NATO OTAN
NATO Communications and Information Agency **NCI** AGENCY

NCIA/ACQ/2023/06845
3 May 2023

To: Bidders List and Distribution List

Subject: **Invitation For Bid IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER Amendment 4**

Provision of a Land Command and Control (C2) Application Software (DEMETER)

References: **A**. AC/4-D/2261(1996 Edition), Procedures for International Competitive Bidding
B. AC/4-D(2008)0002-REV2, International Competitive Bidding Using Best Value Evaluation Methodology, dated 15 July 2015
C. NCI Agency NOI NCIA/ACQ/2022/07326, dated 19 December 2022
D. NCI Agency IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER; NCIA/ACQ/2023/ 06536 dated 03 March 2023
E. NCI Agency IFB Amendment 1; NCIA/ACQ/2023/06695 dated 17 March 2023
F. NCI Agency IFB Amendment 2; NCIA/ACQ/2023/06756 dated 31 March 2023
G. NCI Agency IFB Amendment 3; NCIA/ACQ/2023/06786 dated 14 April 2023

Dear Prospective Bidders,

1.   The purpose of this Amendment 4 is to:

a.   Revise the IFB Bid Closing Date.
b.   Publish Release 3 of IFB Bidders' questions and NCI Agency responses.
c.   Issue revised IFB documents - Book I, Bidding Sheets

2.   In accordance with the Procedures for International Competitive Bidding AC/4-D/2261 (1996 Edition), paragraph 10 (b), sub-paragraph (iii), the Book I, Part I, Bidding Instructions, Section 2, General Bidding Information, Para 2.3.1, is hereby revised as follows:

FROM:

"*All Bids shall be in the possession of the Purchaser at the address given hereafter before 14:00 hours (Central European Time) on* **_May 15, 2023_** *at which time and date bidding shall be closed.*

TO:

"*All Bids shall be in the possession of the Purchaser at the address given hereafter before 14:00 hours (Central European Time) on **May 31, 2023**, at which time and date bidding shall be closed.*

3. NCI Agency responses to Bidders' questions are hereby published with this IFB Amendment 4.

4. Requests for Clarification (RfC) and their respective answers that were released in previous IFB Amendment have been greyed out for your convenience.

5. The Contracting Officer responsible for this solicitation is Mr. Radu Munteanu, and all correspondence regarding this IFB should be sent via email to CO115791DEMETER@ncia.nato.int.

FOR THE CHIEF OF ACQUISITION:

//Original signed//

Radu Munteanu
Contracting Officer

Attachments:

1) Responses to Clarification Requests, Release Number 3
2) Bidding Sheets
3) INTEL FS API Specifications

Distribution List for IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER Amendment 4

All Nominated Prospective Bidders

NATO Delegations (Attn: Infrastructure 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
- TÜRKIYE
- UNITED KINGDOM
- UNITED STATES

NATO HQ

NATO Office of Resources (NOR)
- CIS and Cyber Capabilities Branch (CCC) Branch Head
- NOR Secretariat Section (RPPB, IC, BC)

NCI Agency – NATEXs

NCI Agency – Internal Distribution

IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER CLIN Summary
BASE CONTRACT

CLIN	Description	SOW Reference	Required Completion Date	Delivery Destination	Delivery Form	Unit of measure	Quantity	Unit Price	Total Fixed Price	Investment or O&M	Optional Comments (Mandatory for zero costs lines)
								Declare Currency =>			
1	**CLIN 1 - (BASE-EVALUATED) Implement initial sites - WP1**										
1.1	**Project Management**										
1.1.1	Project Management for Work Package 1	3.7	EDC + 11 months	NCI Agency	PM Service	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.2	**Initiation**										
1.2.1	Documentation	4.2.1	EDC + 2 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.2.2	Site Survey including report	4.2.2	EDC + 2 months	NATO Facilities	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.3	**Training Preparation**										
1.3.1	Training Plan	4.3.2	EDC + 2 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Each	1	-	-	Investment	
1.3.2	Training Needs Analysis Report	4.3.2	TDR: EDC + 4 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Each	1	-	-	Investment	
1.3.3	Training Materials	4.3.2	TMR: EDC + 6 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.4	**Validation**										
1.4.1	System integration testing for Work Package 1	3.8, 4.3.4	EDC + 6 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.4.2	IVVQ testing for Work Package 1	3.8, 4.3.4	EDC + 6 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.4.3	CRQ and Security Testing for Work Package 1	3.8, 4.3.4	EDC + 8 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.5	**Training Delivery**										
1.5.1	User Training courses	4.3.2.5	EDC + 8 months	Izmir, JFCs	Course	Each	25	-	-	Investment	
1.5.2	Functional Administrator courses	4.3.2.5	EDC + 8 months	The Hague	Course	Each	5	-	-	Investment	
1.5.3	System Admin courses	4.3.2.5	EDC + 8 months	The Hague	Course	Each	3	-	-	Investment	
1.5.4	Train the Trainer courses	4.3.2.5	EDC + 8 months	Izmir, The Hague	Course	Each	1	-	-	Investment	
1.6	**Transition**										
1.6.1	Data migration for Work Package 1	4.3.5	EDC + 9 months	NATO Facilities	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.6.2	Installation and activation for Work Package 1 / PSA	4.3.5	EDC + 9 months	NATO Facilities	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.7	**Right to use COTS**										
1.7.1	Right to use COTS for training purposes	1.4.1, 4.3.2	EDC + 8 months	NATO Facilities	Software and Licences	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.7.2	Right to use COTS for test purposes	1.4.1, 4.1.1	EDC + 6 months	NATO Facilities	Software and Licences	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
1.7.3	Right to use COTS for up to 300 concurrent users within the NATO Enterprise	1.4.1, 4.1.1	EDC + 11 months	NATO Facilities	Software and Licences	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
TOTAL PRICE CLIN 1									-	Investment	
2	**CLIN 2 - (BASE-EVALUATED) Implement remaining sites - WP2**										
2.1	**Project Management**										
2.1.1	Project Management for Work Package 2	3.7	EDC + 26 months	NCI Agency	PM Service	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.2	**Initiation**										
2.2.1	Documentation	4.2.1	EDC + 13 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.2.2	Site Surveys including report	4.2.2	EDC + 13 months	NATO Facilities	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.3	**Validation**										
2.3.1	System integration testing for Work Package 2	3.8, 4.3.4	EDC + 23 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.3.2	IVVQ testing for Work Package 2	3.8, 4.3.4	EDC + 23 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.3.3	CRQ and Security Testing for Work Package 2	3.8, 4.3.4	EDC + 25 months	NCI Agency	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.4	**Transition**										
2.4.1	Data migration for Work Package 2	4.3.5	EDC + 26 months	NATO Facilities	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.4.2	Installation and activation for Work Package 2 / PSA WP2	4.3.5	EDC + 26 months	NATO Facilities	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.5	**Right to use COTS**										
2.5.1	Right to use COTS for additional 200 concurrent users within the NATO Enterprise (on top of 300)	1.4.2, 4.1.2	EDC + 26 months	NATO Facilities	Software and Licences	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.6	**Maintenance, Support and Warranty**										
2.6.1	Maintenance and Support for training licences	4.3.5.3	PSA WP1 to FSA	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.6.2	Maintenance and Support for test licences	4.3.5.3	PSA WP1 to FSA	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.6.3	Maintenance and Support for 300 concurrent user licences	4.3.5.3	PSA WP1 to FSA	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
2.6.4	Warranty	6	FSA to FSA + 1 year	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
TOTAL PRICE CLIN 2									-	Investment	
Total Fixed Price - Base Contract									-		

EVALUATED OPTIONS

CLIN	Description	SOW Reference	Required Completion Date	Delivery Destination	Delivery Form	Unit of measure	Quantity	Unit Price	Total Fixed Price	Investment or O&M	Optional Comments (Mandatory for zero costs lines)
								Declare Currency =>			
3	**CLIN 3 - (OPTIONAL-EVALUATED) Interoperability Adaptations - WP3**										
	For instructions on how to fill in, refer to "Instructions" tab										
3.1	**Common Operational Picture (COP) - interfaces**										
3.1.1	1: Recognized Air Picture - NIRIS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.1.2	2: Recognized Logistics Picture - LOGFAS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.1.3	3: Recognized Intelligence Picture - INTEL-FS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.2	**Plans - interfaces**										
3.2.1	4: Order of Battle - TOPFAS/ LOGFAS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.2.2	5: CONOPS - TOPFAS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.2.3	6: OPLAN - TOPFAS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.3	**Course of Action (CoA) - interface**										
3.3.1	7: COA - NIP/ TOPFAS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.4	**Infrastructure - interface**										
3.4.1	8: Identity - IdM	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.5	**Cross Domain - interfaces**										
3.5.1	9: Security Labelling - Mail Guard	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.5.2	10: Security Labelling - IEG	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.6	**Service Management and Control - interface**										
3.6.1	11: SMC - ITSM	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.7	**Situation and Problem - interfaces**										
3.7.1	12: Red ORBAT - INTEL-FS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.7.2	13: Red COA - INTEL-FS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.7.3	14: ICP - RFI Process - INTEL-FS	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, Annex B	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8	**Evaluation criteria**										
3.8.1	E02 Battlespace Management (BM) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to conduct Terrain Management in order to conduct Battlespace Management.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	

3.8.2	E03 Situational Awareness (SA) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to develop and maintain Situation Awareness with NATO applications (e.g. JOCWatch and NCOP).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.3	E04 Interoperability In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to be interoperable (Standard supported: MIP, FFT, NVG, ADatP-3. etc.) and with NATO application.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.4	E05 NATO Common Operational Picture (NCOP) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to produce and disseminate the Recognised Ground Picture (RGP) with NATO Situation Awareness applications (e.g. NCOP).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.5	E06 Security In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to comply with security regulations (e.g. CM(2002)49 (Security within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]) and enable cross security domain access.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.6	E07 Collaborative editing: In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to simultaneously handle documents with collaborative functionalities. In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to simultaneously develop staff product in support of decision making cycle and report assessment to the commander.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.7	E08 NATO Information Portal In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to access, receive and import information products MS Office or PDF files originating from NATO portals.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.8	E09 ORDERS In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to consume, exchange, collaborate on ORDERS documents (file type of MS Office or PDF). In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to produce, approve, disseminate and provide read receipt of ORDERS documents.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.9	E10 Risk analysis In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to enable operators to identify, analyse and evaluate operational risks.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.10	E11 Usability In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to comply with requirements concerning user friendliness (menu, shortcut, drag and drop, in English, etc.) and easy to learned.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.11	E12 Availability In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to work on static or deployed environment and in limited bandwidth environment.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.12	E13 Efficiency In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to enable Information Exchange Requirements (IER) of military forces.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.13	E14 Scalability In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to comply with requirements concerning scalability (number of users, number of servers with replication/synchronisation, etc.).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.14	E15 Confidentiality In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to comply with NATO security regulations (e.g. Information Management, Cyber Defence, security of web application, system security)?	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.15	E16 Integrity In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to enable Information Assurance and Information Management to process and display information.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.16	E17 Survivability In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to enable data to be secured, stored and archived regularly.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.17	E18 Flexibility In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to be adapted to difference environments (static, deployable, remote), configurable (users, roles, etc.).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.18	E19 Training In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to comply with requirements concerning Training packages (Train the trainer, CBT, etc.).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.19	E20 Modifiability In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to make the solution upgradable (modular, remains operational during upgrade, etc.).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.20	E21 Order of Battle (ORBAT) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to consume, produce, exchange, and collaborate Order of Battle (ORBAT) Information with NATO planning applications (e.g. TOPFAS and LOGFAS). In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to export defined attributes of Order of Battle (ORBAT) Information with NATO planning applications (e.g. TOPFAS and LOGFAS).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.21	E22 Operation Plan (OPLAN) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to consume, exchange, collaborate on Operation Plans (OPLAN) documents (file type of MS Office or PDF) with NATO planning applications (e.g. TOPFAS). In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to produce, approve, disseminate and provide read receipt of Operation Plans (OPLAN) documents.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.22	E23 Intelligence products In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to make the solution interoperable with NATO Intelligence and Joint Targeting applications (e.g. INTEL-FS and JTS) in order to support the Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment (IPOE).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.23	E24 Concept of Operations (CONOPS) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to consume, exchange, collaborate on Concept of Operations (CONOPS) documents (file type of MS Office or PDF) with NATO planning application (e.g. TOPFAS).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.24	E25 Course of Action (CoA) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to consume, exchange, collaborate on Course of Action (CoA) documents (file type of MS Office or PDF) with NATO planning application (e.g. TOPFAS).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.25	E26 Logistics Functional Area Services (LOGFAS) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to receive logistic reports from NATO Logistic applications (e.g., LOGFAS).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.26	E27 Assessment In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to support operators to receive assessment inputs, conduct analysis, display data, assess progress of land operation and conduct recommendations with NATO Planning applications (e.g. TOPFAS). In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to process input in accordance with Data Collection Plan, process assessment input and conduct data analysis of collected data.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.27	E28 NATO Information Portal In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to access, receive and import information products MS Office or PDF files originating from NATO portals.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	

