Αρμόδιος:	Ασμχος (ΜΕ) Δημήτριος Κανταρτζόγλου	Βρυξέλλες, 22 Σεπτεμβρίου 2021
Τηλ.:	+32 2 707 6734	**Α.Π.:** 4724
Ηλεκ. Δνση:	d.kantartzoglou@grdel-nato.be	

ΠΡΟΣ:	-ΥΠΕΘΑ/ΓΔΑΕΕ/ΔΑΕΤΕ	(μ.η.)
ΚΟΙΝ.:	-ΥΠΕΞ/Δ' Γεν. Δ/ντη	
	-ΥΠΕΞ/Δ2 Δ/νση	
	-ΓΕΕΘΑ/Γ2	(μ. ΓΕΕΘΑ)
	-Υπουργείο Ανάπτυξης /Γενική Γραμματεία Εμπορίου Πλ.Κάνιγγος	(μ.η.)
	-Υπουργείο Ανάπτυξης /Γενική Γραμματεία Βιομηχανίας /Δνση Διεθνών Βιομηχανικών Σχέσεων Πλ.Κάνιγγος	(μ.η.)
	-Τεχνικό Επιμελητήριο Ελλάδος /Δνση Ε Επαγγελματικής Δραστηριότητας Νίκης 4	(μ.η.)

ΘΕΜΑ: 5^{η} Τροποποίηση Αίτησης Υποβολής Προφορών RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS, Διαγωνιστικής Διαδικασίας: «Provision of Tactical Deployable Communications and Information Systems (TDCIS) for the Portuguese Army»

1. Διαβιβάζεται, συνημμένως, 5^{η} Τροποποίηση Αίτησης Υποβολής Προσφορών (Request for Quotation/RFQ) εν θέματι διαγωνιστικής διαδικασίας Basic Ordering Agreement Plus (BOA+), εκ μέρους NCIA, ως φιλοξενούντος έθνους.

2. Επισημαίνεται ότι καταληκτική ημερομηνία υποβολής προσφορών παραμένει η 29^{η} Οκτωβρίου τ.έ., 13:00 τ.ώ.

3. Ενδιαφερόμενες εταιρίες αναζητήσουν πληροφορίες μέσω καθοριζομένου σημείου επαφής (Point of Contact/POC, βλ. παρ. 10 τροποποιήσεως).

4. Παρακαλούμε για τις ενέργειές σας.

ΛΑΜΠΡΙΔΗΣ

Συν. Σελ: 625 & 1 ηλεκτρονικό αρχείο φύλλων δεδομένων

ANNEX A – CLARIFICATION REQUESTS

ADMINISTRATIVE/CONTRACTUAL					
Serial Nr	RFQ Section Ref.		OFFEROR'S QUESTION	NCI AGENCY ANSWER	Status*
A.1	Book II Part IV AMD 3	SOW Your response to Question A.13 (AMEND 3)	Statement: AMEND 3 did brought a correction in SOW 4.10.1 and suppressed the DOC-1 to DOC-9 keys that were effectively not apropriate in that context. Unfortunately, this had a negative side-effect and destroyed all DOC-* of SOW SECTION 5 where they are relevant. Question: Could You please publish a SOW correction ?	Sections 5 and 4.10.1 of Book II Part IV - SOW have had formatting errors addressed in AMD 4 of the document.	CLOSED No Changes
A.2	Book I AMD 3	Section 1.2	Statement: The Book I contains 2 times sections with same numbers 1.2, 1.3, ... This generates confusion when cross-referencing BI sections. The error comes from the Section 1 "Introduction" which contains 1.1 to 1.13 then next we read 1.2 "PURPOSE", 1.3 "Project Scope", ... Question: In order not to impact the full numbering of the sections, could you please consider renumbering (in pages 4 and 5) the sequence [1.1, 1.2, ..., 1.13] into [1.1, 1.1.1, ..., 1.1.12] ?	Repetition of sub-section numbering within section 1 of Book I was addressed in AMD 4 of the document.	CLOSED No Changes

A.3	Book I AMD 3	Section 2.14	Statement: The Book I contains 2 times a sections with same number 2.14 which are 2.14 "ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION AND DATA" followed by 2.14 "SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENTS" then 2.15 "MANDATORY QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL STANDARDS" ... which generates confusion when cross-referencing BI sections. Question: Could you please tell us whether you would consider sequencing correctly [2.14, 2.14, 2.15] into [2.14, 2.15, 2.16] ?	Book I, Sections 2.15 & 2.16 and associated sub-sections have been renumbered within AMD 4, in relation to their preceding sections.	CLOSED
A.4	Book I, Annex C	Bidding Sheets CLIN Summary worksheet, CLIN 9.8.1; CLIN 9.8.2	CLINs 9.8.1 and 9.8.2 are associated with Warranty Reports. However CLIN 9.8.2 is titled "Quartlerly Obsolescence Report Final Version" which is identical to CLIN 9.5.3. It also identifies the target delivery dates for 9.8.1 as FSA+6 weeks, where as the SOW Table 6 states that this should FSA+6months and the subsequent CLIN 9.8.2 is a date that is before the submission of the draft version. Can the Purchaser please clarify what deliverables associated with Warranty Reports and when they are required?	This misalignment of dates was reviewed and corrected by IPS SME within AMD 4.	No Changes
A.5	Book II, Part IV,	SOW, Appendix C & Clarification response T.20	The Clarification response T.20 indicates that the PFE crypto will not be supplied outside National boundaries, but it is unclear in the SOW whether the other PFE will be supplied outside National Boundaries. Can the Purchaser please clarify whether any of the PFE that the Contractor will be responsible for integrating "INTO" the TDCIS solution will be made available outside National Boundaries?	The Customer's Crypto PFE will not be made available outside of their National boundaries. Furthermore, during initial integration testing expected to be carried out inside the selected contractor's facilities within the National boundaries, the Crypto PFE shall be accompanied by a member of the Customer's staff, who will be responsible for its transport, management and use during such test. All other PFE equipment can be shipped outside of Portuguese borders. All preparations and costs incurred in the shipping from and returning to the Customer's establishment, will be at the potential bidder's expense.	CLOSED No Changes

A.6	Book II, Part IV,	SOW, TVV-18	The SOW indicates that the Test Harnesses for PFE will be made available by the Purchaser. Can the Purchaser please provide details of the Test Harnesses for the PFE that they are planning to provide?	This facility will be provided by the Customer, with details made available to the selected bidder, following contract award.	AMD 5
A.7	Book I,	Bidding Instructions Section 3.7	The Bidding Instructions indicate that the Project Support Case requested under para 3.7.2 should cover all the subsequent Support Deliverables in Section 3.7, but the Quotation Evaluation Criteria in section 4.4.7 indicates that the Project Support Case should only cover; RAMT, FMECA, MTA, LORA, Obsolesence Report, Warranty Report and In-Service Support Monthly Report, with the other Support documents being covered as separate bid deliverables. Can the Purchaser please confirm that the Project Support Case Bid deliverable should only cover the aspects identified in sections 4.4.7.2.1 to 4.4.7.2.6?	Amendment 4 aligned sections 3.7 & 4.7 in Book I.	CLOSED No Changes
A.8	Book I,	Bidding Instructions Section 3.7.2.10	The Bidding Instructions indicate that the Project Support Case requested under para 3.7.2 should cover the System Safety Program Plan (SSPP), but the Quotation Evaluation Criteria in section 4.4.7 does not mention the SSPP. Can the Purchaser please confirm that the SSPP should be covered in the Supportability response or whether it should be covered as part of the Project Support Case response?	Bidders are to submit separate plans for Training, Quality Assurance & Configuration Management. Note also, section 4.4.7.5 has been added to Book I AMD 4 , seeking bidders to provide a preliminary System Safety Program Plan (SSPP). Furthermore, sub-sections of 3.7, Book I have been renumbered to align with the document's structure as shown below: 　　　3.7.2.8 shall become 3.7.3 •　　3.7.2.9 shall become 3.7.4 •　　3.7.2.10 shall become 3.7.5 •　　3.7.2.11 shall become 3.7.6 •　　3.7.2.12 shall become 3.7.7 *The requirement for a SSPP was inserted to the Bidding Instructions under AMD 4.*	CLOSED No Changes

