NCIA Pre-competitive Engagement Calling Notice
Request for Information (RFI)



SPACE DOMAIN OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS
RFI-192934-SDOF

NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA)

NCIA/ACQ/2026/16833
Thursday, 29 October 2026

NCIA Pre-competitive Engagement Calling Notice Request for Information (RFI)

To: Industry Partners

1. The NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA) is conducting pre-competitive market engagement as market research to gather input on potential solutions to support the upcoming acquisition for Space Domain Operational Functions Capability Programme. To that end, we are issuing the attached Request for Information (RFI) RFI-192934-SDOF and holding a dedicated workshop at NATO Edge to solicit feedback from capable and interested industry partners.

2. This Calling Notice RFI is issued for planning purposes only and is not a request for bids. It is part of NCIA's effort to engage early to inform and ensure it has a clear understanding of the marketplace, available capabilities, and potential acquisition strategies.

3. We value your insight and invite you to review and comment on our draft high level problem statement (Annexes A and B) with a view in providing recommendations for improving performance outcomes, competition, and efficiency; and identifying any risks or concerns that should be considered during planning.

4. Feedback can be provided in writing in accordance with submission instructions and/or by attending a dedicated industry engagement – Space Domain Operational Functions Workshop at NATO Edge, taking place on 17-19 November in Izmir (Türkiye), where NCIA will respond to clarifying questions and invite comments from participants.

5. Submission instructions and additional details can be found in the enclosure to this RFI.

6. Only companies from a NATO member country can participate in or respond to this RFI (https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/nato_countries.htm) or attend a dedicated workshop.

7. Should you have any questions or need clarification, please contact Jean-Luc Guellec at RFI-192934-SDOF@ncia.nato.int

8. We thank you in advance for your time and input, and we look forward to engaging with you as we shape this potential acquisition.

For the Chief of Acquisition:

JeanLuc Guellec Digitally signed by JeanLuc Guellec
Date: 2026.10.29 08:25:06 +01'00'

Jean-Luc Guellec
Principal Contracting Officer

NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA)

Enclosure:

- Request for Information with Annexes A and B
- Distribution List

Distribution List

1. **NATO Delegation (Attn: Infrastructure Adviser)**

1. Albania	**12.** Greece	**23.** Poland
2. Belgium	**13.** Hungary	**24.** Portugal
3. Bulgaria	**14.** Iceland	**25.** Romania
4. Canada	**15.** Italy	**26.** Slovakia
5. Croatia	**16.** Latvia	**27.** Slovenia
6. Czechia	**17.** Lithuania	**28.** Spain
7. Denmark	**18.** Luxembourg	**29.** Sweden
8. Estonia	**19.** Montenegro	**30.** Türkiye
9. Finland	**20.** Netherlands	**31.** United Kingdom
10. France	**21.** North Macedonia	**32.** United States
11. Germany	**22.** Norway	

2. **All NATEXs**

NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA)

Table of Contents

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION 5

A. Introduction 5

B. Submission Instructions 5

C. Industry Engagement 5

D. Disclaimer 6

E. Use of Information Provided through Responses 6

F. RFI Point of Contact 6

Annex A – Requested Information 7

Annex B – Problem statement 9

NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA)

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

A. Introduction

1. The NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA) is conducting pre-competitive market engagement as market research to gather input on potential solutions to support the upcoming acquisition for Space Domain Operational Functions Capability Programme. To that end, we are issuing the attached Request for Information (RFI) RFI-192934-SDOF and holding a dedicated workshop at NATO Edge to solicit feedback from capable and interested industry partners.

2. This Calling Notice RFI is issued for planning purposes only and is not a request for bids. It is part of NCIA's effort to engage early to inform and ensure it has a clear understanding of the marketplace, available capabilities, and potential acquisition strategies.

B. Submission Instructions

1. Interested parties are invited to respond in accordance with the instructions below or provide feedback during Industry Engagement:

   a. Submit responses via the email address in section E no later than **12:00 hours Central European Time (CET)** on **03 December 2026**.

   b. Responses should be submitted in PDF or Word format and must not exceed **15 pages**, including:
      i. Responses to Annex A and comments on Annex B, excluding:
         i. Cover page
         ii. Company brochures or product literature (if included)
         iii. Attachments such as past performance references

   c. Use the following subject line for submission
      i. "Response to RFI [RFI Number] – [Company Name]"

   d. All responses should address the items listed in Annex A – Requested Information.

   e. Respondents are also encouraged to review and comment on the draft problem statement in Annex B .