CLIN	Description	SOW Reference	Required Completion Date	Delivery Destination	Delivery Form	Unit of measure	Quantity	Unit Price	Total Fixed Price	Investment or O&M	Optional Comments
3.8.	E29 Situational Awareness (SA) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to develop and maintain Situation Awareness with NATO applications (e.g. JOCWatch and NCOP).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.	E30 Collaborative editing In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to simultaneously handle documents with collaborative functionalities. In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to simultaneously develop staff product in support of decision making cycle and report assessment to the commander.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.	E31 ORDERS In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to consume, exchange, collaborate on ORDERS documents (file type of MS Office or PDF). In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to produce, approve, disseminate and provide read receipt of ORDERS documents.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.	E32 Interoperability In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to be interoperable (Standard supported: MIP, FFT, NVG, ADatP-3, etc.) and with NATO application.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.	E33 Synchronization Matrix In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to synchronise effects, coordinate assets and refine synchronisation in a Synchronisation Matrix.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.	E34 Rehearsal of Concept (ROC) In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to adapt the solution to support operators to perform Rehearsal of Concept (RoC).	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.	E35 War gaming In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to enable the solution to support operators to conduct war-gaming.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
3.8.	E36 Simulation In case of non-compliancy, specify cost to enable the solution to be interoperable with NATO simulation applications, in order to support the operators to consume Courses of Action (CoA) analysis.	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	3 months before start of WP2 Transition	NSF	Electronic	Lot	1	-	-	Investment	
TOTAL PRICE CLIN 3									-	Investment	
4	**CLIN 4 - (OPTIONAL-EVALUATED) Maintenance and Support (M&S) - WP4**										
4.1	**M&S for Year 1**										
4.1.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA to FSA + 1 year	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.1.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA to FSA + 1 year	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.1.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA to FSA + 1 year	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.2	**M&S for Year 2**										
4.2.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 1 year to FSA + 2 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.2.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 1 year to FSA + 2 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.2.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 1 year to FSA + 2 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.3	**M&S for Year 3**										
4.3.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 2 years to FSA + 3 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.3.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 2 years to FSA + 3 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.3.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 2 years to FSA + 3 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.4	**M&S for Year 4**										
4.4.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 3 years to FSA + 4 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.4.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 3 years to FSA + 4 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.4.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 3 years to FSA + 4 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.5	**M&S for Year 5**										
4.5.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 4 years to FSA + 5 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.5.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 4 years to FSA + 5 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.5.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 4 years to FSA + 5 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.6	**M&S for Year 6**										
4.6.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 5 years to FSA + 6 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.6.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 5 years to FSA + 6 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.6.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 5 years to FSA + 6 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.7	**M&S for Year 7**										
4.7.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 6 years to FSA + 7 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.7.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 6 years to FSA + 7 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.7.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 6 years to FSA + 7 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.8	**M&S for Year 8**										
4.8.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 7 years to FSA + 8 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.8.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 7 years to FSA + 8 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.8.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 7 years to FSA + 8 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.9	**M&S for Year 9**										
4.9.	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 8 years to FSA + 9 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.9.	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 8 years to FSA + 9 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.9.	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 8 years to FSA + 9 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.10	**M&S for Year 10**										
4.10	Maintenance and Support for training licences	7	FSA + 9 years to FSA + 10 years	Contractor Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.10	Maintenance and Support for test licences	7	FSA + 9 years to FSA + 10 years	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
4.10	Maintenance and Support for user licences	7	FSA + 9 years to FSA + 10 years	NATO Facilities	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
TOTAL PRICE CLIN 4									-	O&M	
Total Fixed Price - Evaluated Options									-		

			NON-EVALUATED OPTIONS								
CLIN	**Description**	**SOW Reference**	**Required Completion Date**	**Delivery Destination**	**Delivery Form**	**Unit of measure**	**Quantity**	**Unit Price**	**Total Fixed Price**	**Investment or O&M**	**Optional Comments (Mandatory for zero costs lines)**
						Declare Currency =>					
5	**CLIN 5 - (OPTIONAL-NON-EVALUATED) Hourly support for Interface Adaptations**										
5.1	Optional technical specialist to support NCIA	4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.3.4	TBD	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Person days	100	-	-	O&M	
TOTAL PRICE CLIN 5									-		
6	**CLIN 6 - (OPTIONAL-NON-EVALUATED) Additional installations**										
6.1	Installation and activation on a site in Europe	4.3.5.1	TBD	NCI Agency	Service and Support	Lot	1	-	-	O&M	
TOTAL PRICE CLIN 6									-		
Total Fixed Price - Non-Evaluated Options									-		

#	RFP Source Document	Offeror's Question	Purchaser Clarification
1	SRS-001, SRS-002	Could the NCI Agency provide for Bidder with the following reference documents, listed in the document IFB-CO-115791 BOOK II - PART IV SOW Annex A SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS SPECIFICATION (SRS)? The following documents are necessary for the proper preparation of the offer: • [NREF-11][AC/322-D(2019) 0038 (INV) CIS Security Technical and Implementation Directive for the Security of Web Applications.] • [AC_322-D_0048-REV3][Technical and Implementation Directive on CIS Security] • [R-ICD-AT-06.02.14-Map][Agency Technical Instruction AI Tech 06.02.14 Service Interface Profile for Geospatial Services - Map Rendering Service 16 September 2016] • [R-ICD-Intel-FS-DM][CO-115718-I2BE, INTEL-FS Spiral 2 NAF 4.0 L7 Information Model Data Dictionary - All Entities Nov 8, 2022 4:58 PM] • [R-ICD-JOCWatch][JOCWatch 4.1 Interface Control Document Oct 2022] • [R-ICD-FasInterop][TOPFAS/LOGFAS ADL-FPH ORBAT Schemas version 2022.7] • [R-ICD-Namis][Interface Control Document NAMIS v3.4.16 version 1.0 date 21/11/2018] • [R-ICD-NCOP2][Interface Control Document NCOP2 ICD 7 June 2022] • [R-ICD-TOPFAS-DM][TOPFAS Increment-2 Software Design Specification Annex 1: Database Model (Desktop) 8/5/2020] • [R-ICD-TOPFAS-ICD][TOPFAS Increment-2 Software Design Specification Annex 3: Interface Control Document (Desktop) 15/09/2020] • [R-ICD-SOA_IdM][CO-14176-SOA-IDM Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and Identity Management Platform (IdM) Wave I Interface Control Document (ICD) Doc. Version: 15.0 Date: 08/06/2021] • [R-ICD-TOPFAS-Excel][Empty Plan Collecting Sheet Months All Collectors Dated December 2022] • [R-ICD-LOGFAS][LOGFAS INTERFACE CONTROL DOCUMENT 30-Jan-23 Version 8.0.0] • [CM (2007)0118][NATO Information Management Policy (NMIP)] • [C-M (2011)0042][NATO Policy on Cyber Defence] • [AC/35-D/2004][Primary Directive on INFOSEC, NATO Security Policy supporting directive] • [C-(2008)0113(INV)][NATO Information Assurance Policy] • [C-M(2007)0118][NATO Information Management Policy (NMIP)] • [R-ATP322][Command and Control of Allied Land Forces] • [R-TID-CISSec][NATO AC/322-D/0048 - Technical and Implementation Directive on CIS Security.] • [Ref-CCat][NATO Communications and Information Agency Costed Customer Services Catalogue v7.1 2023Service Definitions] • IEG-C [R-ICD-IEGC] Interface Control Document IEG-C • [NREF-JOEL]AC35-D(2002)-DIRECTIVE on the SECURITY of INFORMATION-REV3	These requested documents have been transmitted on 17 & 18 March 2023: - [AC_322-D_0048-REV3][Technical and Implementation Directive on CIS Security] - [R-ICD-AT-06.02.14-Map][Agency Technical Instruction AI Tech 06.02.14 Service Interface Profile for Geospatial Services - Map Rendering Service 16 September 2016] - [R-ICD-JOCWatch][JOCWatch 4.1 Interface Control Document Oct 2022] - [R-ICD-Namis][Interface Control Document NAMIS v3.4.16 version 1.0 date 21/11/2018] - [R-ICD-NCOP2][Interface Control Document NCOP2 ICD 7 June 2022] - [R-ICD-TOPFAS-DM][TOPFAS Increment-2 Software Design Specification Annex 1: Database Model (Desktop) 8/5/2020] - [R-ICD-TOPFAS-ICD][TOPFAS Increment-2 Software Design Specification Annex 3: Interface Control Document (Desktop) 15/09/2020] - [R-ICD-TOPFAS-Excel][Empty Plan Collecting Sheet Months All Collectors Dated December 2022] - [R-ICD-LOGFAS][LOGFAS INTERFACE CONTROL DOCUMENT 30-Jan-23 Version 8.0.0] - [CM (2007)0118][NATO Information Management Policy (NMIP)] - [AC/35-D/2004][Primary Directive on INFOSEC, NATO Security Policy supporting directive] - [C-(2008)0113(INV)][NATO Information Assurance Policy] - [C-M(2007)0118][NATO Information Management Policy (NMIP)] - [R-ATP322][Command and Control of Allied Land Forces] - [R-TID-CISSec][NATO AC/322-D/0048 - Technical and Implementation Directive on CIS Security.] - [Ref-CCat][NATO Communications and Information Agency Costed Customer Services Catalogue v7.1 2023Service Definitions] The remaining documents requested will be transmitted, except for: - [R-ICD-SOA_IdM]: SOA-IdM documentation will be provided as soon as possible. Note that STANAG 4774 and 4778.2 (included in document delivery) instead of [R-ICD-IEGC] shall be used.
2	SRS-034	What are the technical requirements regarding the method of signing the ordering document? How are "authoritative data sources" determined?	There are no specific technical requirements for signing the order document. The question about authoritative data sources is not relevant for this requirement.
3	SRS-110	How will the test confirming compliance with this requirement be carried out?	Refer to Bidding Instructions section 4.8 for the Post Evaluation Test Drive
4	SRS-028	What communication interface should be used to transfer operational data for OPLAN from TOPFAS?	Information provided in ICD
5	SRS-117	What communication interface should be used to deliver the Situation Update to TOPFAS?	Information provided in ICD
6	SRS-140	What is the purpose of micro environments? What functionalities should DEMETER provide to meet this requirement?	NATO operational environment types consist of environments with limited resources, such as deployable environments; SRS contains the functionalities.
7	SRS-152	What is the expected manner and scope of verification of compliance with this requirement through demonstration?	• The verification methods provided are suggested methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
8	SRS-152	Whether a demonstration in an environment with equivalent parameters is allowed?	All proposed environment alternatives must be approved by Purchaser.
9	SRS-152	Could the NCI Agency provide the Bidder with the NATO DCIS nodes infrastructure (current and planned) specification? The document is necessary for the proper preparation of the offer.	No, NATO operational environment types consist of environments with limited resources, such as deployable environments. The fuctionalities depicted in SRS of the DCIS nodes infrastructure are considered sufficient information for bid preparation.
10	SRS-154	What is the expected manner and scope of verification of compliance with this requirement through demonstration?	• The verification methods provided are suggested methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
11	SRS-154	Whether a demonstration in an environment with equivalent parameters is allowed?	All proposed environment alternatives must be approved by Purchaser.
12	SRS-154	Could the NCI Agency provide the Bidder with the specification of NATO's Mission Information Room (MIR) infrastructure? The document is necessary for the proper preparation of the offer.	No, the datacentre requirements are listed already in SRS and are considered sufficient information for bid preparation.
13	SOW-242	Could the NCI Agency provide the Bidder with document NATO-Bi-SC-DIR-075-007? The document is necessary for the proper preparation of the offer.	This document will be transmitted.
14	SOW-289	What product is intended for the preparation of online training materials in accordance with the Sharable Content Object Reference Model (SCORM) Edition 2004? Will the NCI Agency provide the Bidder with a license for such software for the time of the training materials preparation?	SOW-289 targets any form of eLearning materials developed for DEMETER. eLearning is defined in the SOW as "Self-paced online learning, covering a complete or partial course". This statement dictates compliancy with the Sharable Content Object Reference Model (SCORM) Edition 2004. There is no licence required for SCORM compliancy. Any eLearning development tool in the market can publish SCORM 2004 compliant content. For the development of the eLearning content, NCI Agency will not provide licence for the development tools used by the Bidder.
15	164	Could the NCI Agency provide the Bidder with a document "[ASD-AIA-SX000i] International Specification for Integrated Product Support (IPS), Issue No.3.0, Apr 2021" and "[ASD-S3000L] International Procedure Specification for Logistic Support Analysis (LSA), Issue No.2.0, Apr 2021"? The document is necessary for the proper preparation of the offer.	These documents are available on the internet: - https://www.sx000i.org/docs/SX000i%20Issue%203.0.pdf - https://www.s3000l.org/docs/S3000L%20Issue%202.0.pdf
16	SOW-349	Could the NCI Agency provide the Bidder with the document "NATO Guidance on Integrated Logistics Support for Multinational Armament Programs, Ed.C V1, 2017"? The document is necessary for the proper preparation of the offer.	This document will be transmitted.
17	SOW 1.4.3 [24]	What is the preferred scheduled date for PSA WP-3	Refer to SOW figure 1.2 and Bidding sheets: Payment Schedule
18	SOW-313	Does the Purchaser require the Contractor to perform design and build activities to implement adaptation features modifying the selected integration platform or does the Purchaser require the Contractor to implement integration features only into Contractor's product?	The Contractor shall design and build interoperability adaptations on an NCI Agency approved integration platform.
19	SOW-002	In [SOW-002] PSA for WP1 is described as EDC + 11 months. In Annex A – Bidding Sheets, CLIN 1.6.2 (Installation and activation for Work Package 1 / PSA") PSA is described as EDC + 9 months. What is the required completion date for Work Package 1 PSA?	As stated in figure 1.2 of the SOW, PSA for WP1 shall be EDC + 11 months. SSS CLIN 1.6.2 will be updated accordingly.