| A.9 | Book I, | Bidding Instructions, Section 3.9 | The Bidding Instructions indicate that Section 5 of the Technical Proposal that "The Offeror shall describe in the Security-related Documentation (SRD), support of the accreditation process as part of the preliminary PIP in accordance with Section 9 of the SoW" and then describes what each Security document should contain. The equivalent Evaluation Criteria in Section 4.4.9 again describes what each of the Security documents should cover. Can the Purchaser please clarify what is required in Section 5 of the Technical Proposal, and how that relates to the content required in the PIP as per Clarification Response A.7? | Section 4.4.9.2 under 4.4.9 Section 5: Security Accreditation requires plans for the production of documents within section 4.4.9.2.1 CIS description, aligned with the timelines reported within the PIP. The fully developed security accreditation documents do not need to be part of the PIP as the accreditation runs tandem from the project's inception. However, the approach/process for preparation, delivery and review of the security accreditation documentation and security documents must be part of the PIP, including planned/scheduled rollout in relation to the implementation timeline. Their design has to be fully developed and agreed with the Purchaser, for there to be an official CIS Description to review and eventually submit as a Security Accreditation artefact to the SAA. This just as an example. | CLOSED No Changes |
| A.10 | Book II, Part IV, | SOW, Appendix C.4, WP5-10, TVV-53, TVV-54, | Some of the testing will be completed within an establishment of the Customer's. Can the Purchaser confirm there will be suitable external connectivity to support the use of the Purchaser's supplied Test Management and Defect Management tools that the Contractor will be required to use, and whether that will be provided as PFE? | The Customer advises that facilities will be made available at INVOF Alchochete, where all goods for the PRT Army are to be received. These facilities will have power and internet broadband connectivity to support necessary integration and system testing. | CLOSED No Changes |

A.11	Book II, Part IV,	SOW, Table 24	The SOW indicates that the Test related deliverable for requirement traceability is the "Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) updated with test related information", whereas elsewhere in the SOW it identifies an RTM and a VCRM (INT-2 and INT-3). Can the Purchaser please confirm that an RTM with test-related information and the VCRM are the same thing?	The RTM differs from the VVRM in that it iis to llustrate how requirements within the System Requirements Statements document are mapped, or traced, to the system design specifications. The RTM shows that every SRS item has been catered for within the system's design and will be considered by the test team. The VVRM is to show how every SRS item and therefore RTM entry, will be tested through its verification & validation. In summary, the RTM shows each of the system requirements will be met by the design, while the VVRM reports how each will be tested. However, if it is proposed a RTM document would include information demonstrating how each RTM entry would be tested, then this, in effect, forms a combination of the RTM and VVRM documents within a single document.	CLOSED No Changes
A.12	Book II, Part IV,	SOW, WP2-17	The SOW introduces two artifacts that are not referenced elsewhere in the SOW; a VVRM (we assume this is a Verification & Validation Requirements Matrix) Maturity Plan and a full Requirements Traceability Matrix Plan (RTMP). Can the Purchaser please confirm that these additional artefacts are in fact required and with which CLIN deliverables should they be associated?	The VVRM is required by CLIN 8.6.6 in the Summary Worksheet. With regards to the RTMP, the potential bidder would, by implication, have generated an outline plan in how they are going to produce a RTM. Therefore, the RTMP is a by-product of CLIN 8.6.5.	CLOSED No Changes
A.13	Book II, Part IV,	SOW, IPS-97	IPS-97 requires the Contractor to supply a Load Plan Tool that is not mentioned elsewhere in the scope of supply. The requirements associated with this tool are much greater than that for TDCIS (given that all equipment is designed to be supplied in or transported on the Shelter and trailers being supplied). Can the Purchaser please clarify?	Under Amendment 4, IPS-97, 98 and 99 were removed.	CLOSED No Changes

A.14	Book II, Part IV,	SOW, WP 1-2 and [19] Section 2.1	WP 1-2 requires the Contractor to identify the design for the training systems. However Section 1.3 [19] states TDCIS does not include a dedicated Training Environment. Please clarify.	Section 1.3 para [19] refers to the provision of a training ENVIRONMENT, i.e. a classroom with chairs, table and infrastructure. WP 1-2 refers to a training SYSTEM, with which instruction will be delivered in the ENVIRONMENT provided by the Customer. Consideration must also be given to 'hands-on' training during integration and system testing.	CLOSED No Changes
A.15	Book II, Part IV,	SOW WP 1-17, WP 1-18 & section 2.1.8.	Section 2.1.2 WP 1-17 and 1-18 implies that Configuration Capture takes place prior to SRR. However section 2.1.8 states that Configuration Capture will take place post PDR. Can the Purchaser please clarify which is correct?	As stated in A.15 under AMD 4, Book II Part IV - SOW Section 2.1.8 states the contractor is to capture configuration before starting any LLD work after the PDR. The statement emphasises LLD work after the PDR, is not to commence untill CCAP is complete. Therefore, WP1-36.i seeking 'Final CCAP Report' is feasible: no change necessary for CLIN 8.7.10 & 8.7.11.	CLOSED No Changes
A.16	Book II, Part IV,	SOW Annex B	A check of this annex has shown it to be incomplete, additions include but are not limited to SDIP 27, 28, 29, MIL-HDBK-781, the NPKI CP appears to be the incorrect version. The SRS specifies latest edition of various standards in multiple places (PRTTDCIS-1140,PRTTDCIS-1144, PRTTDCIS-1145,PRTTDCIS-1147) of the SRS. In fact the RFQ calls up a variety of references. Could the purchaser provide a complete list of applicable documents, their applicable versions and copies of the documents?	NCIA confirms that all applicable documents and versions are stated within the SoW and SRS. Copies may be requested by the Bidder to their National Delegation to be sent.	CLOSED No Changes
A.17	Book I, Annex C,	Bidding Sheets, CLIN Summary worksheet, CLIN 1.2 (SRR), 1.2.1	The CLIN summary indicates that although we are to supply SRR documents at EDC+6 weeks, the SRR is expected to be complete by EDC+33 weeks, and the draft RAMT and FMECA need to be submitted at SRR-4 weeks, whilst the final draft for the RAMT and FMECA need to be submitted by PDR-4 weeks, which appears to be before SRR - 4 weeks. Is the target date for completion of the SRR (EDC+33 weeks) correct and if so what is the SRR date that applies to the initial draft of the RAMT and FMECA?	Referring to the Bidding Sheet: Draft SRR = EDC + 6 wks; PDR = EDC + 12 wks; CDR = EDC + 21 wks The dates mentioned in the Bidding Sheet are converted below, aligning with the EDC date, as opposed to associated milestone. However, the relative dates used in the Bidding Sheet remain contractually binding. Draft versions of RAMT, FMECA, MTA & LORA = EDC + 2 wks; Final draft of RAMT, FMECA & MTA = EDC + 8 wks; Final version of RAMT, FMECA, MTA & final draft LORA = EDC + 17 wks Final version of SRR remains at EDC + 33 wks	CLOSED No Changes