C. Industry Engagement

1. Planned industry engagement will take place in the form of Space Domain Operational Functions Workshop at NATO Edge, taking place on 17-19 November in Izmir (Türkiye).
2. During the workshop NCIA will brief the high-level problem statement, respond to clarifying questions and invite comments from participants, based on the questions shared (Annex B) in the open forum as well as in bilateral meetings (schedule allowing).
3. More information on NATO Edge attendance and registration is available on event's official website - https://www.natoedge.nato.int/

D. Disclaimer

1. This RFI is for planning and informational purposes only and shall not be construed as a solicitation or obligation on the part of the NCIA. The NCIA does not intend to award a contract based on responses to this RFI. Respondents are solely responsible for all costs incurred in responding to this RFI. The NCIA will consider and analyse all information received from this RFI and may use these findings to develop a future solicitation. The NCIA will consider all responses as confidential commercial information and will protect it as such.

2. NCIA reserves the right, at any time, to cancel this informal market survey, partially or in its entirety. No legal liability on the part of NCIA for payment of any sort shall arise and in no event will a cause of action lie with any prospective participant for the recovery of any costs incurred in connection with the preparation of documentation or participation in response hereto. All effort initiated or undertaken by prospective informal market survey participants shall be done considering and accepting this fact.

E. Use of Information Provided through Responses

1. **Confidentiality of Responses**

The NCIA may incorporate industry comments and responses, in part or in whole, into a future release of a solicitation. Should respondents include proprietary data in their responses that they do not wish to be disclosed to the public for any purpose, or used by NCIA (except for internal evaluation purposes), they must:

a. **Mark the title page with the following legend:**

This document includes data that shall not be disclosed outside NATO and shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed – in whole or in part – for any purpose other than for NCIA internal evaluation purposes, unless otherwise expressly authorised by [insert company name]. This restriction does not limit the NCIA's right to use information contained in this data without restriction if it is obtained from another source. The data subject to this restriction are contained in sheets [insert numbers or other identification of sheets]

b. **Mark each sheet of data it wishes to restrict with the following legend:**

Use or disclosure of data contained on this sheet is subject to the restriction on the title page of this document.

F. RFI Point of Contact

1. Jean-Luc Guellec

2. RFI-192934-SDOF@ncia.nato.int

Annex A – Requested Information

1. Respondents are encouraged to provide the following information in their response:

   a. **Company Information**

      i. Legal Business Name
      ii. Address
      iii. Website
      iv. Primary Point of Contact
      v. Email address

   b. **Technical Capability and Relevant Experience**

Provide a concise description of the organisation's contribution to Space Domain Awareness (Understand the environment, including threats), Operational Space Support ((Ingestion of Space Data, Products and Services), and/or Space Domain Coordination (Coordinate and share space, information with operational users).

   i. Summary of relevant capabilities - Identify the organisation's role in the delivery chain, and map the offering to the capability coverage areas in Annex B. Specialist responses addressing only part of the scope are welcome.

   ii. Summary of relevant past performance considering the details included in Annex B. Clearly distinguish deployed capabilities from prototypes, proposed developments and capabilities dependent on third-party suppliers

   c. **Feedback and Recommendations**

      i. Responses to the RFI Questions as per Annex B.
      ii. Comments on the proposed background, scope and objectives.
      iii. Recommended innovations, alternative approaches and opportunities for reuse.
      iv. Proposed delivery increments and key customer dependencies.
      v. Recommendations for improving competition, integration and operational adoption.
      vi. Comments on the draft Problem Statement

Use quantitative evidence where available. Where estimates are necessary, state the assumptions, range and basis of calculation. Identify information that would be needed to provide a more reliable assessment.

Commercial estimates should be non-binding and distinguish data or product charges from platform, integration, support, licensing and continuity costs.

   d. **Questions or Concerns**

      i. Identify significant technical, commercial, security, legal and delivery risks, together with proposed mitigations.
      ii. Highlight dependencies on proprietary components, external infrastructure, restricted data sources, specialist personnel or other constrained resources.
      iii. Suggestions for enhancing competition

Supporting material may include product descriptions, interface documentation, demonstration results and relevant project references. Identify proprietary information in

accordance with the calling notice and comply with its submission, length and information-handling instructions.

NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA)

Annex B – Problem statement

Note: This is a DRAFT and subject to change. The NCIA is seeking industry feedback.

Consultation status: This annex presents the proposed operational need and areas for industry feedback. It does not establish a final specification, contract structure, purchase quantity or commitment to acquire every capability described

1. Background

The NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCIA) requires an integrated, secure and resilient capability to enable Space Domain Awareness, Operational Space Support and Space Domain Coordination by transforming national and commercial space data, products and services into timely operational assessments and coordinated mission support. This capability support the NCIA's mission to deliver interoperable communications and information services that connect NATO and Allied forces, strengthen informed decision-making, and enable effective planning and execution of operations across Multi Domain Operations (MDO).

NATO operations depend on space-enabled services and on an accurate understanding of the conditions affecting them. Relevant information is supplied through national systems, commercial operators and other authorised contributors, using different formats, access arrangements and delivery mechanisms.

NATO's operational need extends beyond obtaining space observations or maintaining a Space DPS catalogue. Commanders and staffs require a coherent understanding of space activity, environmental conditions, service availability and mission dependencies. They must also be able to request suitable support, assess the implications of disruption and coordinate the use of available capabilities.

The operational challenge is therefore broader than obtaining more data. NATO must be able to identify what information is needed, obtain it in time, evaluate its reliability, understand its significance and distribute useful outputs to the personnel and systems making operational decisions.

The three Space Domain Operational Functions address complementary parts of this challenge:

Function	**Intended contribution**
Space Domain Awareness	Establish and maintain an operational understanding of space activity, environmental conditions, dependencies and potential threats.
Operational Space Support	Match and connect operational requirements and mission needs to available space capabilities and manage the provision of relevant data, products and services.
Space Domain Coordination	Integrate, coordinate and disseminate space information to support operational planning, synchronisation, execution and assessment.

Existing capability foundation

For the approved initial activities, NATO is adopting the United States Space Force Joint Commercial Operations approach, including the Global Data Market (GDM) and Unified Data Library (UDL).

The NATO GDM supports competitive access to commercial data, products and services. The NATO UDL provides the associated standardised data platform that will serve as a central hub for accessing and managing data that supports NATO Space operational systems, turning multiple sources of collection points into a centralized picture.

This engagement seeks to understand complementary capabilities, operational integration and future growth around that foundation.

2. Operational Problem

From the industry approach perspective, the operational problem may be summarised as follows: how can NATO convert distributed commercial space capabilities, data, products, and services into trusted, timely and coordinated operational support, while retaining secure information sharing, competition and service continuity?

Issues to be addressed include:

- Inconsistent interfaces, metadata, access rights and licensing conditions.
- Difficulty assessing completeness, timeliness, relevance, reliability and uncertainty.
- Manual effort in discovery, processing, request handling, correlation, analysis and reporting.
- Gaps between data acquisition, specialist assessment and operational use.
- Limited visibility of service availability and commercial dependencies.
- Barriers to combining contributions across organisations, security domains, and on-prem and /or cloud environments.
- The risk that a service available in routine conditions cannot sustain crisis demand.
- The need to flexibly incorporate new capabilities without repeatedly rebuilding the integration framework.

3. Scope

The Contractor shall provide secure, resilient and interoperable space data, products, services, software and integration support to enable the development of Space Domain Awareness, the provision of Operational Space Support, and the conduct of Space Domain Coordination, covering the acquisition, management, processing, analysis and controlled dissemination of national and commercial space information, its integration into NATO operational systems and workflows, and the training, maintenance and support necessary for sustained operational use including, but not limited to:

2.1 Operational Functions

Space Domain Awareness

- Acquire and correlate observations, orbital information, environmental data and relevant contextual information.

- Support object identification, tracking, behaviour characterisation and event assessment.
- Develop and maintain a Recognised Space Picture.
- Present data freshness, provenance, uncertainty and analytical confidence.
- Deliver relevant alerts, assessments and visualisations into operational information systems.
- Maintain visibility of available national and commercial contributions.

Operational Space Support

- Translate operational needs into actionable support requests.
- Support discovery, selection, acquisition and delivery of suitable information and services.
- Track fulfilment, quality, availability and usage restrictions.
- Identify alternatives when the preferred source or service is unavailable.

Space Domain Coordination

- Incorporate space dependencies, risks and support options into operational planning.
- Enable collaborative assessment and coordination of support priorities.
- Distribute relevant information through existing command-and-control and planning tools.
- Monitor delivery and assess whether the support meets the intended operational need.