20	SOW [23], Book I 3.5.7.5.1	Does the Purchaser allow or require the Contractors to implement features, stated in SRS, that are currently unavailable or partially available in the COTS solution to be delivered in the next upcoming releases? Is it possible to deliver those functionalities within WP3?	All features are to be delivered by PSA of WP2.
21	SOW-011	Does the Contractors' personnel (software developers, testers, administrative staff etc.) assigned to the project performing activities in the Contractor's office that do not require access to classified information and will not perform work in NATO premises, need to have NATO SECRET security clearance?	Contractor/Sub-contractor's personnel, including freelance consultants and interpreters, or any other type of freelance personnel or self-employed service providers who carry out works on NATO premises or Contractor's facilities in connection with a classified NATO programme/project or any other type of NATO contract requiring access to information classified NC or above shall hold a PSC at the requisite level and, if required by national laws and regulations, an appropriate FSC. This means that, as the contract is at NC or above then the Contractor personnel in question would in fact need to hold a PSC at the appropriate level. The company would also need a Facility Secuity Clearance (FSC).
22	SOW-127	Which test management and automation tools are used by the Purchaser? Please provide ICD documentation.	JIRA with the Zephyr plugin for test management and Azure automation tools. No ICD provided as part of these tools.
23	SOW-129	Which requirements coverage supporting tools and defect management tools are used by the Purchaser? Please provide ICD documentation.	Requirements management: IBM DOORS. Defect management: JIRA and Azure tooling. No ICD provided as part of these tools.
24	BOOK II - PART IV SOW, 9 - References	Could the contracting authority provide the following reference documents, which the contracting authority refers to in the document IFB-CO-115791 BOOK II - PART IV SOW? The following documents are necessary for the proper preparation of the offer: • [AD-070-001] ACO Directive 070-001 Allied Command Operations Security Directive, Dec 2021 • [AI-16.31.03] NCIA - Agency Instruction 16.31.03, Requirements for the preparation of IPSP, Sep 2022 • [ALP-10] NATO Guidance on Integrated Logistics Support for Multinational Armament Programs, Ed.C V1, 2017 • [ASD-AIA-SX000i] International Specification for Integrated Product Support (IPS), Issue No.3.0, Apr 2021 • [ASD-S3000L] International Procedure Specification for Logistic Support Analysis (LSA), Issue No.2.0, Apr 2021 • [ASOP-07.01.25] NCI Academy Standard Operating Procedure - Grading and Assessment, May 2020 • [NATO-Bi-SC-DIR-075-007] NATO Bi-SC Education and Individual Training Directive (E&ITD) 075-007, Sep 2015 • [NCIA-AD-06.00.16] NCIA - Agency Directive 06.00.16, Configuration Management, Feb 2020 • [NCIA-AI-23.02] NCIA - Agency Instruction 23.02, Deployment Management Planning, Oct 2019 • [NCIA-AI-TECH-06.03.01] NCIA - Agency Instruction 06.03.01, Identification of Software Assets, Jun 2016 • [NCIA-SOP-06.03.05] NCIA – Agency Standard Operating Procedure 06.03.05, Software Patch Management, Oct 2020 • [NCIA-SOP-23.01] NCIA – Agency Standard Operating Procedure 23.01, Enterprise IT Change Management, Mar 2020 • [R-ICD-NIRIS] Track Store Open API interface – original version to be provided • [SOA-IdM] SOA-IDM Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and Identity Management (IdM) Platform - Wave 1 - Interface Control Document (ICD) V15.0, Jun 2021 - System Design Specification (SDS) V9.3, May 2021 • [STANAG-4427] Edition 3 - Configuration Management in System Life Cycle Management • [XSD-LC2IS] Interface Control Document (ICD) for LC2IS Inc 2 Contract no CO-14463-LC2IS F0057 62794795 558 Rev M - Annex E LC2IS Inc 2 XML Schema Definition	All documents requested will be transmitted, except for: - [R-ICD-NIRIS]: will be provided as soon as possible. - [SOA_IdM]: SOA-IdM documentation will be provided as soon as possible. - [XSD-LC2IS]: this document will be provided as soon as possible. These documents are available on the internet: - [ASD-AIA-SX000i]: https://www.sx000i.org/docs/SX000i%20Issue%203.0.pdf - [ASD-S3000L]: https://www.s3000l.org/docs/S3000L%20Issue%202.0.pdf
25	SOW Annex-A, p.28, SRS-139	The requirement contains that "DEMETER system intrinsic availability is greater than 99.5%." Intrinsic (theoretical) availability will be calculated for DEMETER's software architecture/CSCIs only. There will be no models generated, i.e. no diagrams like RBD for hardware, but assessment on software maturity will be made after getting diminishing software error data, during unit tests and integration tests. For third-party software this value will be taken as 100%. Is this assumption correct?	Yes, the claim shall be supported by collected data.
26	SOW Annex-A, p.45, SRS-256	The requirement contains that "DEMETER exhibits a mean-timebetween- failure (MTBF) characteristic of less than 3.65 hours per month..." Could you explicitly elaborate on, what is intended here? What is the equivalence of this specific MTBF target value?	Application shall have redundancy to be able to recover from failures within specified timeline.
27	SOW Annex-A, p.58, SRS-322 and SRS-323	In order to evaluate our compliance, we need detailed information about the following content; • Metadata format or standard used in NIP • The interface standards for the NIP	NATO Unclassified NIP/EDMS and IKM documents provided. NU_EDMS v1.7.19 - Functional Admin Manual NU_EDMS v1.7.19 - User Manual NU_IKM Tools Core 1.3.0 - As-built Architecture (Hardware Software) NU_NIP v1.5.26 - Configuration Manual NU_NIP v1.5.26 - Functional Admin Manual NU_NIP v1.5.26 - User Manual
28	SOW, p.59, SOW-366 p.62, SOW-383 p.64, SOW-395	The times for the provision of workarounds (two business days) and the defect fixing (ten days) for critical defects mentioned in SOW-366 seems to be conflicting with the times mentioned in SOW-383/SOW-395 (eight business hours for workarounds, and four business days for fixed solution). Could you explicitly elaborate on these requirements?	SOW-366 in the Maintenance and Support Concept is a typo. And will be updated in a forthcoming amendment. The service level to be respected during Warranty and (Optional Maintenance and Support) Post-Warranty periods are the the SOW-383 and SOW-395.
29	SOW, p.62, SOW-384	The last sentence of SOW-384 states that "…the Contractor's response time at Purchaser site shall be within two business days from the moment of Purchaser notification. Our understanding is that this "2-business days of response time" is not included in the defect fixing time mentioned in SOW- 366, SOW-383 and SOW-395? Could you explicitly elaborate on this?	As explicitly written in SOW-384 and SOW-396: The Contractor shall integrate the provision of on-site service support within its maintenance services to be provided off-site from the Contractor's facilities, or on-site at the Purchaser facilities as required in case the issue cannot be resolved remotely or to support warranty releases and deployment and hand-over thereof. In case on-site support provision at the Purchaser facilities is required, the Contractor's response time at Purchaser site shall be within two business days from the moment of Purchaser notification. The 2 days are additional to the 4 business days requested in the SOW-383/SOW-395 for the patch release. Moreover the 2 additional days shall start: 1. If deemed necessary by Purchaser to accomplish the deployment 2. After the Purchaser notification of request for on-site support
30	SOW Annex-A, p.54, SRS-301	Is the Service Catalogue provided in [Ref-ATP-A2SL]? If not provided, could you please define Service Catalogue.	NATO Unclassified A2SL list provided (NU_20230406_A2SL)