A.18	Book I, Annex C,	Bidding Sheets, CLIN Summary worksheet, CLIN 8 (PMP), 8.1	The CLIN Summary indicates that the PMP needs to be submitted for Purchaser Approval by EDC+33 weeks. Given the pivotal role of the PMP in a project, is this date correct; or should it be inplace in the same timeline as the other master plans?	NCIA confirms the PMP shall be made available in advance of the other key plans. Consequently, the PMP is to be submitted for the Purchaser's approval by EDC + 2 wks, in line with the QMP & draft IPSP	AMD 5
A.19	Book I, Annex C,	Bidding Sheets, CLIN Summary worksheet, CLIN 10, 10.1	It states that CLIN 10.1 Milestone should be delivered at EDC-8 weeks. Is that correct ?	The date of EDC - 8 wks is to ensure the potential bidder has incorporated this option in their submission to the Purchaser. However, the potential bidder is to consider this section of the submission will not be evaluated as part of the evaluation for the contract award and their efforts are to be prioritised accordingly.	CLOSED No Changes
A.20	Book I, Annex C,	Bidding Sheets, CLIN Summary worksheet, CLIN 12, 12.1 & 12.2	The CLIN Summary indicates that the In Service Support extension deliveries need to be delivered EDC-8 weeks. Is that correct?	Please see response to A.19	CLOSED No Changes
A.21	Book I, Annex C,	Bidding Sheets, CLIN Summary worksheet & Clarification Responses A.20 A.22	Clarification Response A.22 indicates that "to meet Purchaser approval" means that the Contractor should have completed the appropriate Purchaser review cycle to ensure an agreed/approved deliverable has been provided. This means that the Contractor will have needed to supply the initial version of the deliverable, Purchaser reviewed that deliverable, Contractor updated the deliverable and the Purchaser agreed that updates sufficiently addressed comments. Even if the time is compressed, as per response to clarification A.20, we are unclear how the early deliverables (i.e. need to meet Purchaser approval within 4 weeks from EDC, e.g. CLINs 1.1.2, 8.3.1, 8.5.1.1, 8.6.1, 8.7.1, 8.7.9) can be achieved.Can the Purchaser please confirm that they can support compressed reviewcycles such that these early deliverables could be approved within the required timeframe?	NCIA confirms the required timeframe.	CLOSED No Changes

A.22	Book I, Annex C,	Bidding Sheets, CLIN Summary worksheet & Clarification Responses A.20 A.22	The Purchaser has indicated that they will try and achieve the compressed review cycle where they can or will align to the NATO document review cycle documented in the SOW.Can the Purchaser please confirm that all document deliverables will be reviewed in the timelines proposed (subject to the volume caveats expressed), and there will be no types of document that will be subject to a significantly longer review cycle (e.g. Security Document Set), due to additional stakeholder dependencies.	Please see response to A.21 above.	CLOSED No Changes
A.23	Book II, Part IV,	SOW, INT-2, INT-3, WP5-33, Section 8.3.4	The SOW requires both RTM and VCRM to be produced and maintained throughout the programme. However the SOW only defines the content required of the RTM (see WP5-33, Section 8.3.4), which includes verification and test linking.Can the Purchaser please confirm that all the info identified Section 8.3.4 should be captured in the RTM, and what should be captured in the VCRM (which is not captured in the RTM)?	The RTM differs from the VCRM in that it is to illustrate how requirements within the System Requirements Statements document are mapped, or traced, to the system design specifications. The RTM shows that every SRS item has been catered for within the system's design and will be considered by the test team. The VCRM is to list the requirements of a specification and identifies the method(s) for verifying them and the appropriate quality control methods for each requirement. Detailed VCRMs may include considerably more, such as test ownership, verification requirements, and verification results. In summary, the RTM shows each of the system requirements will be met by the design, while the VCRM reports how each will be tested. It is evident the definition of the RTM in section TVV-44 encompasses aspects of a VCRM also. Therefore, it will be considered acceptable, if a bidder's submission has an RTM, which includes details required by a VCRM.	CLOSED No Changes
A.24	-	-	To increase competition and ensure that all offerors can provide novel and compliant solutions, would the Authority please confirm that all requirements are absolutely mandatory? Would the Authority consider proposals that include alternates, proposal decrements, or solutions that meet the functional intent of the system without being compliant to every requirement?	NCIA confirms that all requirements are absolutely mandatory as stated in the Sow and SRS.	CLOSED No Changes

A.25	-	-	The requirement documents are extensive and very detailed. There is therefore a risk that a proposal will be judged non-compliant due to the mis-interpretation of a single requirement/specification; which will reduce competition for the Authority. The Authority is requested to make one-to-one meetings available to all bidders so that interpretation of requirements can be confirmed through verbal discussion.	NCIA may not host a Bidders Conference for this requirement. Bidders are encouraged to submit Clarification Requests.	CLOSED No Changes
A.26	Book I	2.2.4	Could you please define "identifiable sub-assemblies", For example : Considering Dell, HP and Cisco have some if not most of their sub assemblies and electronics (mostly chips and some internal components) sourced out of plants in China/Malaysia, does this requirement mean we are forbidden to use those global companies that allready have their presence in other NATO CIS solutions ? Moreover, Considering that Israel is a major Non-Nato Ally that can provide specific quality solutions to some of the required equipment in this bid, could they be considered to provide parts of the overall solution or is this forbiden at every level of the solution?	Per AC/4-D/2261(1996 Edition) dated 12 January 1996 - NATO Security Investment Program Procedures for International Competitive Bidding defines sub-assemblies as follows: Sub-Assembly : A portion of an assembly consisting of two or more parts that can be provisioned and replaced as an entity - this definition purposely excludes components and/or parts (as defined in ACodP-1) , which are not subject to the provisions herein. There are no exceptions to countries that may be allies of NATO.	CLOSED No Changes

* Status: Is Amendment to RFQ required as a direct result of the Clarification Request?

TECHNICAL					
Serial Nr	**RFQ Section Ref.**		**OFFEROR'S QUESTION**	**NCI AGENCY ANSWER**	**Status***
T.1	Book II Part IV AMD 3	SOW SEC-…	Statement: The series of security requirements starts with SEC-3. Q1: We missed identifying SEC-1: can You please highlight where it is ? Statement: We found SEC-2 at unexpected location "2.2.4 CONDUCT OF QUALIFICATION TESTING", isolated from all other SEC-* . Q2: Shall SEC-2 be answered in the context of 2.2.4 "2.2.4 CONDUCT OF QUALIFICATION TESTING" or instead be answered together with all other SEC-* in SOW 9 "SECUIRTY ACCREDITATION" ?	Issue identified in the numbering of Section 9 requirement paragraphs has been addressed within AMD 4; the first requirement statement under Section 9.2 being renumbered as 'SEC-1'. The requirement paragraph at Book II, Part IV - SOW sub-section 2.2.4 was prefixed incorrectly and has been corrected in AMD 4.	CLOSED No Changes
T.2	Book II Part IV AMD 3	SOW Table of content	minor comment: While it has been corrected in the text part, we still find in the table of content of the SOW, section 2.4 still "(WP3) CONDUCT" while it shall be "(WP4) CONDUCT".	The entry for WP 3 in the Table Of Contents, Book II, Part IV - SOW has been corrected to read 'WP 3' in AMD 4.	CLOSED No Changes

T.3	Book I Part IV AMD 3	Bidding Instructions Section 3.5.3.5	Statement 1: SOW 9 (Security Accreditation) shall be treated in response to SECTION 5 (Security Accreditation). Statement 1: [BI-3.5.3.5] (in SECTION 1 PIP) is directed to include required security accreditation documents as described in SOW 9. Question: Could You please clarify whether offerer shall duplicate the response of SECTION 5 in SECTION 1 ? When not the case, please specify what part of SOW 9 shall be answered in SECTION 1 and what part of SOW 9 shall be answered in SECTION 5 ?	Section 3.5.3.5, Book II, Part IV - SOW states 'The PIP shall include required security accreditation documents as described in Section 9 of the SOW'. Section 3.9.1, Book II, Part IV - SOW states 'The Offeror shall describe in the Security-related Documentation (SRD), support of the accreditation process as part of the preliminary PIP in accordance with Section 9 of the SoW'. The latter requirement expects the bidder to outline the range of documents they will produce, relating to the accreditation of the System. While the former expects the PIP to illustrate, how & when the SRD will be available.	CLOSED No Changes
T.4	Book II Part IV AMD 3	SOW Paragraph [179]	Statement: SOW [179] The CIS Description for TDCIS is ... to be developed after contract award. Statement: [BI-4.4.9.3] The CIS Description document shall at a minimum include ... Question: We understand that [179] is not in line with BI-4.4.9.3 and that the offerer shall propose a CIS description in its proposal. Can you please confirm ?	NCIA confirms the bidder's proposal is to include an outline of the CIS Description they plan to produce, following the contract award.	CLOSED No Changes