These capabilities support authorised NATO decision-makers and do not imply changes to established command relationships or ownership of national or commercial space systems.

2.2 Capability Coverage Areas

Coverage area	Illustrative content
Orbital objects and events	Object catalogues, orbital predictions, launch and re-entry events, fragmentation, conjunction analysis.
Space environmental conditions	Environmental forecasts and alerts, radiation and geomagnetic effects, atmospheric drag, and ionospheric impacts on space-enabled services.
Mission dependencies and service performance	Coverage, access opportunities, service status, predicted outages, dependency mapping and cross-domain impact assessments.
Space activity and behavioural assessment	Pattern-of-life analysis, manoeuvre assessment for unusual activity and proximity events, contextual assessment and evidence-based interpretation of possible threats.
Navigation and timing assurance	Availability, integrity, interference, deceptive-signal indicators, regional degradation and alternative-service assessments.
Satellite communications and transport support	Coverage and capacity information, service resilience, interference assessment, prioritisation and options for surge or restoration. Note: this does not refer to any bandwidth requests.

Coverage area	Illustrative content
Space-related security assessment	Integrated assessments of threats, vulnerabilities and ambiguous activity affecting NATO's dependence on space capabilities.

The categories can overlap. Respondents should identify reusable products and shared dependencies rather than assume separate acquisition of equivalent information for each area.

2.3 Shared Enabling Capabilities

The operational functions require:

- Documented interfaces and reusable integration components.
- Data validation, cataloguing, provenance and lifecycle management.
- Controlled sharing across organisations and authorised security environments.
- Traceability between requests, purchases, delivered information and associated usage rights.
- Protection of sensitive operational interests expressed through requests.
- Hosting and support arrangements appropriate to NATO security and continuity needs.
- Transparent separation of marketplace, repository, supplier and integrator responsibilities.
- Validated analytical automation with appropriate human oversight.
- Training, operational support, exercises and performance evaluation.
- Practical supplier substitution, data portability and technology refresh.

A common interface or successful schema validation does not, by itself, demonstrate scientific accuracy, analytical consistency or fitness for operational use. These aspects require separate assurance.

2.3 Scope Boundaries

This consultation:

- Does not establish a requirement for a NATO-owned satellite constellation or new sensor network.
- Does not prescribe a single prime contractor, contract duration or fixed-price catalogue.
- Does not presume that a commercial service is accredited or suitable for NATO merely because it is operational elsewhere.
- Does not establish hosting locations, migration dates or security approvals from supplier proposals.
- Does not assume that every commercial product can be redistributed without restriction.
- Does not equate a broad supplier pool with assured availability during crisis or conflict.

4. Illustrative User Story

During a NATO activity, an operational staff receives reports of reduced performance in a space-enabled service. Available information is incomplete, and possible causes include environmental conditions, technical failure and unusual space activity.

The space support team needs to:

1. Identify the affected mission dependencies and immediate information needs.
2. Locate relevant national and commercial data and request additional support where necessary.
3. Correlate the available evidence, showing uncertainty and distinguishing observations from analytical judgements.
4. Update the Recognised Space Picture and communicate the implications to affected staffs.
5. Coordinate authorised support alternatives and track whether they restore the required service.
6. Preserve the information trail for assessment, reporting and subsequent improvement.

The workflow should remain useful when a provider becomes unavailable, communications are constrained or some information cannot be released to every participant.

The desired result is faster, better-supported human decision-making with less manual movement of information between disconnected tools.

5. Objectives and Measures of Success

The intended capability should:

1. **Improve operational understanding** through timely, coherent assessments of space activity, environmental conditions and mission dependencies.
2. **Shorten the path from operational need to usable support** by connecting requesting, acquisition, delivery, analysis and dissemination.
3. **Reduce duplication and manual handling** through reusable interfaces, common information management and integrated workflows.
4. **Enable trusted information use** by preserving quality indicators, provenance, access controls and commercial rights.
5. **Strengthen continuity** through tested recovery, alternative supply and proportionate assurance arrangements.
6. **Support effective competition** by enabling specialist participation, transparent costs and manageable supplier transitions.
7. **Demonstrate value incrementally** using operational scenarios, measurable performance and user feedback.

Industry is invited to recommend realistic targets, test methods and trade-offs. This RFI does not establish numerical acceptance thresholds.