31		Could you please provide guidance on obtaining the reference documents listed in ANNEX E of the bid package from the NCIA, or suggest an appropriate alternative way? Reference ID Reference Document Details R-ICD-AT-06.02.14-Map Agency Technical Instruction AI Tech 06.02.14 Service Interface Profile for Geospatial Services - Map Rendering Service 16 September 2016 R-ICD-Intel-FS-DM CO-115718-I2BE, INTEL-FS Spiral 2 NAF 4.0 L7 Information Model Data Dictionary - All Entities Nov 8, 2022 4:58 PM R-ICD-JOCWatch JOCWatch 4.1 Interface Control Document Oct 2022 R-ICD-FasInterop TOPFAS/LOGFAS ADL-FPH ORBAT Scemas version 2022.7 R-ICD-Namis Interface Control Document NAMIS v3.4.16 version 1.0 date 21/11/2018 R-ICD-NCOP2 Interface Control Document NCOP2 ICD 7 June 2022 R-ICD-TOPFAS-DM TOPFAS Increment-2 Software Design Specification Annex 1: Database Model (Desktop) 8/5/2020 R-ICD-TOPFAS-ICD TOPFAS Increment-2 Software Design Specification Annex 3: Interface Control Document (Desktop) 15/09/2020 R-ICD-SOA_IdM CO-14176-SOA-IDM Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and Identity Management Platform (IdM) Wave I Interface Control Document (ICD) Doc. Version: 15.0 Date: 08/06/2021 R-ICD-TOPFAS-Excel Empty Plan Collecting Sheet Months All Collectors Dated December 2022 R-ICD-LOGFAS LOGFAS INTERFACE CONTROL DOCUMENT 30-Jan-23 Version 8.0.0 C-M (2011)0042 NATO Policy on Cyber Defence (Restricted) Ref-Ccat NATO Communications and Information Agency Costed Customer Services Catalogue v7.1 2023 Service Definitions Ref-DEFP PO(2021)0360 Data Exploitation Framework Policy R-ICD-IEGC To be delivered (related documents send STANAG 4774, 4778) R-RGP AD 80-84 NATO Recognized Ground Picture R-4778.2-BindProf STANAG 4778.2 Profiles for Binding Metadata to a Data Object Edition A - Version 1 December 2020	These requested documents have been transmitted on 17 & 18 March 2023: - R-ICD-AT-06.02.14-Map Agency Technical Instruction AI Tech 06.02.14 Service Interface Profile for Geospatial Services - Map Rendering Service 16 September 2016 - R-ICD-JOCWatch JOCWatch 4.1 Interface Control Document Oct 2022 - R-ICD-Namis Interface Control Document NAMIS v3.4.16 version 1.0 date 21/11/2018 - R-ICD-NCOP2 Interface Control Document NCOP2 ICD 7 June 2022 - R-ICD-TOPFAS-DM TOPFAS Increment-2 Software Design Specification Annex 1: Database Model (Desktop) 8/5/2020 - R-ICD-TOPFAS-ICD TOPFAS Increment-2 Software Design Specification Annex 3: Interface Control Document (Desktop) 15/09/2020 - R-ICD-TOPFAS-Excel Empty Plan Collecting Sheet Months All Collectors Dated December 2022 - R-ICD-LOGFAS LOGFAS INTERFACE CONTROL DOCUMENT 30-Jan-23 Version 8.0.0 The remaining documents requested will be transmitted, except for: Note that STANAG 4774 and 4778.2 (included in document delivery) instead of [R-ICD-IEGC] shall be used.
32		ASOP-07.01.25 (NCI Academy Standard Operating Procedure - Grading and Assessment, May 2020)	This document will be transmitted.
33		NATO-Bi-SC-DIR-075-007 (NATO Bi-SC Education and Individual Training Directive (E&ITD) 075-007, September 2015)	This document will be transmitted.
34		[AI-16.31.03] NCIA - Agency Instruction 16.31.03, Requirements for the preparation of IPSP, Sep 2022	This document will be transmitted.
35		SOAIDM-SDS-APPL_SERVICES	Please refer to the document SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023.
36		SOAIDM-SDS-OBSERVABILITY	Please refer to the document SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023.
37		SOAIDM-SDS-LIFECYCLE_AUTOMATION	Please refer to the document SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023.
38		SOAIDM-SDS-INSTALLER	Please refer to the document SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023.
39		SOAIDM-SDS-ANNEXES	Please refer to the document SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023.
40		ITM-SDP	All ITM related requirements are generically provided in SRS and therefore are not provided separately as part of this IFB
41		R-ITM	All ITM related requirements are generically provided in SRS and therefore are not provided separately as part of this IFB
42		Ref-CPP-MJO+	Please disregard this reference.
43		Ref-ATP-A2SL	NATO Unclassified A2SL list provided (NU_20230406_A2SL)
44		NU_CO-13703-ITM_2.2.2_SDP_IaaS_v1.8	This document is not directly referenced in IFB, therefore not considered relevant for bid preparation and therefore are not provided separately as part of this IFB
45		DEMETER ICD	Unclear what bidder is requesting, DEMETER is the new Land C2 system to be delivered, therefore no ICD yet exists
46		Information Exchange Requirements (IERs) [MC 593/1] Minimum Level of Command and Control (C2) Service Capabilities in Support of Combined Joint NATO Led Operations	This document will be transmitted.
47		Information Exchange Requirements (IERs) [MC 0640] NATO Minimum Scale of Communications and Information Systems (CIS) Capabilities in the Land Tactical Level	This document will be transmitted.
48		SOA IDM Latest Release with All Annexes (Wave 2)	Please refer to the document SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023.
49		R-4774-CMLS	This document will be transmitted.
50		[NREF-11][AC/322-D(2019) 0038 (INV) CIS Security Technical and Implementation Directive for the Security of Web Applications.]	This document will be transmitted.
51		[R-4774-CMLS]	This document will be transmitted.
52		[R-4778.2-BindProf]	This document will be transmitted.
53		AGeoP-26 Ed A Ver 1 Defence Geospatial Web Services	Not directly referenced in IFB, therefore not considered relevant for bid preparation
54		AGeoP-08 Ed B Ver 1 NATO Geospatial Metadata Profile	Not directly referenced in IFB, therefore not considered relevant for bid preparation
55		AGeoP-11 Ed B Ver 1 NATO Geospatial Information Framework	Not directly referenced in IFB, therefore not considered relevant for bid preparation
56		STANAG 6523 Ed 1 Geospatial Web Services	Not directly referenced in IFB, therefore not considered relevant for bid preparation
57		STANAG 2586 Ed 2 NATO Geospatial Metadata Profile - AGeoP-8 Edition B	Not directly referenced in IFB, therefore not considered relevant for bid preparation
58		STANAG 2592 Ed 2 NATO Geospatial Information Framework - AGeoP-11(B) Ver. 1	Not directly referenced in IFB, therefore not considered relevant for bid preparation
59	Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.pdf tab "Criteria To Requirements" line 106	E23.06 is not linked to SRS requirements. Is this intentional?	SRS requirements are guidance for evaluation criteria , if there is no associated requirement, evaluation criteria shall be considered as is.
60	SOW Annex A, Page 9 SRS-027	This requirement refers to [NREF_JOEL] which is not mentioned in Chapter 2 of the SRS nor in 04-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xslx (References tab). Could you please provide the referenced document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	Use (NU) AC35-D(2002)-Directive on the Security of Information Rev 3
61	SOW Annex A, Page 10 SRS-029	This requirement refers to [NREF_TIDE] which is not mentioned in Chapter 2 of the SRS nor in 04-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xslx (References tab). Could you please provide the referenced document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	Use (NU) AC35-D(2002)-Directive on the Security of Information Rev 3
62	SOW Annex A, Page 11 SRS-039	This requirement refers to [N-JOEL] which is not mentioned in Chapter 2 of the SRS nor in 04-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xslx (References tab). Could you please confirm that the reference should be [NREF_JOEL] or else provide the referenced document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	Refer to (NU) AC35-D(2002)-DIRECTIVE ON THE SECURITY of INFORMATION-REV3, which has been transmitted before.
63	SOW Annex A, Page 15 SRS-063	This requirement refers to [REF_CCIR] which is not mentioned in Chapter 2 of the SRS nor in 04-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xslx (References tab). Could you please provide the referenced document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	This reference is no longer valid; please disregard.

64	SOW Annex A, Page 44 SRS-0248	This requirement refers to [R-ITM] which is not mentioned in Chapter 2 of the SRS nor in 04-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xslx (References tab). Could you please confirm that the reference should be [R-ICD-SOA_IdM], or else provide the referenced document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	ITM infrastructure requirements are seperately stated in SRS. SOA Requirements are provided as a reference document (SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023).
65	SOW Annex A, Page 50 SRS-287	This requirement refers to [MC 593/1, MC 0640] which is not mentioned in Chapter 2 of the SRS nor in 04-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xslx (References tab). Could you please provide the referenced document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	These documents will be transmitted.
66	SOW Annex A, Page 12 SRS-042	This requirement mentions "NATO formal message communication platforms (AIMS, NMS)". Could you provide information on what these communication platforms are?	Information related to AIMS/NMS is not considered relevant to the DEMETER bid.
67	SOW Annex A, Page 12 SRS-042	This requirement mentions "ORDERS in the correct format APP 11 (D)(1) so that it can be transferred to the destination with NATO formal message communication platforms (AIMS, NMS) manually". Could you elicit what "manually" means in the context of this requirement?	Manually means that DEMETER does not need to support automatic delivery.
68	SOW Annex A, Page 44 SRS-250	This requirement mentions "NERS environment". Can you provide information on this environment?	NERS is the NATO Enterprise Reference System, which imitates operational network, as such applications which comply with the SRS should be able to work in NERS.
69	SOW Annex A SRS-207	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However it seems that this requirement can be best verified by inspecting the maintenance procedures. Would you consider changing the verification method to "Inspection"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
70	SOW Annex A SRS-279	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However it seems that this requirement can be best verified by inspecting project documentation. Would you consider changing the verification method to "Inspection"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
71	SOW Annex A SRS-005	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
72	SOW Annex A SRS-007	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
73	SOW Annex A SRS-008	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
74	SOW Annex A SRS-080	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
75	SOW Annex A SRS-085	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
76	SOW Annex A SRS-086	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
77	SOW Annex A SRS-088	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
78	SOW Annex A SRS-089	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
79	SOW Annex A SRS-109	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
80	SOW Annex A SRS-110	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
81	SOW Annex A SRS-111	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
82	SOW Annex A SRS-144	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
83	SOW Annex A SRS-145	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
84	SOW Annex A SRS-166	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
85	SOW Annex A SRS-168	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
86	SOW Annex A SRS-274	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.

#	Reference	Comment	Response
87	SOW Annex A SRS-275	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
88	SOW Annex A SRS-277	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
89	SOW Annex A SRS-280	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
90	SOW Annex A SRS-282	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
91	SOW Annex A SRS-283	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
92	SOW Annex A SRS-288	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
93	SOW Annex A SRS-289	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
94	SOW Annex A SRS-307	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
95	SOW Annex A SRS-308	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
96	SOW Annex A SRS-309	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
97	SOW Annex A SRS-311	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
98	SOW Annex A SRS-312	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
99	SOW Annex A SRS-320	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
100	SOW Annex A: SRS-328	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
101	SOW Annex A: SRS-330	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
102	SOW Annex A: SRS-331	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
103	SOW Annex A: SRS-332	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
104	SOW Annex A: SRS-333	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
105	SOW Annex A SRS-334	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
106	SOW Annex A SRS-335	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
107	SOW Annex A SRS-336	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
108	SOW Annex A SRS-344	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
109	SOW Annex A SRS-347	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.