T.5	Book II Part IV AMD 3	SOW Paragraph [178]	Statement: SOW [178] Initial version of the Security Accreditation Plan for the TDCIS is to be developed by the Contractor. Statement: BI 4.4.9.1 The Security Accreditation Plan for the TDCIS is to be developed by the Purchaser and presented for approval to the SAA. This document will be made available to the Contractor after contract award. Question: Do we understand correctly that the offerer 's reponse shall not contain an Initial Security Accreditation Plan ?	As part of their submission, the Bidder shall provide a skeleton structure of the Security Accreditation Plan (SAP) document, based upon their project schedule and milestones. Following Contract Award, the SAP shall be developed further, in conjunction with the Purchaser, prior to its submission to the Security Accreditation Authority.	CLOSED No Changes
T.6	Book I Part IV AMD 3	Bidding Instructions Section 3.9.5.5.1	Statement: BI 3.9.1.5 is followed by [BI-3.9.5.5.1, BI-3.9.5.5.2, BI-3.9.5.5.3, BI-3.9.5.6, ..., BI-3.9.5.13] . Question: In case a new Biddding Instruction will be published, could you please correct that sequence to [BI-3.9.1.5.1, BI-3.9.1.5.2, BI-3.9.1.5.3, BI-3.9.1.6, ..., BI-3.9.1.13] . ?	Reviewing Book I, Part IV Bidding Instructions Section 3.9.1 illustrated incorrect section structure, from sub-section 3.9.1.5 within AMD 3, through to the end of Section 3. All necessary corrections have been made within Book I, Part IV Bidding Instruction AMD 4.	CLOSED No Changes
T.7	Book I Part IV AMD 3	Bidding Instructions Section 3.9.5.13	Statement: 3.9.5.13 (Section 5 Security Accreditation) refers to SOW 9.11 (STVR). Question: Could You confirm our understanding that it shall refer to SOW 9.2 (SECURITY ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS) instead of 9.11 ?	This assumption is correct and Section 3.9.5.13, Book I has been corrected in AMD 4 to read '9.2'. As a consequence of the amendment for T.6 above, this section is Section 3.9.1.13.	CLOSED No Changes

T.8	Book II Part IV AMD 3	SOW Annex A SRS (PRTTDCIS-3248)	What is the level of configuration applied in the MPC? How the Contractor should know the level required for configuring the TDCIS or its sub-elements ?	1.In MPC, TDCIS will be configured up to Mission Ready state in order to have all services ready and operational for all users prior to deployment. 2. No configuration is expected to be performed on the field (unless a new service needs to be deployed), only troubleshooting and incident resolution. 3. List of Services and Users are per-mission-specific. Contractor shall consider the worst-case scenario: all possible services with the largest user community. 4. Installing and Configuring PFE payloads for ISM, providing services; such as: Functional Application Services is a Customer responsibility.	CLOSED No Changes
T.9	Book II Part IV AMD 3	SOW Annex A SRS (PRTTDCIS-1208)	Network Interconnection Point (NIP) will be available for collocating Mission Network Partners (MNP) in the same security domain as the TDCIS configuration (xS and/or xU), in compliance with the Federated Mission Network (FMN) framework. Is the NIP applicable only xS and/or xU ? or it is applicable on the xR domain?	MNP only federates in xS and xU domains. There will be no NIP in the xR domain.	CLOSED No Changes

| T.10 | Book II Part IV AMD 3 | SOW Annex A SRS (PRTTDCIS-2683) | The requirement shows that each TDCIS Node shall be equipped with two (2) System Administrator Workstations per security domain present in the Node. Question 1: What are the specs for the Workstation needed for Sys Admin per each security domains at each node level ? Question 2: Can these workstations be taken from the PFE list (EUD Laptops) or they have to be part (and priced) of the offering ? | Ruggedised laptops are covered in section 4.8.1 (in SRS v1.2) Sys Admin Laptops are project deliverables from the Contractor (PRTTDCIS-1819). For Specs, see PRTTDCIS-1823 | CLOSED No Changes |

| T.11 | Book II Part IV | SOW Section 4.11.10 Training Timeframe | Has NCIA any specific expectations, restrictions or limitations, regarding the Training approach to be used within this project? | Aside from the conditions given within Section 4.11.10, the training is to be scheduled to minimise time between training completion and User Acceptance Testing. This is to reduce skill fade and quickly develop the Customer's TDCIS familiarity prior to OPTEVAL, when Capability Testing is to be carried out. The Contractor is to ensure an optimal level of training is given to the students, with training delivery profiled against their respective roles and associated responsibilities, as to be detailed within the Training Needs Analysis document. | CLOSED No Changes |

T.12	Book II Part IV	SOW Section 7. QAP-24	Could NCIA clarify the concept of "If sub-contracted quality resources are used" if it refers to prime contractor subcontracting part of the quality organization and not to partners of the consortium that are going to follow the standard process defined by prime contractor.	Please see Book I Section 2.2 Eligibility. Section 2.2.2 states "All Contractors, sub-Contractors and manufacturers, at any tier, must be from Participating Countries". 'Participating Country' is defined as one of the contributory 30 NATO member nations.	CLOSED No Changes
T.13	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3252	Could you please clarifyif there is a minumum level of the system redundancy expected when not directly specified in the document, or not described in the bearer services? (LRU,PSU, Network, Media Gateway)?	Where not directly specified, redundancy is design driven and shall be implemented by the contractor to meet all performance targets (availability amongst others).	No Changes
T.14	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1124	Could you clarify how it is intended to manage the difference between MS,Nat-S, and NS. Ie: Can they share the same xS hardware? Do they need virtual segregation etc?	TDCIS Nodes xS domain will only be configured to one variant at a time: either MS, either Nat-S.Hardware shall meet security accreditation but both flavors will never coexists in the same Node. NS Kit will only be configured to NS flavor. NS Kit and TDCIS Nodes xS shall not run on shared hardware and will be physically segregated.	CLOSED No Changes
T.15	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1144	Is it acceptable to limit testing down to the level of Nodes and Modules ?	Correct, the combination of components and housing elements have to comply with environmental constraints. "Naked" components (without housing element) need to be self-compliant with environmental constraint, for example: Datalink ODU.	CLOSED No Changes
T.16	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1147	If a complete LRU/Module is tested in accordance to SPID-27, can we assume its internal parts, which are considered internal to an LRU/Module, allready covered by SPID-27?	Please see response for T.15.	CLOSED No Changes
T.17	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1149	Is Tempest required for Unrestricted systems? If not needed, is it acceptable if they reside in the same rack of Restricted and Secret systems while not being physically interconnected?	Clarification quotes PRTTDCIS-1149 (instead of PRTTDCIS-2379). Even if xR and xU are security classificaiton domains, "Classified" in PRTTDCIS-1149 refers to xS. It is also correct, that TEMPEST level B is required for xS and TEMPEST level C for xU and xR.	CLOSED No Changes

T.18	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1155	What is the level of description expected by the Security Configuration Catalogue? (ie : Country of Origin, Version, EOL… etc)	Security Configuration Catalog refers to configuration hardening. No "level of description" is expected from the Contractor. Security Configuration Catalog and hardening mechanisms are limited to configuration patterns and should not influence the solution design.	CLOSED No Changes
T.19	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1157	When NTP is not available from the static infrastructure, what is expected for fallback? (ie: GPS, Atomic clock etc…) who/what provides the fallback ?	There is no requirement stated within the SRS for the provision of a back-up to the infra-structure's timing signal. It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure PRTTDCIS-1157 is met and PRTTDCIS-1749 is achieved.	CLOSED No Changes
T.20	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3319	Can we define and propose what the LRU level will be, or, is there an expected level of LRU allready identified by the client?	No, BIT is a LRU internal function. As far as the BIT is able to cover FD and FI requirements, there is no need to go further than the lowest LRU according to the maintenance concept and levels. The lowest LRUs will be consolidated through LORA.	CLOSED No Changes
T.21	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3320	Please clarify the following, Is the BIT fault detection expected to go further than the LRU since this will be the main focus for direct maintenance in the field?	See response to T.20	CLOSED No Changes
T.22	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1717	Please confirm if the CAS subsystem RAM requirement is intended for each independant nodes. Hence do you expect 1.6 Terabyte of RAM per CAS module?	Correct, each CAS module (per ISM instance, per Security Domain) shall have a minimum available capacity of 1.6TB	CLOSED No Changes