The engagement should ultimately help NATO identify practical delivery increments that connect commercial innovation to operational needs without prescribing an unnecessarily narrow technical solution.

6. Questions for Industry

Respondents should answer only the questions relevant to their offering. Responses should distinguish existing capability from planned development and identify supporting evidence, assumptions and dependencies.

a. Technical Feasibility and Operational Integration

Q1 — Capability coverage and maturity

- Which operational functions and coverage areas can your organisation support directly, and which depend on partners or marketplace suppliers?
- What is operational today, what requires adaptation, and what is the timeline that they could be delivered?
- What delivery timescales are achievable, and which technical, commercial or customer dependencies determine those timescales?
- What evidence supports the stated maturity?

Q2 — End-to-end operational use

- How would your contribution connect an operational request to acquisition, delivery, analysis, dissemination and assessment?
- Where would manual steps remain, and how would responsibilities be divided between NATO, suppliers, platform operators and integrators?

Q3 — Space Domain Awareness

- How would you produce or improve a Recognised Space Picture using multiple sources?
- What are the limits in orbital coverage, object characterisation, update frequency and predictive accuracy?
- How are missing or conflicting observations represented?

Q4 — Operational Space Support

- How would users identify suitable services, express their needs, compare available options and track fulfilment?
- How would your approach avoid duplicate purchasing and support urgent requirements without bypassing necessary approvals?

Q5 — Space Domain Coordination

- How would your capability help staffs incorporate space dependencies and service limitations?
- How would your capability support multiple options into planning and execution?
- How would outputs reach existing operational systems rather than remain confined to a separate application?

Q6 — Data characteristics and quality

- What time references, coordinate conventions, validity periods, uncertainty measures and provenance are supplied for relevant observations, assessments, alerts and forecasts?
- How are data quality and operational usefulness assessed separately from format compliance?

Q7 — GDM and UDL integration

- How would your offering use the adopted marketplace and repository where applicable?
- Which interfaces are available today, who performs any conversion or normalisation, and what additional integration is needed?
- How would incompatible versions, rejected deliveries and gaps in repository coverage be handled?

Q8 — Delivery and interoperability

- Which file formats, application interfaces, streaming methods and bulk-delivery mechanisms are supported?
- What evidence demonstrates interoperability with relevant NATO or national systems?
- What limitations arise with legacy systems or restricted connectivity?

Q9 — Hosting and security

- Where would data, applications, backups and support functions operate?
- Which jurisdictions and third parties would be involved?
- What evidence supports the proposed security approach?
- What further NATO approvals, cross-domain arrangements or infrastructure would be required?

Q10 — Rights and controlled redistribution

- Who owns source data and derived products?
- What rights would NATO receive for retention, reuse, analysis, internal sharing and external release?
- How would rights remain associated with information after transformation or fusion?
- What restrictions or additional costs apply to sharing with nations, partners, research bodies or public institutions?

Q11 — Confidentiality of operational requests

- How would you limit disclosure of the requesting organisation and its operational interests during competition, supplier communications, fulfilment and payment?
- What could still be inferred from locations, objects, timing or licence terms?
- How would confidentiality be balanced with required auditability and usage rights?

Q12 — Analytical automation and artificial intelligence

- Which functions use automated or artificial-intelligence methods and which require human analysis, review or approval?
- What training data, external supplied models and associated licensing dependencies are involved?
- How are outputs identified, explained, validated and reconstructed?
- How is customer information protected from unauthorised reuse?
- What safeguards prevent customer information from being reused without authorisation, including for model training or improvement?

b. Product Performance and Scalability

Q13 — Orbital and environmental information

- What operational scale and performance can you demonstrate for object tracking, event monitoring and environmental assessment?
- How do object count, event frequency, coverage, update rate and delivery delay affect capacity and cost?

Q14 — Mission-impact analysis

- How does your offering distinguish service-status reporting, mission-specific decision support and predictive scenario analysis?
- What customer information is needed to connect space-service degradation to operational consequences?
- How do model complexity, data integration and analyst responsiveness affect delivery?

Q15 — Activity and security assessments

- What capabilities do you provide for detecting unusual activity, characterising events and supporting assessments of cause or intent?
- What evidence, confidence indicators and human review accompany these outputs?
- How do you manage false alerts and competing explanations?

Q16 — Navigation, timing and communications support

- How would you identify and assess degradation of navigation, timing or satellite communications services?
- What can you provide concerning coverage, integrity, interference, alternatives, priority access and restoration?