110	SOW Annex A SRS-348	The verification method of this requirement is set to "Test". However, it seems that verifying it is possible without "instrumentation, other special test equipment or specific test patterns to collect data for later analysis" (from section 1.4.3). Would you consider changing the verification method to "Demonstration"?	• These are suggested verification methods. • Refer to SOW paragraphs 4.2.1 and 8.13 which describe how this will be managed during the contract.
111	SOW Annex A Chapter 2 pages 3 and 4	This Chapter refers to "AD 80-84 NATO Recognized Ground Picture". Could you please provide this document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	This document will be transmitted.
112	SOW Annex A Chapter 2 pages 3 and 4	This Chapter refers to "NATO Policy on Cyber Defence". Could you please provide this document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	This document has been transmitted on 17 / 18 March 2023.
113	SOW Annex A Chapter 2 pages 3 and 4	This Chapter refers to "Command and Control of Allied Land Forces". Could you please provide this document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	This document has been transmitted on 17 / 18 March 2023.
114	SOW Annex A Chapter 2 pages 3 and 4	This Chapter refers to "NATO Communications and Information Agency Costed Customer Services Catalogue v7.1 2023Service Definitions". Could you please provide this document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	This document has been transmitted on 17 / 18 March 2023.
115	SOW Annex A Chapter 2 pages 3 and 4	This Chapter refers to "PO(2021)0360 Data Exploitation Framework Policy". Could you please provide this document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	This document will be transmitted.
116	SOW Annex A Chapter 2 pages 3 and 4	This Chapter refers to "To be delivered". Could you please provide this document which should be included in the IFB document pack?	Refers to LOGFAS ICD and provided with previous batch of documents.
117	Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix	There are no System Requirements Specifications for the Engineering Criteria E19, which relates to Training. Is this intentional?	SRS requirements are guidance for evaluation criteria , if there is no associated requirement, evaluation criteria shall be considered as is.
118		[AC322-D(2019)0034 (INV)] C3B -Consultation Command & Control Board C3 TAXONOMY BASELINE 3.1	This document will be transmitted.
119		[ACMP-2009-SRD-41] Examples of Configuration Management Plan Requirements, Ed.A V1, Mar 2017	This document will be transmitted.
120		[ACMP-2100] The Core Set of Configuration Management Contractual Requirements, Ed.A V.2, Mar 2017	This document will be transmitted.
121		[AD-070-001] ACO Directive 070-001 Allied Command Operations Security Directive, Dec 2021	This document will be transmitted.
122		[AI-16.31.03] NCIA - Agency Instruction 16.31.03, Requirements for the preparation of IPSP, Sep 2022	This document will be transmitted.
123		[ALP-10] NATO Guidance on Integrated Logistics Support for Multinational Armament Programs, Ed.C V1, 2017	This document will be transmitted.
124		[AQAP 4107] Mutual Acceptance of Government Quality Assurance and Usage of the Allied Quality Assurance Publications, Edition A, Version 2, Nov 2018	This document will be transmitted.
125		[AQAP-2070] NATO Mutual Government Quality Assurance (GQA) Process	This document will be transmitted.
126		[AQAP-2105] NATO Requirements for Quality Plans, Ed.C V1, Jan 2019	This document will be transmitted.
127		[AQAP-2110] NATO Quality Assurance Requirements for Design, Development and Production, Ed.D V1, Jun 2016	This document will be transmitted.
128		[AQAP-2210] NATO Supplementary SQA Requirements to AQAP-2110 or AQAP2310, Ed.A V2, Sep 2015	This document will be transmitted.
129		[ASD-AIA-SX000i] International Specification for Integrated Product Support (IPS), Issue No.3.0, Apr 2021	This document is available on the internet: https://www.sx000i.org/docs/SX000i%20Issue%203.0.pdf
130		[ASD-S3000L] International Procedure Specification for Logistic Support Analysis (LSA), Issue No.2.0, Apr 2021	This document is available on the internet: https://www.s3000l.org/docs/S3000L%20Issue%202.0.pdf
131		[ASOP-07.01.25] NCI Academy Standard Operating Procedure - Grading and Assessment, May 2020	This document will be transmitted.
132		[C-M(2002)49] Security within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization	This document will be transmitted.
133		[C-M(2015)0041] Alliance C3 Policy	This document will be transmitted.
134		[ISO/IEC/IEEE-29119] International Standard for Software Testing, 2022	This document is available on the internet: https://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/index.html
135		[ISO/IEC/IEEE-29148] International Standard for Systems and software engineering – Life cycle processes – Requirements engineering, 2011	This document can be obtained from ISO, see: https://www.iso.org/standard/72089.html
136		[ISO-9000:2015] Quality management systems – Fundamentals and vocabulary	This document can be obtained from ISO, see https://www.iso.org/standard/45481.html
137		[NATO-Bi-SC-DIR-075-007] NATO Bi-SC Education and Individual Training Directive (E&ITD) 075-007, Sep 2015	This document will be transmitted.
138		[NCIA-AD-06.00.16] NCIA - Agency Directive 06.00.16, Configuration Management, Feb 2020	This document will be transmitted.
139		[NCIA-AI-23.02] NCIA - Agency Instruction 23.02, Deployment Management Planning, Oct 2019	This document will be transmitted.
140		[NCIA-AI-TECH-06.03.01] NCIA - Agency Instruction 06.03.01, Identification of Software Assets, Jun 2016	This document will be transmitted.
141		[NCIA-SOP-06.03.05] NCIA – Agency Standard Operating Procedure 06.03.05, Software Patch Management, Oct 2020	This document will be transmitted.
142		[NCIA-SOP-23.01] NCIA – Agency Standard Operating Procedure 23.01, Enterprise IT Change Management, Mar 2020	This document will be transmitted.
143		[NREF-JOEL] Not in reference lists, but referenced from SRS-017 etc.	This document will be transmitted.
144		[Ref-ATP-A2SL] Not in reference lists, but referenced from SRS-296	NATO Unclassified A2SL list provided (NU_20230406_A2SL)
145		[Ref-DEFP] PO(2021)0360 Data Exploitation Framework Policy	This document will be transmitted.
146		[R-ICD-FasInterop] TOPFAS/LOGFAS ADL-FPH ORBAT Schemas version 2022.7	This document will be transmitted.
147		[R-ICD-IEGC]	Use STANAG 4774 and 4778.2 (included in document delivery) instead.
148		[R-ICD-Intel-FS-DM] CO-115718-I2BE, INTEL-FS Spiral 2 NAF 4.0 L7 Information Model Data Dictionary - All Entities Nov 8, 2022 4:58 PM	This document will be transmitted.
149		[R-ICD-NIRIS] Track Store Open API interface – original version to be provided	This document will be provided as soon as possible.
150		[R-ICD-SOA_IdM] CO-14176-SOA-IDM Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and Identity Management Platform (IdM) Wave I Interface Control Document (ICD) Doc. Version: 15.0 Date: 08/06/2021	Please refer to the document SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023.
151		[R-ITM] Not in reference lists, but referenced from SRS-248	R_ITM shall be ignored, the specifications of any system that shall operate in NATO enterprise environments are stated in SRS.
152		[R-RGP] AD 80-84 NATO Recognized Ground Picture	This document will be transmitted.
153		[R-SharePoint] Standard SharePoint message and content exchange protocols	Please refer to standard Microsoft Sharepoint documentation.
154		[SOA-IdM] SOA-IDM Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and Identity Management (IdM) Platform - Wave 1 - Interface Control Document (ICD) V15.0, Jun 2021 - System Design Specification (SDS) V9.3, May 2021	Please refer to the document SOAIDM Platform Integration Requirements, dated April 2023.
155		[STANAG-4107] Mutual Acceptance of Government Quality Assurance and Usage of the Allied Quality Assurance Publications	This document will be transmitted.
156		[STANAG-4427] Edition 3 - Configuration Management in System Life Cycle Management	This document will be transmitted.
157		[XSD-LC2IS] Interface Control Document (ICD) for LC2IS Inc 2 Contract no CO14463-LC2IS F0057 62794795 558 Rev M - Annex E LC2IS Inc 2 XML Schema Definition	Provided per email [XSD-LC2IS] ICD for LC2IS Inc 2 Annex E XML Schema Definition
158		Why is the price limit divided into CLINs 1-3 and 4, if CLINs 1-2 are basic and CLINs 3-4 are optional? Whether the price limit should refer to CLIN 1-2 and 3-4?	"CLINS 1-3 are about the investment and CLIN 4 is about Maintenance. So the dividing line is governed by the budget INV/O&M and not by the fact that some of the CLINS belong to the Base Contract and some are optional. Additionally, CLIN 3 is still an Evaluated Option."
159		In the labor tab there is only one column to enter labor rate (column „O"). Is it allowed to add columns to enter Unit Cost per MD for subsequent years?	No, it is not allowed to enter additional columns for subsequent years. If the Bidder however wishes to use different labour rates for subseqent years they can add additional rows and show separate labour rates or unit costs for each CLIN in a separate row.

160	AMD1 Book I-Annex A-Bidding Sheets Tab "CLIN Summary"	Could you please precise in which CLIN do we include the WP3 initiation phase? The bidding sheet doesn't mention the §4.2.x as done in CLINs 1.2.1/1.2.2/2.2.1/2.2.2.	There is no specific sub-CLIN in CLIN 3 for the cost of the WP 3 initiation phase. When exercised, these costs should be spread across the exercised sub-CLINs.
161	AMD1 Book I-Annex A-Bidding Sheets Tab "CLIN Summary"	Could you please confirm that we have to include the Project Management costs in the M&S CLINs?	Please spread all costs across the sub-CLINs and related detail tabs (Labour, Material, Travel, ODC)
162	Bidding Sheets Tab "CLIN Summary"	According to the bidding sheets, the M&S CLINs must be priced in man/days (labour tab). Could you consider a pricing in lump sum price per year based on a percentage of the license fee(material Tab)? This would be in line with the usual business model for the M&S of a COTS	Under consideration
163	Annex A-Bidding Sheets Tabs "Labour, Material, Travel"	We understand that the contract will last for 12 years & two months. However the bidding sheets file only presents columns for ten years to indicate man days (idem for Material & Travel) per year. Could you please confirm there is no mistake? If not, how do we proceed for CLINs 4.8/4.9/4.10	Bidding Sheets updated to accommodate 15 years (bidding sheets provided with AMD4)
164	Annex A-Bidding Sheets & Book I-Bidding Instructions	Given the fact that there is an economic price adjustment formula, the bidding sheets only takes into account current (2023) labour cost and others (tab Rates). Could you please confirm that the bidding sheets file must only be based on current costs when the price evaluation takes into account a calculated present value?	The inclusion of Economic Price Adjustment (EPA) for the future contract and use of Present Value (PV) calculation during the evaluation serve different purposes. The EPA provides relief of some pricing uncertainty for future prices/quotes/rates by allowing the payment amounts to be adjusted for inflation, per the formula specified. The PV evaluation is used given the long duration of the contract to take into account the time value of money for the Purchaser so that appropriate weighting is given to both near term and long term requirements. The contract price at award will still be the Bidder's proposed price and it is to the Bidder's discretion how to account for the other factors in their proposed price. For example if additional labour rates, unit costs, travel costs or ODCs are needed that can be done by using additional rows in the detailed tabs (Labour, Material, Travel, ODC) and show separate labour rates or unit costs for each CLIN in a separate row.
165	Annex A-Bidding Sheets Tab "Payment Schedule" and SOW),§1.4	The SOW and the bidding sheets file indicate different dates for the PSA & FSA WP2 milestones for the project. Could you please indicate which one is correct? (Payment Schedule tab & SOW §1.4)	The SOW is correct and bidding sheets have been amended accordingly (AMD4)
166		To be able to provide our best offer, we kindly request an extension of the BCD of at least 1 month.	Bid Closing date was amended to May 15 2023 in Amendment 1 and is amended further to May 31 2023 in Amendment 4
167		Could you please confirm if we can sign the documents electronically with an Official Certificate or if it must be a handwritten signature?	The documents may be electronically signed
168	BOOK II, Part II Contract Special Provisions, 17.9 BOOK II, Part III Contract General Provisions, 30.2.2	If we deliver COTS software (within the scope of WP1 and WP2) the provisions of Sec. 17.9 of BOOK II, Part II Contract Special Provisions and sec. 30.2.2 of BOOK II, Part III Contract General Provisions saying about unlimited number of users (or licenses) do not apply (i.e. COTS are purchased in a specific number of licenses)? However, in case when we modify the COTS software by adding new functionalities within the scope of WP3, then such COTS software, which is the base for derivative product (final product), is to be understood as Contractor Background IPR and according to above provisions can be used and exploit by an unlimited number of users within NATO and NATO members?	Under consideration
169	06_IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER_Book II-Part II Special Provisions, Article 14	The confidentiality and non-disclosure provisions set out in Article 14 of Part II Contract Special Provisions are currently drafted as one-way. A variation is requested to ensure that the confidentiality and non-disclosure provisions are reciprocal in the final drafting.	No variation will be implemented in the clause
170	07-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book II-Part III-Contract General Provisions, Clause 14.2	This clause provides that the Facility Representative will determine whether the Purchaser's Facilities are provided free of charge, or determine what charges are payable. For transparency and understanding, please can you provide clarity as to the assessment criteria for determining when the charges will apply i.e. only in the event of re-test, and the relevant price list?	There is no circumstances foreseen where the purchaser would charge the contractor for access to purchaser's facilities.
171	07-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book II-Part III-Contract General Provisions, Clause 16	This clause provides a unilateral change control process requiring the Contractor to act as if a change control has been approved until advised otherwise, irrespective of whether the Contractor agrees or considers the work achievable etc. Requiring the Contractor to proceed with the change as part of the contract prior agreement (as per clause 16.7) is an unusual and onerous clause which could lead to avoidable dispute or breach. A variation is requested, amending the change control process to a mutual process, requiring the agreement of both the Contractor and Purchaser prior to a change forming part of the binding contract scope.	The changes clause is unique to Government or International Organizations contracts and it is meant to allow the Purchaser flexibility in executing an unileral Contract amendment. It does not require a mutual agreement, but the Contractor may request for an Equitable adjustment afterwards. The cases in which it can be used are also limited as detailed in the provision.
172	Contract General Provisions, Clause 19.3 and Clause 28	These clauses provide for a full right of audit, including an audit of pricing. A waiver is requested so that any such audit relates only to bespoke development and other services provided under the contract, but does not permit inspection and interrogation of prices, development processes and other data as it relates to third party COTS products.	The waiver will not be granted.
173	Special Provisions, Article 6.7 Part II And CGP Clause 25.7	Please can the Purchaser confirm that Article 6.7 Part II Contract Special Provisions replaces clause 25.7 General Contract Provisions rather than supplementing it?	Article 6.7 of CSP replaces Article 25.7 "Invoices and Payment" of the Contract General Provisions.
174	Contract General Provisions, Clause 21.7	Purchaser remedies available under this contract provide that the Purchaser can elect, at their sole discretion, to have the contractor fix defects, require all information to be passed to Purchaser to allow Purchaser to remedy any defect with Contractor covering the costs, or for there to be a reduction in contract value. A variation is requested to define an order of precedence in respect of these remedies, and to enable the Contractor an opportunity to take remedial action in the first instance. Only where the Contractor fails to remedy within a reasonably agreed timeframe, or where there is termination following breach, shall the Purchaser seek to remedy the defect itself or through third parties, with any additional costs being charged to the Contractor.	The variation will not be granted.
175	Special Provisions, Article 22 Part II	This Article, in its current drafting, is contrary to standard software maintenance provisions which provide for bug fixes, new releases etc. to be made available as part of the maintenance package. A waiver is therefore requested for this Article. Alternatively, if the intent of this Article was to address instances where a COTS product is discontinued and a new product is released in its place (distinct from upgrades etc. as part of maintenance), a variation is requested to remove the language referring to upgrades in order to add clarity to this Article.	CSP Article 22.1 is amended to read: " If any COTS products specified in the Contract are discontinued by their original providers for commercial or technological reasons, the Contractor shall propose their substitution by the new versions that are intended as market replacement of the original products. The proposed items shall provide an equivalent or enhanced performance without a price or life- cycle support cost increase and the Contractor shall be responsible for the installation, integration and transition of data and information to the new version."
176	Contract General Provisions, Clause 42.6	A waiver is requested of clause 42.6 as it unreasonably restricts the legal recourse of the Contractor in the event of dispute. Whilst it is the intention of the parties in the event of any dispute to follow the dispute resolution procedures and seek to reach settlement by mutual agreement, and further to furnish the Contracting Authority with all facts, evidence and proof during the early dispute resolution process, the Contractor cannot be limited in arbitration only to that evidence previously identified and issued previously raised, as other matters may become evident throughout the process. It is agreed that reasonable efforts should be taken to ensure that all matters are raised, and facts, evidence and proof produced to the Contracting Authority in advance, but to limit disclosures and remedies as per the current drafting is inequitable.	The waiver will not be granted.
177	CGP Clause 42	It is usual in arbitration clauses to define the language of arbitration, but this is not specified in clause 42 General Contract Provisions. A variation is requested to specify the language of arbitration as English in the final drafting.	Variation granted will be implemented in the Contract Special Provisions of the final contract to specify English as the language for arbitration.

