, the Source codes of BMD ITB Build 5 will not be available to the winning Bidder after Contract award. All available Software documentation is already provided as part of the Bidders library.	1
T.7	Bidding Instructions 1.6.4, 4.2.7.4.3.1, 4.5.4.1.1, 4.5.4.2.1	Can we use COTS products like....? <i>(list of proposed names removed)</i>	NCI agency has no preference, as long as the requirements in the IFB are met and the following conditions are satisfied according to the stated references: 1) none of the work, including project design, labour and services, shall be performed other than by firms from and within NATO Participating Countries (cfr clause 1.4 of the	1

Technical				
Serial NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Amd #
	SOW-334		<p>Special Contract Provisions). The Intellectual Property Rights for all software and documentation used by the Contractor in the performance of the Contract shall vest with firms from and within NATO Participating Countries and no royalties or license fees for such software and documentation shall be paid by the Contractor to any source that does not reside within a NATO Participating Country.</p> <p>2) life time expectancy of the COTS products must be ensured including optional warranty period.</p> <p>3) Directive AC322-D(2017)0016 (Technical and Implementation Directive on Supply Chain Security for COTS CIS Security Enforcing Products) as referenced in bidding instruction 1.6.4.</p> <p>4) Ref 4.2.7.4.3.1, Ref 4.5.4.1.1 and Ref 4.5.4.2.1 of Bidding Instruction document.</p> <p>5) Ref SOW-334.</p>	
<u>T.8</u>	<u>Instructions - Amd I - 3.5.3.12.1 (Page 3-9) and 3.5.5.8.1 (Page 3-14)</u>	<u>Instruction 3.5.3.12.1 requires providing initial technical Risk Register per SOW 3.4.</u> <u>Instruction 3.5.5.8.1 requires providing initial supportability Risk Register per SOW 3.4.2.</u> <u>However SOW 3.4/3.4.2 actually refer to the Issue Register, not Risk Register.</u>	<u>NCI Agency confirms that Instruction 3.5.3.12.1 and 3.5.5.8.1 refers to Risk Register not Issue Register.</u> <u>The Bidding Instructions are updated.</u>	<u>2</u>

Technical				
Serial NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Amd #
		<u>Will Instructions 3.5.3.12.1 and 3.5.5.8.1 be corrected to refer to SOW 3.3.2 (Risk register), as is done for IFB 3.5.4.11.1 in regard to the management Risk Register?</u>		
<u>T.9</u>	<u>SOW - Amd 1 - 3.10 Project Master Schedule (Page 38)</u>	<u>SOW-82 states that the PMS shall be based on Microsoft Project 2010. However, because Project 2010 is nearing end of life (April 2021) may the PMS be provided in Project 2016?</u>	<u>NCI Agency confirms that PMS shall be provided in Microsoft Project 2010.</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>T.10</u>	<u>Instructions - Amd 1 - Annex B-14 (page 15); SOW - Amd 1 - SOW-14 (Page 26); Annexes to SOW - Annex D (Page 2)</u>	<u>There is an inconsistency in naming the Test Manager/Test Director position. Annex B-14. List of Proposed Key Personnel refers to the position as Test Manager; Annex D - Personnel Qualifications refers to the position as Test Director; and SOW-14 refers to the position as Test Director.</u> <u>Please advise which title should be used.</u>	<u>NCI Agency confirms that the name of the role is Test Director. Annex B-14 of the Bidding Instructions is updated.</u>	<u>2</u>