T.23	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2814	Could you please confirm if the 20 minutes includes time for graceful shutdown?	20 minutes is the minimum duration for which the ISM Lite shall remain Operational and support all services it hosts. When the 20 minute duration is over, the 'Graceful Shutdown' process shall be initiated. To support this later, UPS shall have sufficient remaining battery power (beyond the 20 minutes) to successfully complete the 'Graceful Shutdown'.	CLOSED No Changes
T.24	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2091	Could you please elaborate on the 48-port switch. Does the customer want all 48 ports to be SFP or can a combination of SFP and fixed RJ-45 ports would be acceptable?	A mix of fixed RJ-45 and SFP ports on the same switch will be unacceptable. See also PRTTDCIS-3822 (added in SRS v1.2) on use of RJ-45. See also PRTTDCIS-2559 and PRTTDCIS-2560 for use of fiber connections (inc. to EUD) PRTTDCIS-1789 states that Access BoB network elements shall be implemented with 24-ports ethernet switches. PRTTDCIS-1503 only refers to 48-ports switches to illustrate the way the modelling rule-set is to be understood.	CLOSED No Changes

T.25	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2469	Please define the following : Apart from the compute nodes, do the following in the red area need to be TEMPEST certified : The routers, the firewalls, the switches.	Like for Environmental constraints compliancy, the combination of components and housing elements have to meet TEMPEST certification. For instance, elements inside a shelter do not need to be individually TEMPEST certified as long as the Shelter provides the appropriate level of TEMPEST protection between outside and inside. "Naked" components (without housing element) need to be TEMPEST self-compliant, for example: Level C for xU and xR Sys Admin Laptops and Level B for xS Sys Admin Laptops (PRTTDCIS-1823)	CLOSED No Changes
T.26	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2548	Please clarify the following : If a central node like a RAP or TN handles two mision subsets at the same time, do subsets use different router/switch appliance or can they co-exist on the same appliance using protected VLANs? Would this occurence ever occur? (ie : Two missions deployed over the same TDCIS infrastructure)	There are no Operational use cases where a Node (AN, BCC, RAP, TN...) will support multiple missions at the same time. The TDCIS pool of RAP and TN (like other node types) will be divided between the different missions. From a Color Cloud level perspective (CCA, ISM...), a certain TDCIS subset will only be used in a single mission environment. From a Black Network perspective, as per PCN concept, nothing prevents any node (RAP, TN, BCC, ...) to transport any type of traffic regardless of its content. Therefore, for any given mission having a PCN federated black network, the mission assigned TDCIS subset will only have one combination of Colour Cloud flavor configured (for instance: MU, Nat-R and MS). The same TDCIS subset Black Network, acting as a PCN segment, could be used as a transit network for Mission Partner traffic (for instance Belgian Nat-U).	CLOSED No Changes

T.27	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1452	Please clarify if there is any need for PoE switch ports in the CCC network modules.	Considering the requirements for Wireless AP and Sys Admin VoIP deskphones in the xU enclave (see PRTTDCIS-3012), requirements for PoE switchports in CCC does not differ from other node types.	CLOSED No Changes
T.28	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1501	Could you please confirm that 1GE single-mode fiber (SMF) will be used for all 10 cores or is there an expectation that there be provision for Multi-mode MMF fiber? Could you please clarify if we should also provide fiber connection for external connections? Connector types, fiber types?	Umbilical harness cores are expected to be SMF. All physcial connections types and quantities to satisfy all interconnection requirements (generated by the list of interfaces amongst others) are design driven. All termination panels minimum quantities and types requirements are to be found in section 6.2.4 (of SRS v1.2). For illustration purpose, PRTTDCIS-2222 lists the minimum of RJ-45 and HMA connectors for ECP. These connectors are above and beyond design driven quantities such as the connectors required to connect UAM to CNM for instance.	CLOSED No Changes
T.29	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2745	Could you please confirm that NS kit needs (or not) a UPS?	NCIA confirms that a UPS unit is required. See modules breakdown figures in corresponding sections.	CLOSED No Changes
T.30	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2687	Can the NS kit be rail mounted or does it have to be rack mounted?	NS Kit is Transit and transport case mounted. See modules breakdown figures in corresponding sections.	CLOSED No Changes
T.31	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1578	Could you please specify if the video will be H.264/ format? If not, what is the expected video format to consider?	See new statement PRTTDCIS-3835 in SRS v1.3	AMD 5

T.32	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1682	Please clarify the following : A VM Cluster is implemented over 3 servers in VMWare. Does it imply that the customer expects a minimum of 3 servers per cluster?	The quantity of servers required to implement the VM cluster needed to meet the requirements, is design driven according to the requirements in PRTTDCIS-1682.	CLOSED No Changes
T.33	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1684	Please clarify, does the customer expect a NAS only solution or a SAN is satisfactory?	PRTTDCIS-1684 defines the Software Defined Storage function and does not refer to specific implementation (NAS or SAN). Technology used to implement this function is design driven. The Contractor has to provide the best design which meets current state of the art technology, industry best practices and fulfils requirements.	CLOSED No Changes
T.34	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1779	Please clarify that for this case, an all disk SAN/NAS is acceptable. (Non Flash)	PRTTDCIS-1779 clarifies the software optimization feature of the Software Defined Storage and does not not refer to specific implementation (NAS or SAN). Technology used to implement this feature is design driven. Contractor has to provide the best design which meets current state of the art technology, industry best practices and fulfils requirements.	CLOSED No Changes
T.35	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3016	Please clarify : Concerning the extra PFE workloads resources(VMs), does it have to reside on separate physical servers, or can it be mixed with regular servers in the cluster?	ISM PFE workload will be hosted in the cluster.	CLOSED No Changes

T.36	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1786	Please clarify : For PoE, do you require regular PoE at 15W or PoE+ at 30W?	The Bidder's design will identify the exact product required as Voice appliances. Customer will purchase it (inc. licenses) to provide as PFE. As Voice appliances models are design driven, the requirement of PoE or PoE+ is design driven too.	CLOSED No Changes
T.37	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1798	Could you please expand on the meaning of this requirement?	As per PRTTDCIS-2330 and following statements in 6.4.1 (in SRS v1.2) : unless stated otherwise, all transit case based elements (e.g. RNM Lite, CNM Lite…) are to be equipped with a connectorized front panel (CFP) to operate with closed lids. PRTTDCIS-1798 indicates that this CFP is not required for UAM, considering the large quantities of ports.	CLOSED No Changes
T.38	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3312	Could you clarify that the concern is only for physical faillure (Mechanical).	The requirement statement is to be amended to read 'physical and, or functional failure'.	AMD 5

T.39	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1372	Please Clarify, Is there any rack size standard that is to be enforced? Are DIN rail mountings permitted?	See PRTTDCIS-2118. Use of DIN Rails is permitted for Electric components in electric boards and in racks for electric componenets such as termination blocks.	CLOSED No Changes
T.40	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2472	Could you please provide the SCC, without it, it will not be possible to evaluate its impact on the technical solution and the level of effort.	Security Configuration Catalog and hardening mechanisms are limited to configuraiton patterns and should not influence the solution design. Document shall be released for their review and further understanding of the requirement PRTTDCIS-2472.	CLOSED No Changes
T.41	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3325	Could you please re-consider the "99%" portion of this requirement, it is very limiting to the selection of certain components.	Given there will only be two staff supporting the deployed nodes, every effort must be made to constrain loadings placed upon them. Therefore, this requirement statement will not be amended.	CLOSED No Changes