178	Contract General Provisions, Clause 31.6	The COTS product does not include all required information detailed at clause 31.6 as standard. To include this would result in development of a bespoke release of the COTS product specific to NATO meaning that it would not be part of the standard COTS roadmap. As such a variation to clause 31.6 is requested to exclude COTS products. It is proposed that this information instead be provided in a cover sheet or separate read- me file.	A variation will be granted. CSP will be amended to replace or supplement CGP 31.6
179	Bidding Instructions, Clause 4.8, Post Evaluation Test Drive	The bidder understands that a post evaluation test drive will be conducted with the winner selected from the best value exercise. In order to get the best value out of this tender process, the bidder recommends the following changes to the post evaluation test drive: 1. The test drive should be conducted with the the three highest scored bidders from the best value exercise. 2. 4.8.1.4 should be changed to that all evaluation criteria in TVCRM that is marked as COTS available should be tested. 3. 4.8.3.3.6 should be changed so an unsuccessful test drive will determine the Bidder's Offer to be non-compliant.	The test drive procedures will remain as stated in the Book I Bidding Instructions
180	Book II Part III-Contract General Provisions §21, page N°25 21.8	"When NQAR is not applicable based on the scale of the project, the Purchaser reserves the right to perform inspections through his own staff in accordance with the latest ISO standard at the time of inspection." Could you confirm that Contractor shall comply with the latest ISO standard at the time of contract signature? Could you confirm that it is also valid for other standards (administrative or technical)?	We confirm that the contractor shall comply with the ISO standard for which certifcation is required in Book I, Annex B
181	Contract Special provisions – § 17, page N°17, 17.5	"This licence shall also allow the Purchaser and its member nations to use and authorise others to use the software for further adaptation, integration, modifications and future procurements." Could you confirm that this article applies to the Foreground IPR only? Could you define "others"?	Under consideration
182	Contract Special provisions – § 17, page N°17, 17.7	"The Contractor warrants, undertakes, and represents that any derivative product created under this Contract from the stated Background IPR shall be considered as Foreground IPR and, therefore, shall be governed by the terms and conditions specified in Clause 30.3 (Foreground IPR) of the Contract General Provisions." Could you confirm that a derivative product is restricted to the adaptations realized in WP3? If not, could you define a derivative product?	Indeed, a derivative product is restricted to the adaptations realized in WP3
183	Statement of Work (SOW), [SOW-526]	What is the impact of having AQAP certificates of approval (2110, 2210 or 2310) on the requirement related to approval of QA procedures aspects?	The QAP has to comply with AQAP 2105. The Purchaser will review it and agree on the proposed Quality activities. The Contractor having a ISO9001 certification does not mean that the developed QAP for this project is 'accepted' by default.
184	Contract General Provisions,§30.2.2 & Special Provisions,§17.8 & Annex A-Bidding Sheets & Statement of Work (SOW),§3.6, [SOW-038]	The Special provisions and the SOW ask for no additional fee due to further re-transfer of the software or additional end user while the bidding sheet asks for a price to cover a right to use for 500 users. Considering a lot of COTS have a license model based on numbers of users, instances, capacities, would you mind to align the different related clauses in the Special provisions and SOW to take into account these existing licensing models and the limit fixed of 500 users?	Under consideration
185	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf	Can you confirm that a criterion (or top-level criterion) is a line in the TVCRM with value 3 in column B of the TCVRM?	Confirmed
186	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf	Can you confirm that a sub criterion is a line in the TVCRM with value 4 in column B of the TCVRM?	Confirmed
187	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf § 4.2.5.3 page 26	"The sub criteria are listed in descending order which reflects the relative importance that the Purchaser places on each sub criterion". Is the descending order relative to the whole set of sub criteria (value 4 in column B of the TCVRM) or does the descending order reflect Purchaser's priorities within each top-level criterion (value 3 in column B of the TCVRM)?	This should read as: "The level 3 criteria are listed in descending order which reflects the relative importance that the Purchaser places on each criterion"
188	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf § 3.5.5.2. page 21	Can the mapping of a sub-criterion include several sections of the Technical Bid?	Yes, the mapping of a sub-criterion may include several sections of the Technical Bid, however the reference must be specific
189	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf § 4.8.1.5.	"The Test Drive will be deemed successful if all Test Scenarios in the Final Test Plan are successfully demonstrated per the Acceptance criteria defined by the Purchaser": when will the Acceptance criteria be made available to the apparent winner?	The Acceptance criteria for the Test Drive will be made available to the apparent winner at DO+2 weeks (Draft Test Plan).
190	Book I-Bidding Instructions § 4.5.2.1.2.	"For each of the listed engineering criteria and sub-criteria". Can you confirm that this should read "For each of the listed engineering sub-criterion"?	Book I is being amended to read: "For each of the listed engineering sub-criteria, the Bidder shall provide the following evidence…"
191	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf § 4.3.3.3.2.	This para refers to "a composite score […] in any of the sub-criteria". What does the term "composite score" refer to?	The "composite score" reffers to the score at sub-criterion level
192	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf § 4.3.3.3.2.	This para refers to "a composite score of less than 20% of the maximum score possible in any of the sub-criteria". What method will be used to compute both the maximum score and the composite score of a bidder at sub-criterion level?	Maximum score is the highest score possible. The method to calculate it is procurement sensitive information.
193	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf § 3.2.1.	The filename required for technical videos is "115791-DEMETER-Company Name–Vol-III– Tech005-Part I-Technical-Videos-NoX.mp4 (where 'X' is number)". Since Powerpoint files are acceptable, can we assume that their filename would be "115791-DEMETER-Company Name–Vol-III–Tech005-Part I-Technical-Videos-NoX.ppt (where 'X' is number)"?	Yes, that assumption is correct.
194	Book I-Bidding Instructions	Could you please confirm that the post evaluation test drive won't address features that are planned as part of the product roadmap (sub-criterion S02.01)?	Please refer to paragraph 4.8 of the Bidding Instructions for a description of the post evaluation test drive.
195	Book I-Bidding Instructions	How will the product roadmap (features under development that will be available for WP2) be considered in the bid's engineering notation?	From an engineering perspective, only currently available capabilities are assessed.
196	SOW Annex-A, p.63, SRS-350	What does "similar products" and "other document templates" refer to?	• SRS-350 is for guidance purposes. • Products (documents) that have similar content (e.g. OPLAN/CONOPS) shall be produced by templates designed by the HQs within NCS.
197	SOW Annex-A, p.5, SRS-003	What kinds of files the "Information Products (IP)" include?	• SRS-003 is for guidance purposes. • Information Products are HQ produced or used files/data that have importance to Operation (e.g. OPLAN/CONOPS/OPORD)
198	SOW Annex-A, p.53, SRS-296	Does NATO Database Platform support NoSQL databases? If not, is it mandatory to use RDBMS? If so, this clashes with SRS-297 which states a condition "if DEMETER is based on RDBMS".	• SRS-296 is for guidance purposes. • At the moment PLT006 Service doesn't support NoSQL databases. Service re-use is part of NATO policy and Agency Directives and is the preferred option. Should there be deviation from these guidelines, the implications of this will be reviewed as part of the bid evaluation.