Distinguish informational products from services that supply actual communications capacity.

c. Commercial Models, Continuity and Competition

Q17 — Pricing and cost transparency

- Which pricing units best fit your contribution: objects, events, regions, assessments, subscriptions, capacity, usage or reserved availability?
- Provide indicative ranges where possible and explain the effects of responsiveness, analytical depth, redistribution rights and surge demand.

Separate supplier charges from platform, integration and support costs.

Q18 — Acquisition approach

- Within the adopted GDM/UDL baseline where applicable, which needs are best met by per-request competition, recurring subscriptions, pre-agreed rates, reserved capacity or complementary integration contracts?
- What trade-offs arise between budget predictability, rapid ordering, continuing competition and supplier investment?

Q19 — Service levels and accountability

- Which measurable commitments could you accept for delivery, availability, quality, responsiveness and recovery?
- How should failures be investigated and resolved when a service spans a data supplier, marketplace, repository, analytical application and NATO infrastructure?

Q20 — Continuity under disruption

- What service could you sustain during increased demand, communications loss, cyber incidents or supplier interruption?
- Identify common dependencies that might defeat apparent supplier diversity, and provide evidence of recovery or substitution testing.

Q21 — Priority access and surge

- What arrangements could secure additional capacity or faster response during crisis or conflict?
- What activation times, costs and legal limitations apply, including national prioritisation and pre-existing customer commitments?
- Which assurances cannot be provided by contract alone?

Q22 — Portability and exit

- How could NATO replace a supplier or component while retaining access to purchased information, derived products and operational configurations?
- What rights, export mechanisms, transition support and costs would make exit practically executable?

Q23 — Participation and innovation

- What conditions would encourage participation by specialist suppliers, smaller companies and new entrants?
- How could new sources or analytical capabilities be introduced without excessive onboarding effort, repeated integration costs or disruption to accredited services?

d. Delivery, Support and Validation

Q24 — Training and operational support

- What training is required for operators, analysts, administrators and integrators?
- How are platform instruction and specialist analytical training distinguished?
- What support hours, maintenance arrangements and exercise participation would be available?

Q25 — Demonstration and acceptance

- What limited-scope demonstration would provide credible evidence of end-to-end value?
- Propose measures for timeliness, quality, analyst workload, request fulfilment, rights preservation, interoperability and recovery.

Distinguish laboratory or benchmark results from representative operational performance.

Q26 — Delivery sequence and customer dependencies

- What sequence of increments would reduce delivery risk while producing useful capability early?
- What interfaces, representative data, personnel, facilities, approvals and decisions must NATO provide?
- Which dependencies determine the schedule?

Q27 — Recommended changes and principal risks

- Which assumptions, scope elements or objectives should be revised?
- What alternatives could achieve the intended outcome more effectively?
- What are the most important technical, commercial, legal or organisational risks and mitigations?

Q28 — Delivery roles and allocation of responsibilities

- What role would your organisation perform in generating primary observations or other source data, producing derived information, or supplying analytical products and expert assessments?
- What role would your organisation perform in connecting customers with suppliers through brokerage or marketplace services, and in hosting, processing, organising and distributing information?
- What role would your organisation perform in providing operational applications and visualisation, integrating systems, running managed services, and delivering training and ongoing support?
- For each applicable role, what capabilities would your organisation contribute, which responsibilities would be assigned to other parties, and how would the interfaces between those responsibilities be managed?

Q29 — Relevant project experience and operational results

- Which completed or ongoing assignments best demonstrate your suitability for the proposed contribution, and what operational needs and delivery environments did they address?

- What was the scope and scale of your organisation's work in each example, and how did its responsibilities differ from potential competition?
- How did the delivered capability connect with customer systems or other suppliers' services, and what integration work did your organisation undertake?
- What evidence demonstrates operational adoption and measurable benefits, how were those benefits assessed, and which results relate only to trials or controlled demonstrations?

Q30 — Security experience and supporting evidence

- What relevant experience can you provided that demonstrates meeting security obligations and supporting accreditation or comparable approval processes, and what was your organisation's responsibility?
- What releasable project references, customer confirmations or evaluation records are available to substantiate the claimed experience and results?
- What demonstration material or supporting technical evidence could be provided, and what confidentiality, release or access restrictions apply? Responses should not contain classified or otherwise unauthorised information.