T.42	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1947	Could you please specify with how many people are available to do the teardown of all the different node types? Timings on teardown for a node is directly dependant of the qualificaton and deployed operational manpower to the specific node. Could you also clarify if this requirement also valid for two shelter node configurations? What is the expected manpower to match this requirement for teardown?	PRTTDCIS-2627 amended to specify two (2) Trained Tech Per shelter.	AMD 5
T.43	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2629	Could you please elaborate on certain aspects of this requirement? Since we are not providing the operational personnel and the vehicle platform it is hard to guarantee timing requirements.	The shelter and where used, trailer, are to be shut down, powered down, secured for transport: mounted onto a lorry with standard ISO container points, with no interconnects, with any trailer hitched to the vehicle with brake/power lines connected. The Contractor will have to demonstrate this during validation phase with its own personnel. Vehicle platform will be provided as PFE for the sake of this validation. The Customer will provide the necessary vehicles in time for the planned validation tests, as stated at Book II Part IV SOW paragraph 10, section 1.2 and shown in Appendix F.	CLOSED No Changes
T.44	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2887	Could you please confirm that the Colaboration Application is a PFE as stated in PRTTDCIS-2700?	Contractor design will identify the exact product required to fulfil all Collaboration Application requirements. Customer will purchase it (inc. licenses) to provide as PFE.	CLOSED No Changes

| T.45 | Book II Part IV | SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2912 | Could you please elaborate? From our understanding, certain nodes will require more than this amount (ie: an AN Node or a BCC Node, etc). | As required by PRTTDCIS-2880 and shown in Table 1, Book II, Part IV, SOW, the largest user community will be 36, requiring the mail server to provide a maximum of 36 'personal mailboxes' (PRTTDCIS-2911). A further 10 'functional mailboxes', also referred to as 'Service Mailboxes' shall be required for each node. Therefore, 46 mailboxes are to be provided for each security domain used within each node. | CLOSED No Changes |
| T.46 | Book II Part IV | SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1366 | Could you please provide a copy of the Technical Note TN-1078 or indicate who to contact in order to procure it? | Bidder's shall go through their National Delegation to request reference documents; however, it will be provided under issuance of Amendment 5. | AMD5 |

T.47	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3314	Could you please specify if this is applicable to a module, a sub-module, a node, the whole system deployed? Could you please also define "Certified failures rates"? As well, Based on the definition of MTBCF available from document 'Book II Part IV SOW RFQ-CO-115363-PRT_TDCIS' the critical failure mean any condition in which the entire system is not operating according to specifications. Could you please provide more detail about critical failure, this also applied for MTTRS which is only calculated for critical failure.	The MTBCF (as well as MTTRS) is related to the whole system deployed and shall be calculated with a bottom-up approach solving the RBDs from component level to System level. To this extent in the FMECA are listed TDCIS functions (and relevant node, module, sub-module ones) to comply with SRS. Into this list the critical and non-critical functions of the TDCIS are identified. A critical failure is a failure of an HW or SW element in the System breakdown that causes the loss of a critical function. Certified failure rates are the failure rates that are declared by the contractor and that have to have proven evidence calculation as prediction and/or from field data with sound statistical ground.	CLOSED No Changes
T.48	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3316	Could you please confirm that the intent of the Portugese Army is to bring spares readily available in the theater of operations within very short transportation distance of each nodes? If not, please clarify intent towards this requirement?	PRTTDCIS-2752 clearly defines the readiness for the repair and maintenance kits, which is to contain all necessary items to allow the maintenance level required to achieve PRTTDCIS-3316.	CLOSED No Changes
T.49	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3315	Could you please confirm that you expect the service to be restored faster than part replacement supporting the service itself in PRTTDCIS 3316? Or restoration of service time is to be considered post repairs?	The service has to be restored according to PRTTDCIS-3316 (Mean Time To Restore Service (MTTRS)) per relevant Maintenance Levels both Hardware (HLs) and Software including Firmware (SLs) shall be: 1) MTTRS for HL/SL1 and HL/SL2 < 20 min ; 2) MTTRS for HL/SL3 < 60 min). Restoration of service can be achieved by either: repairing the faulty item or replacing the faulty item with a spare one. If the latter approach is used then the faulty item follows the repair cycle.	CLOSED No Changes
T.50	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3512	Could you please elaborate on the relation of this requirement with PRTTDCIS 3316 and PRTTDCIS 3315?	As per IPS-17: PRTTDCIS-3315 is related to critical and non-critical failures, PRTTDCIS-3316 is related to critical failures only.	CLOSED No Changes

T.51	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-3313	Could you please specify the assumed duration of deployments without maintenance for the system? Mission lengths (aka deployment lenghts) can vary alot in a bracket of weeks, months, even years.	PRTTDCIS-3313 states each component used is to have a certified MTBF of 1500 hours. This is combined with PRTTDCIS-1949 which states each node is to be self sustainable for upto 72 hours.	CLOSED No Changes
T.52	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2801	Could you please elaborate on the following : After removal of the crypto unit, the CNM lite could still be operational and requires to remain Tempest? ie : Meaning the CNM lite will sometimes operate with no Crypto unit?	No, crypto device (a component of CCA-NS subsystem of CNM Lite) shall only be removable for transport. Removing the crypto from the transit case shall not jeopardize the TEMPEST compliancy of CCA-NS when crypto is put back into the transit case (after arival at mission location) to ensure CCA-NS will remian compliant to process NS data. CCA-NS is not meant to be used without crypto device.	CLOSED No Changes
T.53	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2221	Could you please confirm the external panel RJ-45 Ethernet intended use? (We would typically expect all data coming out of a shelter to be transiting on fiber, especialy if sensitive (xR and xS, but maybe even xU).	Please see response for T.22 above.	CLOSED No Changes
T.54	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-2394	Is it expected to have all units environmentaly tested, or just all unit "types"? Is it acceptable in some cases to do a compliance analysis or request a waiver for these as mentionned in your documentation?	One instance of each Element exposed to environmental conditions shall be tested in climate chamber (no analysis allowed). For example: the Shelter shall be tested against OPE-1a; UAM transit cases to OPE-1b, etc If a certificate of compliance already exists, the test does not need to be repeated, within the scope of this project. For example: the HCLOS ODU may already have a suitable original manufacturer certificate. No Waivers expected at this stage.	CLOSED No Changes

T.55	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS (PRTTDCS-2268)	The fully equipped trailer weight limit of 1500kg seems to be critical since a DG, motorized mast, antennas and ancillaries are to be mounted on a platform that can have a length up to 5m and equipped with four stabilizers. Please confirm the weight limit is for the trailer only	The Customer has confirmed that the Gross weight of the trailer, including all installed equipment shall not exceed 2,000Kg. Amendment to the Book II, Part IV Annex A- SRS (PRTTDCIS-2268).	CLOSED No Changes
T.56	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1188	Could you please provide Vehicle informations (max speed, load capacity, haul capacity, unloading capacity, iso corner attachement to ground height...)	Vehicle details are not available at this time. The vehicle is being provided by the Customer to handle the trailers and shelters detailed in section 1.4.8, Book II, Part IV SOW, Annex A SRS (wieght, dimensions, …). The potential bidders are to consider the information given at T.43 and T.55 above.	CLOSED No Changes
T.57	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS v1.0 PRTTDCIS-1190	Could you Please revise the schematic in fig.4 adding link types between node for added clarity?	Figure 4 in PRTTDCIS-1202 is a simplified high level diagram illustrating the network topography between the different node types. This schematic is for contextual illustration purposes only. Node to node connections types, be they wired and, or wireless are detailed throughout the SRS. Producing a detailed schematic with exacting inter-node link details, risks this becoming unclear and open to interpretation.	CLOSED No Changes
T.58	Book II Part IV	Statement of Work Section 8.3.2 TVV-39	In TVV-39 it states that "The test cases shall follow the template provided by the purchaser" but we cannot see that template, could you provide us the Test case template?	The templates referred to in this section will be provided to the selected bidder soon after Contract Award.	CLOSED No Changes