#	Reference	Question	Answer
199	SOW Annex-A, p.39, SRS-213	It is not clear with which system does the "Connectivity Status" needs to be shown. Also what is the exact meaning of the "view" mentioned in the "last update time of the view" statement.	• SRS-213 is for guidance purposes. • View means in this context the information presented on the screen. Connectivity status refers to the same information that the view presents.
200	SOW Annex-A, p.28, SRS-140	Is there any other implications of "micro environments" such as physical dimension restrictions and hardware resource specifications in addition to number of users less than ten?	NATO operational environment types consist of environments with limited resources, such as deployable environments; SRS contains the requirements.
202	SRS-058, SRS-059	The API between Demeter and NATO Intelligence System is needed. Also, use cases of the services in the API are needed. • When and how to call each service of the API • What to do in fail/success scenarios for each service	Document is provided together with the Amendment 4
203	SOW Annex-A, p.60, SRS-334	Is the "Plan Collection Sheet" will be part of a plan (attachment or main text) or will DEMETER only give the ability to fill and send the excel sheet separately?	The preferred solution is to have an automated interface with TOPFAS; other options may be possible and will be evaluated.
204	Book II Part IV, SOW Annex-A, p.36, SRS-152	What are the infrastructure and platform requirements of NATO DCIS nodes infrastructure?	NATO operational environment types consist of environments with limited resources, such as deployable environments; SRS contains the functionalities.
205	Book II Part IV, SOW Annex-A, p.50, SRS-247	This requirement related to the useability of DEMETER, underlines the need for a format able usage statistics for administrative purposes, without specifying what is exactly considered as usage statistics. We have considered possible use cases and interpreted that the following usage statistics information could be of use for the customer's administrative purposes: • Which users have not logged in to the system for a certain period of time (maybe for the longest time with respect to the others) • Which users have logged in at least once during the last X hours/days/months • Which applications/workspaces are most frequently used (Which features are most frequently used) • Which application/workspace was last used when • Which applications/workspaces have not been used for the longest time Can you please confirm if our interpretation above is correct or provide us with further explanation otherwise? And as for the "format able" part of this requirement, is there a specific format required or preferred?	SRS requirements for usabilty are only for guidance. Supplier should consider how well they meet the evaluation criteria related to usability.
206	Book I 3.2.1	The document labelling for Price and TVCRM suggest ".xls" Excel format but the provided files are ".xlsx" Can one submit Excel files in ".xlsx" format?	Yes, on the condition that it can be processed with Excel 2016.
207	BOOK II, Part II – 7.7	Could the Purchaser present the calculation of the Economic Price Adjustment based on sample data from previous years? When submitting an offer, we would like to make sure that we understand correctly what kind of input data we should enter into the calculations.	Under consideration
208	SOW [23],Book I 3.5.7.5.1, Responses to Clarification Questions, Release Number 1, #20	Please confirm, if you request the Contractor to develop all requirements stated in the SRS into its COTS product before PSA WP2 that are currently not implemented or partially implemented.	The Purchaser requests the Contractor to develop all requirements stated as criteria and sub-criteria in the TVCRM before PSA WP2. The SRS is allowing the supplier to understand NCIA's expectations of a Land C2 COTS. Specifically, SRS defines minimum requirements for security and interoperability.
209	Book I-Bidding Instr	Is it required to have a traceability with the SRS in the product description?	Not, that is not required.
210	Book I-Bidding Instr. § 4.2.5.3 page 26	How will subcriteria priority (which formula) be taken into account in the computation of ES?	The L3 criteria, as listed in col B of TVCRM are in priority order as per col A, L4 sub-criteria priority are also listed in col A.
211	Book II-Part I – Prospective contract	Will it be possible to sign electronically all documents that NCIA may require from the bidders and eventually the contract by the preferred bidder? In that case does a pdf document signed with a company "internal" certification authority is acceptable or do you request a public trusted version of the electronic signature?	Yes. A company "internal" certification authority is acceptable
212	Book II-Part I-Prospective Contract	In case the Bidder submits an offer as a consortium, could you please confirm that all consortium members will be mentioned under section 5 "Contractor" of the NCI AGENCY CONTRACT, if awarded?	Only the lead contractor from a consortium will be listed under section 5 "Contractor" of the NCI AGENCY CONTRACT, if awarded
213	05-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book II-Part I-Prospective Contract	In case the Bidder acts as a consortium, could you please specify whether the consortium members will be paid separately?	All payments executed under the contract will be made to the lead contractor under the consortium.
214	Book I-Bidding Instructions	Does the NCIA expect the bidders to state they are compliant to all the SOW requirements (through a compliance matrix)?	The purchaser expects contractor's compliancy with the SOW.
215	Special Provisions. §15 & Statement of Work (SOW), §2.1	Could you clarify what kind and how much NR information the contractor will have to handle in its premises? Are the two furnished NR laptops sufficient for this purpose? How will be established the connection between the contractor & the NCIA to share NR documents?	The Purchaser expects the two NR laptops to be sufficient to handle all the NR information (which is mostly related to accreditation work).
216	Book I-Bidding Instr §1.6.3 & CSP §15	Could you confirm that the Contractor won't need to store in its premises NS material?	The Purchaser confirms there is no need to store NS material at the contractor's premises.
217	Book I-Bidding Inst	Are we allowed to accelerate some sequences in the video provided for evaluation?	Yes, but if the video has been accelerated, the Bidder must clearly indicate this and specify the original duration.
218	Book I-Bidding Instr	The paragraph §3.5.5.2 asks to "complete the TVCRM by including Bidder's mapping (reference) each evaluation criteria and sub-criteria to a specific section of the Technical Bid". The TVCRM Excel file guidance says that "Bidder's inputs are required only in fields with orange background". Only sub-criteria are in orange in the TVCRM file. Criteria contains "N/A" and are not in orange. Do we have to only fulfil, in the TVCRM Excel file, the sub criteria lines or to fulfil the criteria and the sub criteri?	Only the L4 sub-criteria. 3.5.5.2 should read as "complete the TVCRM by including Bidder's mapping (reference) of each evaluation sub-criteria to a specific section of the Technical Bid"
219	Book I-Annex A-Bidding Sheets	In the Bidding sheets CLIN Summary tab, WP3 payment milestones have fixed dates (CA+X) regardless of the effective date of option exercised which may be at any moment before 6 months after CA (Bidding instructions 1.3.4.6) : please clarify	Under consideration

220	Contract GeneralProvisions,Clause 31.4 and21.7	The bidder would like to request a waiver in respect of COTS products at clause 31.4.4 General Contract Provisions and any other Purchaser remedy under the Contract (including clause 21.7.1 General Contract Provisions) whereby the Contractor is required to supply all materials and instructions to the Purchaser to enable them to remedy any defect and pay all costs reasonably incurred. These clauses appear to be tailored toward the supply of hardware, but do not make sense when applied to software as they do not provide for the best solution for the Purchaser. The Purchaser does not have access to the COTS building environment, and modifications/defect remedy by Purchaser or other third party would be inappropriate and difficult to deploy. Furthermore such modifications/defect remedy by the Purchaser or third party would not be possible due to IP restrictions. The Purchaser is already well covered by the Service Level Agreement which will ensure remedy of defects. The advantage in purchasing a COTS product is that it is a mature product and therefore defects are less likely to occur. Additionally, if a Purchaser or third party made changes to COTS software such as defect fixing, these changes would not be supported as part of the COTS product or maintenance and could result in future upgrades or updates not working effectively or at all, which again would be unsupported as a result of the prior fix not provided by the Supplier. It is very unusual to require a COTS product to be capable of defect remedy by the Purchaser. Instead, the obligation should be on the Supplier to provide such remedy as would be true of large international suppliers such as Microsoft. In light of the above, defect fixing in COTS software is requested to be limited to the Supplier, with no permission or reserved rights for any third party (including the Purchaser). For clarity, this waiver request does not impact the rights of the Purchaser as it relates to any bespoke development (foreground IP).	Under consideration
221	Question to Answer 124 and 125.	Apart from support on inquiries and assessments from National Authorities within Prime Quality Assurance Conditions and Supplementary Quality Assurance Conditions. How does the purchaser suggest we as a potential supplier best support to comply with the AQAP 4107 and AQAP 2070 requirements, as these regulate how Quality Assurance services are provided between NATO Nations.	The aim of these AQAPs is primarily to regulate how Mutual Government Quality Assurance of defence products should be performed to establish confidence that the contractual requirements relating to quality are met. Specifically, in AQAP-2070 there are examples in Annex A – GQA supporting processes, which provides a view on inputs provided by the supplier and Annex B - Templates as Example of a Certificate of Conformity (CoC). These are applicable for use by suppliers. The diagram in Annex A of AQAP-4107 explains the applicability of AQAPs in contracts. It is noted that: - the Supplier's obligations are assumed, through the contractual Quality Requirements e.g. AQAP 2110 para. 5.4.12 and 5.6. - it is an AQAP 2110 and 2310 requirement that the Supplier establishes the cause of the nonconformity and takes appropriate corrective action to prevent recurrence.
222	AMDT3 : answers to questions 20, 59, 117, 196, 197, 198, 199, 205	If the SRS are for guidance only, could you specify when the final SRS requirements will be provided? If the SRS are for guidance only, could you clarify why the prospective contract quote the SOW and its annexes that contain the SRS? Consequently, how can we commit on a fix and firm price offer? If there are variations between the SRS for guidance and the final ones, could you confirm that those will be subject to a Change Order? If the SRS are only for guidance, could you clarify § 3.4.1.5. that indicates "The structure of the Bidding Sheets shall not be changed, other than as indicated elsewhere, nor should any quantity or item description in the Bidding Sheets. The currency(ies) of each Contract Line Item and sub-item shall be shown. The prices provided shall be intended as the comprehensive total price offered for the fulfilment of all requirements as expressed in the IFB documentation including but not limited to those expressed in the SOW and Software Requirements Specification (SRS)." Could you explain to what to comply? Evaluation Criteria? When you state that "All features are to be delivered by PSA of WP2." (answer to question 20), could you precise which feature you are talking about?	Under consideration
223	Book I - Annex D-TVCRM.xslx, Book I - Annex E	The description of sub-criterion E12.01 is not the same in both documents. Can you please provide a single description for E12.01?	Under consideration
225	Book I - Annex D-TVCRM.xslx,	The description of sub-criterion E04.11 is not the same in both documents. Can you please provide a single description for E04.11	Under consideration
226	Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xlsx	Requirements SRS-182, SRS-244,SRS-245 and SRS-246 are associated to E11.03 "DEMETER shall be easy to learn.", but are technical requirements with no impact on learnability. Can you provide guidance as to which subcriteria this requirements should be linked?	Under consideration
227	06_IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER_Book II-Part II Special Provisions	The Contract's SP is stating §17.3: « Any use by the Purchaser of Contractor Background IPR for the purpose of carrying out work pursuant to the Contract shall, subject to any obligation on the part of the Contractor to make payments to any third party in respect of IPR which is licensed from such third party, be free of any charge to Purchaser. The Contractor hereby grants to the Purchaser a non-exclusive, royalty-free and irrevocable licence throughout NATO, NATO operations (including out of area operations) and/or among NATO member nations to use and authorise others to use any Contractor Background IPR for the purpose of exploiting or otherwise using the Foreground IPR for any purpose." 1. Can the Agency define "others"? 2. Can the Agency clarify the meaning of "for any purpose"	Under consideration
228	SRS-275, SRS-276 SOW-325	SRS refers to different "modes of operation" e.g. training, demo and operational, whereas SOW mentions "multiple instances of an approved baseline release (up to four: operational instance, exercise instance, training instance and test instance)". Can you clarify the relationship between instances and modes of operation?	"Modes of operation" and "instances" are the same. Supplier shall ensure system is capable of providing all these modes of operation/instances.
229	SOW 4.1.1. Figures 4.1 & 4.2	Can the Purchaser clarify the position of the DMT and UAT on these timelines?	Figure 4.1: DMT and UAT are part of the WP1 configuration phase, also refer to Figure 4.4 which gives more details. Figure 4.2: DMT is part of the WP2 configuration phase, also refer to Figure 4.5 which gives more details.
230	Annex A – Bidding Sheets, Tab "CLIN Summary"	Can the Purchaser clarify in which CLIN the DMT, UAT and SiAT activities can be placed?	For WP1: in CLIN 1.4.1 and 1.4.2. For WP2: in CLIN 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.
231	Bidding Sheets, Tab "CLIN Summary"	Can the Purchaser clarify in which CLIN the Factory Acceptance Phase (page 16, Table 3.1 of the SOW), activities should be placed?	For WP1: in CLIN 1.4.2. For WP2: in CLIN 2.3.2.
232	SOW Table 4.2,	Where will take place the site survey and the activation related to the deployable CIS configuration? Could you clarify "Europe" in table 4.2? Is it Brunssum?	The installation location is either the location of the deployable kit in one of the joint HQs (JFC Brunssum, JFC Naples) or LANDCOM or a remote access terminal to the deployable kit.
233	SOW, Table 4.1, p45 & Annex A-Bidding Sheets	"1 iteration for the train the trainer courses": it is also mentioned that the train the trainer courses are for two locations (Izmir and The Hague – reference: Bidding sheets). Could you confirm if there are 1 or 2 train the trainer courses?	There is 1 train the trainer course. Dependent on the location of the students, this will be in The Hague or Oeirias.
234	SOW Page 45 : Table 4.1	In the SOW some paragraphs with "the Contractor shall" statement are not numbered as [SOW-X]: please confirm whether they are to be considered as SOW requirements: 4.3.2.2.4, 4.3.2.2.5, 4.8.4.4 (end of the paragraph).	Under consideration
235	SOW [SOW 339], p53	"(4) The Contractor has resolved all critical and high severity defects": Could you define "high severity defect"? Is it "major" defect, as defined in page 32?	Yes, this should read as: "The Contractor has resolved all CRITICAL and MAJOR defects discovered during this phase and provided updated baseline releases, as required;"

236	SOW [121, 124, 128], p35	TRR (Training Readiness Review) is mentioned in the table of Figure 4.1. However, it does not appear in any timeline related to Figure 4.1, 4.2 or 4.3. Could you define when in the timeline TRR occurs and could you confirm that this milestone (TRR) enables the initiation of the Training courses?	The TRR milestone will occur between EDC and EDC+6 months. It is the Contractor's responsibility to plan accordingly for this, in order not to jeopardize specified milestone dates.
237	SOW, 4.3.5.3 [SOW-337], p53	The paragraph is not addressing additional training that may be needed due to differences between the COTS versions delivered for PSA and FSA, whereas "Maintenance and Support for training licences" is included in the bidding sheets for WP2. Who is responsible for this additional training (Contractor or NCIA)? Same question for the 10 years support.	Only training for WP1 is included in the project. Training to be given after WP1, including during the 10 years support is the Purchaser's responsibility, either internally or thru a separate contract.
238	SOW 4.3.5.3 [SOW-337], p53	The paragraph is not addressing the training courses that may be necessary for the additional sites where DEMETER is deployed during WP2 or for sites deployed in WP1 (refresh due to adaptations and evolutions in the COTS version for WP2). How is the training in the new additional sites taken into account? Who is responsible for this training (Contractor or NCIA)?	Only training for WP1 is included in the project. Training to be given after WP1, including during the 10 years support is the Purchaser's responsibility, either internally or thru a separate contract.
239	SOW,[SOW-018]	Apart full disk encryption, is there other requirements (HW/SW) about workstations connected to the NSF?	Workstations that connect to NSF shall use up-to-date operating system and virus protection, and to connect NSF, VPN shall be used for authorized users to fully utilize NSF (VM access, etc).
240	Statement of Work (SOW), [SOW-041]	Could you please clarify the frequency of the Project Board meetings?	In principle the project board meetings will be conducted quarterly. If the project status requires this, the frequency may be increased.
241	Statement of Work (SOW), [SOW-028] ; [048] ; §3.5	Could you please clarify which costs are to be taken into account by the bidders? [048] indicates a lot of purchaser furnished services (licenses included?) while [SOW-028] seems to indicate the contrary. "The Contractor shall include the associated costs for the Microsoft Azure Cloud Services and tooling in its price estimation." Could you please provide the different costs related to the mandatory azure Services that are to be funded by the contractor? Has the IaaS services (compute) to be funded by the contractor? Could you please describe the services available in the other platforms (IVVQ testbed, Support & Reference)?	Under consideration
242	Statement of Work (SOW)	Could you provide the list of supported OS?	- Windows Server 2016/2019/2022 - Red Hat Enterprise Linux 7.X (excl. 7.4)/ 8.4 - Oracle Linux 8.4 - Windows Client 10 (21H1) /11 (21H2)
243	SOW, Annex B ; & Book I-Annex A-Bidding Sheets	"[214] ICD documents are included for reference in order for the Contractor to be able to assess the complexity and scope; ICD documents may be updated during contract execution." Could you please confirm that the provision of some developments is mandatory for all the interfaces listed as you indicate that the ICDs may be updated? When the final versions of the ICDs will be fixed?	Throughout the duration of the project, ICDs may be updated. Therefore, it is expected that some developments may be needed for all of the interfaces. The ICD documents will be baselined after EDC and before start of the development work. Any changes to interfaces after that, will be handled through the use of the change management process.
244	Annex A-Bidding Sheets (CLIN 1.5)	Could you please confirm that the training delivery is expected to be completed for all sites between EDC+6M and EDC+8M?	Confirmed.
245	Book I - Annex D-TVCRM.xlsx (E19.01 - D.1.3.1)	"E19.01 - D.1.3.1" DEMETER shall refine both Land C2 Training Needs Analysis, and Land C2 Training Requirements Analysis." Could you confirm what are the documents provided by NATO that could help refine the TNA & TRA ? When would they be available?	The Contractor has to assume that the TNA document will have to be produced from scratch. For TRA, it should be assumed that there will not be a prior developed document, refer to [SOW-267] for the course of action: [SOW-267] The Task Analysis shall refine a prior developed (as part of a Training Requirements Analysis (TRA) Report), or perform a new Performance Gap Analysis to assess the gap between the current skills of the target audience and the tasks they will be expected to perform in the use and support of the system, in order to determine which performance gaps can be addressed by training.
246	SOW Page 45 : Table 4.1	Level of expertise / profile per training type : Could you confirm if several levels of expertise or profile are expected for each course type? If different levels are expected, could you provide more details?	Under consideration
247	SOW Page 45 : Table 4.1	Train the trainers : Could you provide more details on train the trainers expectations? Would NATO trainers need to cover all course types (user, Functional Admin, System Admin) or only for User courses? Would NATO trainers have attended user, Functional Admin, System Admin courses prior to the train the trainers course	Yes, they would need to cover all course types and the bidder can assume that they will have attended the courses as mentioned prior to the train-the-trainers course.
248	SOW Book I-Annex A-Bidding Sheets	SOW - Section 4.2.1 Kick-off meeting [SOW-231] For WP1, the Contractor shall deliver to the Purchaser no later than two weeks prior to the start of the kick-off meeting the meeting invitation, including agenda and the following Contractor documentation: : (…) (4) Training Plan (Section 4.3.2.1) BIDDING SHEETS 1.3.1 Training plan – Required completion date : EDC + 2 months Could you confirm that the Training plans referred to in both document are iterations of the same deliverable? According to the timelines developed in the SOW, it is our understanding that the training Plan must be published before the end of the training analysis.	Indeed, the training plans referred to in both documents are iterations of the same deliverable. Indeed, the Training Plan must be delivered before the end of the training analysis.
249	SOW (197)	"NCI Agency Learning Management System (LMS): The LMS managed by NCI Academy. LMS is used to host the SCORM compliant eLearning content." Could you provide more details about the technology the LMS is based upon?	The LMS is based on open source ILIAS version 5.x.

250	SOW – TVV events	Could you please clarify : - If there will be a SAT in WP1 & WP2 (table 3.1 vs Figure 4.4) - Why UAT and DMT are planned in WP3 and not in WP2? - Under which responsibility the IVVQ tests are? ([SOW-161] -> Purchaser vs [SOW-155] & Figure 4.4 -> Contractor) - In which test phase the security tests under contractor responsibility will happen? - If CIAV is part of the SIT or the SIAT? ([154] vs Figure 4.4) and then under which responsibility? - If the SIAT exercises will be planned in a coherent planning with the PSA milestones. - On which environments the different types of Test Event will happen?	- There will be no SAT (System Acceptance Testing) for WP1 and WP2 - There will be UAT for WP3 (Figure 4.6), there will be no DMT testing as follow on WP2 Validation Activity shall cover the DMT. - IVVQ official NCIA activity shall be fully supported by Contractor, any discrepancy identified that leads to a validation failure shall be resolved by the Contractor. The Purchaser will manage the process. - NCIA-NATO Cyber Security Centre (NCSC) shall perform extensive testing for applications to be included in A2SL list. This testing is during the Change Request (CRQ) phase. Contractor shall be responsible for the security validation of the system. - CIAV tests shall complement SIT tests for the validation phase. The validation phase is a prerequisite for SiAT. CIAV tests shall be supported by the contractor, and discrepancies shall be worked on. The Purchaser will manage the process. - Exercises that will be used in SiAT have not yet been defined. - SIT shall be performed in NCIA provided NERS environment (NS equivalent test and integration environment). CIAV shall be implemented on an NCIA node in the CFBLNet network. SiAT shall be performed using Operational Network (NS) servers (either Data Centre serving centrally, and/or Dedicated servers on site).
251	Statement of Work (SOW). WP3	Could you please reconsider the mandatory use of the NSF for adaptations (source code & build) made under WP3? Indeed, WP3 adaptations may affect to some different existing parts of the actual definition of the COTS and it will be hard to handle both existing COTS definition and its roadmap (obsolescence management, new features) and DEMETER's one in different environments.	Under consideration
252	Statement of Work (SOW)	As stated in Statement of Work [126], the COTS version for WP2 is likely to be a new version bringing additional or improved features/capabilities iaw the COTS roadmap. If WP3 is exercised, depending on the date of exercise, the selected interoperability adaptations will be developed from the current COTS version (WP1) and in parallel of the new COTS version development to be used in WP2. The SOW current timeline (Figure 1.2 and Figure 4.5) doesn't include any activity for validation of WP3 interoperability adaptations with the WP2 COTS version before deployment and activation. Please clarify	Under consideration
253	SOW-Annex A-SRS, Page 9 Requirement ID: SRS-267	This requirement demands HTML5/CSS3 technology for the client UI, however requirements SRS-150, SRS-151, SRS-163, SRS-164 and SRS-184 open the door to thick client technology. Can you clarify?	Under consideration
254	Statement of Work (SOW), Annex A and Annex B	The IFB documents contain multiple references to DEMETER interfaces with external systems, including Information Products identification: • SOW Annex B, Table 10.1 • SOW Annex B, Table 10.2 • SOW Annex B, Figure 10.1 • SOW Annex A requirements Unfortunately those references are not fully aligned. Can you clarify the order or precedence of the various references above?	Under consideration
255	SOW §9 References, Table 10.2 - References, page 95	According to this table, DEMETER should interface NIRIS to get the Recognized Air Picture. The table gives as interface description "L16" and "TCP/IP – UDP" as interface communication means. We understand TCPIP – UDP as being JREAP(C), however as far as we know, NIRIS today does not implement this protocol. Can you clarify?	NIRIS supports JREAP-C, in accordance with STANAG 5518Ed4, over TCP/IP (Server and Client) and UDP (unicast, broadcast and multicast), since 2008.
256	SOW Annex B Interfaces, page 94, Table 10.1 & SOW-Annex A-SRS	ITSM system is only listed in Table 10.1 of the SOW. No requirement deals with this system in the SRS. Do you confirm that DEMETER should interface ITSM system? Could you provide the ICD document [R-ICD-ITSM] describing this interface?	Under consideration
257	SOW Page 45 : Table 4.1	Training sites : Could we have the sizing of the total number of trainees per site	Refer to Table 4.1 in the SOW for the number of seats per iteration. For the User courses, it can be assumed that 1-2 iterations per JFC need to be conducted; the remaining iterations will be in Izmir.
258	Book I - Annex D-TVCRM.xslx, Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xlsx	The descriptions of sub-criteria E04.14 and E04.15 have been swapped between both documents. Please confirm that the right description is that of 04-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book I - Annex E - Eval Criteria to Reqt Matrix.xlsx and issue an updated version of 03-IFB-CO-115791-DEMETER-Book I - Annex D-TVCRM.xslx?	Under consideration
259	Book I-Bidding Instructions.pdf & Book I-Annex A-Bidding Sheets & Book-II-Part-IV-Statement of Work (SOW)	As mentioned in article 1.2.1 of the bidding instructions, the scope of the Invitation for Bid (IFB) is for services to provide the users with the best available Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) software product. The product description of the tenderer's offer will show the level of compliance by detailing how the COTS meets the criteria's features. When a criteria is fully met by the tenderer's COTS, no corresponding WP3 price will appear in the bidding sheet. The level of compliance will be evaluated in the bidding process by the NCIA (preferred bidder selection and test drive). Will the compliance of the COTS be challenged again during project execution? Indeed, it is stated in the SOW that all the SRS requirements will be assessed during the project phase (IADT principle). Could you specify how a disagreement about the acceptance criteria ([SOW-111]) will be dealt with?	Under consideration
260	SRS-253	It is stated that "DEMETER can be deployed and operated at environments where database cluster is used for storage." Our system stores operational and management data in DB clusters. Is it also expected to store files, media etc. in the DB cluster?	It is not required that files, media, etc. are stored in the DB cluster, however there is a possibility to use EDMS (Data Handling System) and NIP (SharePoint based) storage.
261	Bidding Instructions 2.11.3/4	What other accepted methods of Standby Letters of Credit can the Bidder use, aside from counter-guarantee, that are preferred by the agency?	Under Consideration

Embedded contains 3 files describing;

- BSO API: The API for the BSO Management Application

bso-api-26-April.xml

- ORBAT API: The API for the ORBAT Management Application

orbat-api-26-April.xml

- DV API: The API that provides the enumerations used to build drop down menus, the "Domain Values"

dv-api-26-April.xml