T.59	Book I & Book II	Bidding Instruction Annex B-14	In Book I, Bidding Instructions, Annex B-14: it is stated "The Offeror Background IPR specified in the table below will be used for the purpose of carrying out work pursuant to the Contract. The Offeror has and will continue to have, for the duration of the Contract, all necessary rights in and to the Background IPR." If the Contractor has already developed a TDCIS and wants to retain IP in its design and configuration is it enough to specify it in the list of Background IP Annex B-14?	The aim of this contract is to transfer all IP generated in the design and production of TDCIS, plus the integration of its component parts to the PRT Mod. The Purchaser will accept no constraints or limitations on the use of Contract deliverables. Accordingly, the Contractor shall not include any Background Intellectual Property or third party software in the code provided to the Purchaser. In the event that any such code would have to be included, the Contractor shall seek Purchaser's prior agreement and ensure that unlimited rights are secured for the Purchaser to use the deliverables under the Contract. Per the Special Provision 29 IPR clause in Book II Part II , the "Purchaser will accept no constraints or limitations on the use of Contract deliverables. Accordingly, the Contractor shall not include any Background Intellectual Property or third party software in the code provided to the Purchaser. In the event that any such code would have to be included, the Contractor shall seek Purchaser's prior agreement and ensure that unlimited rights are secured for the Purchaser to use the deliverables under the Contract." The intent of Annex B-14 is for contractors to provide notice of any intended use of background IP. As stated in the clause, if the background IP would be used, Contractor shall ensure that unlimited rightsof use are secured for the Purchaser in said background IP.	CLOSED No Changes
T.60	Book I Annex C	CLIN Summary, CLIN 2, CLIN 7, CLIN 11,	To avoid unnecessary handling of comms and crypto material, and potential logistic and operational issues with this kind of critical PFE equipment (or all PFE equipment), will we be able to perform integration and testing operations at a Portuguese Military Facility – performing those tasks in a more effective and secure way?	The Customer is making arrangements for facilities to be available at PRT Army Reception Centre, INVOF ALCOHETE, in which integration tests with PFE could be performed.	CLOSED No Changes

T.61	Book II Part IV	SoW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1555	Can the Purchaser please clarify the specification for PCA Interface ID#6 "Ethernet (FO and Cu)". It currently states that the RJ45 (i.e. Cu) and fibre are to be 100/1000Mbps.	These interfaces need to be realized with ports allowing change of SFP from RJ45 to Fiber and supporting a throughput of 100/1000Mbps.	CLOSED No Changes
T.62	Book II Part IV	SoW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1532	The SOW indicates that the SBC for V2 interworking across NIP interface only applies to xU and xS.Can the Purchaser please confirm that this should also be supported for the xR domain as well?	Federation with missions partners under the FMN framework are only done on xU and xS. No NIP nor federation requirement on xR.	CLOSED No Changes
T.63	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1817	PRTTDCIS-1817 - This note states that all EUDs are PFE with the exception of the Administrator's EUDs. As such, VoIP Phones and terminals are provided for the Administrator as part of the contract. The following VoIP SRS requirements, however, shall only pertain ONLY to provided Administrator equipment. The Prime shall not take responsibility for any requirements for PFE deliverable equipment unless a CoC is included with the PFE stating that the deliverable PFE meets the requirements stated below. If these requirements are desired for all VoIP phones, then please change the requirement to include delivery of Tempest VOIP phones along with the desired count of phones per type per node. PRTTDCIS-1828, 1829, 1831, 1833, 1835, 1836	All PFE EUD appliances will comply with requirements stated in the SRS.	CLOSED No Changes

T.64	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS - 1829, PRTTDCIS-1831	Please clarify: There is no reference as to the required quantities and types of voice EUDs other than the wireless units for the Administrators. The system shall support the 4 types of stated devices but without definition of the quantities of provided PFE phones, the correct licensing cannot be properly estimated.	PRTTDCIS-1431 states the quantity of users per node. Each user is considered to have a dedicated VoIP phone. For quantities, please view PRTTDCIS-2880.	CLOSED No Changes
T.65	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1256	Figure 47 shows that the MMA interconnection that includes the RoIP Gateway (ICC-204 IP). Please indicate if all the interconnect cables between the radios, Iridium PTT and ICC-204 are PFE.	PRTTDCIS-3220 states that all PFE detailled specifications will be shared after Contract Award.	CLOSED No Changes
T.66	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1256	Figure 47 shows that the MMA-xU **design** concept. Please indicate what the dashed line between the RoIP Gateway and the MMA router represents as Figure 48 shows a solid line.	Figure 47 illustrates the **concept.** It is not meant to drive the design. In order to illustrate that Iridium PTT and Radio PTT xU have to be integrated with the MMA, a RoIP gateway is illustrated to interface. Different radio gateways (such as the Iridium docking station for instance) might be required to interface tthose to the MMA-xU. The dashed line as no particular meaning. In figure 48, for the MMA xR integration with CNR, the Radio Gateway brand and model is known.	CLOSED No Changes

T.67	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1604	The requirement states that all MMA shall be built and licensed the same, irrespective of the security domain. This is in conflict with PRTTDCIS-1625 and 1600, 1673. Furthermore, there is cost to implementing functionality that is not used between the various configurations. Please verify what requirement is correct?	PRTTDCIS-1604 is correct, the generic rule is that all MMA are to be built and licenced the same. PRTTDCIS-1625 and PRTTDCIS-1600 induce implementation constraints as a specialisation of this rule for the particular case of the SBC: => xU and xR: SBC as virtual payload of ISM => xS: SBC as a dedicated appliance There is no conflict with PRTTDCIS-1673	CLOSED No Changes
T.68	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-2934	The advice statement indicates that the existing Service Monitoring Tool in use in PRT NDN is Zabbix. Is Zabbix compliant with requirements for Service Modeling (e.g. SYS-1422)? Is Zabbix complaint with requirements for configuration audits against baseline configurations (i.e. SYS-1510)?	NCIA could not identify in the RFQ documentation released the SYS-1422 and SYS-1510 bidding candidate refers to.	CLOSED No Changes
T.69	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1431, PRTTDCIS-2555, PRTTDCIS-1239	Requirements PRTTDCIS-1431/PRTTDCIS-2555 speak to the user count and security level access at the each TDCIS Nodes while PRTTDCIS-1238 described the architecture of the TDCIS. According to the desired architecture, each TDCIS contains various building blocks including CNMs for the various CCAs and ISMs in each CNM. PRTTDCIS-1451-55 clarify the required building blocks for each node type.The ISM building block requirements are further detailed later in the document but describe **enterprise** datacenter type server architectures/requirements. While the ISM makes sense at the AN, BCC and CCC, the application and **requirements** for this type of hardware at a TN, RP, and RL is very confusing especially when the user count at those locations is only the system administrators. Please clarify if this is desired capability or should the building blocks be indivualized based on Node type (ie ISM in a TN may differ in construct than an ISM in a AN node).	Question quotes PRTTDCIS-1238 which is non existing, NCIA consider this as a typo and will refer to PRTTDCIS-1239 instead (As referenced in "RFQ Section" Column. All Modules (CNM, ISM…) have to be built the same across all nodes and under the dimensioning constrain of PRTTDCIS-2880 also clarified in T.44 AMD 4. ISM in TN (or any other node) may not differ in construct.	CLOSED No Changes

T.70	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-2322	It is recognized that there is a desire to create the smallest SWaP for the deliverable system. The sizing requirements of the transit cases, however, are not realist when asking for the use of COTS solutions and products. Are the sizing requirements feasable for the larger COTS equipment required?	Components used to realize the different Elements are design-driven. Purchaser is not aware of any unfeasibility of meeting those dimensions and weight limits with Commercially available devices.	CLOSED No Changes
T.71	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1200	Please provide further clarification on the lowest echelon command for the smallest deployable subset. Would it be at the company level or Battalion level?	The smallest deployable subset is a single Node used for company level and below.	CLOSED No Changes
T.72	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-3221	Please clarify. Is the note trying to state that the PFE 150W HF Power amplifier is able to be mounted as a dual system within the same 5U rack space or should this read "CNR 150W HF Power amplifier and CNR 50W U/VHF Power amplifier....."	Correct, PRTTDCIS-3221 is amended.	AMD 5
T.73	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-1810,2671	The definition of a UAM-small is extremely **vague** and is defined in 2671 as "Small: This variant is realized through the sole usage of network ports available on components of the CNM;". Table 8 shows the UAM quantities (both medium and small). It is understood that within the construct of a node that contains 2 shelters, 2 small UAMs may be required (i for each shelter). It is not clear as to why any single shelter would require more than 1 small UAM. Please clarify or update the table to reflect the correct counts.	As described in PRTTDCIS-2673, a single Small UAM is implemented though a single dedicated port on CNM appliances.PRTTDCIS-1810 lists the quantities of each Small UAM per domain and per Node. The distribution of Modules and Elements between Shelters in dual-shelter nodes is design-driven. However, the quantities of Small UAM cannot be decreased. For example, a CCC (single shelter) shall have 2 Small UAMs realized by 2 dedicated ports on its CCA-xu and on its CCA-xR.	CLOSED No Changes
T.74	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-2697, PRTTDCIS-2920	2697 define the # of end users while 2920 described the # of Administrators. Are the Administrator part of the end user count or additions to it?	Unless stated otherwise, Sys Admin quantities are always on top of the user quantities. The System Administrators will be in addition to the end user.	CLOSED No Changes

T.75	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-3044	Please define which protocols need to traverse the datadiode.	This level of detail will be shared after Contract Award, during the Configuration Capture (CCAP).	CLOSED No Changes
T.76	Book II Part IV	SOW Annex A SRS PRTTDCIS-2318	This requirement implies that all CIS modules need to be placed in transit cases. The shelter contains racks for the segregated CIS security domains and their associated equipment. The current understanding is that CIS modules for those nodes shall be mounted to the 19" racks directly and the only transit cases that are required are for the BoBs and the NS System. Please clarify/validate if this is the desired operation/integration.	All Shelter housed element is expected to be in rack frames. Access BoBs (PRTTDCIS-1804), NS Kit Elements (PRTTDCIS-2805, PRTTDCIS-2824, PRTTDCIS-2832, PRTTDCIS-2741) and DRS (PRTTDCIS-1740) are to be Transit Case.	CLOSED No Changes

* Status: Is Amendment to RFQ required as a direct result of the Clarification Request?

NCIA/ACQ/2021/ 07259
17 September 2021

To	:	All Nominated Prospective Bidders
Subject	:	**Responses to Clarification Requests to Request For Quotation (RFQ)– RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS, <u>Amendment 5</u>** **The Provision of Tactical Deployable Communications and Information Systems (TDCIS) for the Portuguese Army**
Reference(s)	:	A. AC/4-D(2019)0004(INV) B. NCIA/ACQ/2021/06476 NOI RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS dated 18 Jan 2021 C. NCIA/ACQ/2021/06775 NOI RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS, Amendment 1 dated 9 Apr 2021 D. NCIA/ACQ/2021/68940 RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS, dated 2 Jun 2021 E. NCIA/ACQ/2021/06983 RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS, Amendment 1 dated 15 June 2021 F. NCIA/ACQ/2021/07015 RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS, Amendment 2 dated 25 June 2021 G. NCIA/ACQ/2021/07065 RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS, Amendment 3 dated 14 July 2021 H. NCIA/ACQ/2021/07140 RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS, Amendment 4 dated 6 August 2021

Dear Madam/Sir,

1. The purpose of this Amendment 5 to RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS is to publish the responses to the Clarification Requests (CRs) received for the subject Request For Quotation (RFQ). The Purchaser's responses to the CRs are issued as Annex A to this letter.

2. As a direct or indirect result of these CRs, the following documents have been amended and are re-issued in its entirety. Prospective Bidders are strongly advised to carefully review the revised documents. The changes within the bidding documents are denoted in "red" font for ease of traceability.

A. RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS Book I Bidding Instructions. Annex C Bidding Sheets revises the following:
   - CLIN 8.1 is revised to EDC + 3 Weeks

B. RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS Book II Prospective Contract Part I. The Schedule of Supplies and Services is revised.

C. RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS Book II Prospective Contract Part IV Statement of Work and Annex A, SRS.

3. By virtue of this Amendment 5, 2A, 2B and 2C above replaces and supersedes any previous version issued in the context of RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS.

4. All other RFQ documents remain unchanged from their original version as issued on 2 June 2021.

5. The Bid Closing Date has not changed and remains at 29 October 2021 at 13:00 Hrs Local Brussels Time.

6. The overall security classification of this RFQ is «NATO UNCLASSIFIED».

7. This RFQ and any Amendment thereto remains the property of the NCI Agency and shall be protected in accordance with the applicable national security regulations.

8. This RFQ does not constitute either a financial or contractual commitment at this stage.

9. Prospective Bidders are advised that the NCI Agency reserves the right to cancel, withdraw, or suspend this RFQ at any time in its entirety and bears no liability for bid preparation costs incurred by firms or any other collateral costs if bid cancellation, withdrawal, or suspension occurs.

10. Please send all questions concerning this RFQ to the undersigned at:

Eva Benson, Contracting Officer

E-mail: RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS@ncia.nato.int

For the Director of Acquisition

Eva Benson
Contracting Officer

Enclosure:
Annex A: Clarification Requests Answers, Amendment 5
Annex B: RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS Book I Bidding Instructions, Annex C Bidding Sheets
Annex C: RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS Book II Prospective Contract in its entirety

Distribution List:

All Nominated Prospective Bidders   1

NATO Delegations (Attn: Infrastructure Adviser):   1

Embassies in Brussels (Attn: Commercial Attaché):

    Albania   1

    Bulgaria   1

    Canada   1

    Croatia   1

    Czech Republic   1

    Denmark   1

    Estonia   1

    France   1

    Germany   1

    Greece   1

    Hungary   1

    Iceland   1

    Italy   1

    Latvia   1

    Lithuania   1

    Luxembourg   1

    The Netherlands   1

    Norway   1

    Poland   1

    Portugal   1

NCIA/ACQ/2021/ 07259

Romania	1
Slovakia	1
Slovenia	1
Spain	1
Turkey	1
United Kingdom	1
United States (electronic copy to **brussels.office.box@mail.doc.gov**)	1
Belgian Ministry of Economic Affairs	1

Distribution List for RFQ-CO-115363-PRT-TDCIS

- **Offerors** (sent separately in electronic version)

- **NATO Delegations** (Attn: Investment Adviser):

  Albania
  Belgium
  Bulgaria
  Canada
  Croatia
  Czech Republic
  Denmark
  Estonia
  France
  Germany
  Greece
  Hungary
  Iceland
  Italy
  Latvia
  Lithuania
  Luxembourg
  Montenegro
  The Netherlands
  North Macedonia
  Norway
  Poland
  Portugal
  Romania
  Slovakia
  Slovenia
  Spain
  Turkey
  United Kingdom
  United States
  Belgium Ministry of Economic Affairs

- **Embassies in Brussels** (Attn: Commercial Attaché):

  Albania
  Bulgaria
  Canada
  Croatia
  Czech Republic
  Denmark
  Estonia
  France
  Germany
  Greece

Hungary
Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Montenegro
The Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Turkey
United Kingdom
United States

- **NATO HQ**

NATO Office of Resources
Management and Implementation Branch – Attn: Deputy Branch Chief

Director, NATO HQ C3 Staff
Attn: Executive Co-ordinator

- **Strategic Commands**

ACO/DCOS CIS & Cyber Defence

ACT/DCOS Capability Development

- **NCI Agency –Internal Distribution**

- **NATEXs**