Attachment A.   Answers to Clarification Requests

INVITATION FOR BID

IFB-CO-15575-BMD

Amendment 2

SERIAL NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Status
A.1	**Book 1. Page Page I-7 Paragraph 1. 6**	We have reviewed the documentation provided in the bidders' library (CD) and we have not been able to find the following documents included in the table. Please can you confirm if the names are correct in Reference column?	The Bidders' Library documents in question are included in the 92 files of the CD. Reference column in Book I 1.6 Bidders' Library has been updated for clarity.	Amdt 1
A.2	**Cover Letter** **Book I, Section 2. Para 2.3. Bid Delivery and Bid Closing**	Cover letter states the proposal is due Thursday, 1 September. 1 September 2020 is a Tuesday. Would NATO please clarify the due date/day?	Bid Closing day is Tuesday 01 September 2020, paragraph 2.3 of Book I has been updated accordingly.	Amdt 1

SERIAL NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Status
A.3	**Book 1. Page I- 37 3.6.2, subsections 3.6.2.1 & 2, Book I, Page I- 31, IFB bid Package Content 3.2, 3.1.1**	Book 1. Page I-37 3.6.2 – This section is titled "Table of Contents, and is followed by subsections 3.6.2.1, which provides the requirements for the Table of Contents, and 3.6.2.2, which provides the requirements for the Traceability Matrix (Annex G). Book I, Page I-31, IFB bid Package Content 3.2, 3.1.1 provides a breakdown of how each volume should be submitted. The breakdown for Volume III includes the Table of Contents, but does not identify where the Traceability Matrix should be placed. Question: Are we correct in our assumption that the Traceability Matrix, grouped with the "Table of Contents" requirements in the IFB, should immediately follow the Table of Contents in the Volume? If that assumption is not correct, please clarify where the Traceability Matrix (Annex G) should be provided.	Table of Content, Executive summary and Traceability Matrix are all to be included in each Part of Volume III. This change of instruction is reflected in Amendment 1 of Book I at paragraph 3.3.3.3.	Amdt 1

SERIAL NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Status
A.4	Statement of Work (SOW) Document, such as 4.2.4.3.3.2	Under the BMD IFB Package document (attached above) there are references to Statement of Work (SOW) Document, such **as 4.2.4.3.3.2 Qualifications and experience of proposed personnel for the Engineering Lead, Senior System Architect and two Senior System Engineers referenced in SOW section 8.3". (Book I, Page I-47)** However we are not able to identify the mentioned document. Could you please send the mentioned document, If not clarify the issue for us?	The Statement of Work is included in the IFB Package document and starts on page 280. Section 8.3 of the SOW is on page 362. (Part IV, Page 83 of SOW).	Amdt 1

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

SERIAL NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Status
A.5	Book I, Annex A 2.2,4.0, 5.1	Can you please indicate the missing references?	References are updated in Amendment 1 of Book I at relevant paragraphs	Amdt 1

		Technical		
Serial NR	**IFB REF**	**QUESTION**	**ANSWER**	**Status**
T.1	**SOW\Section 3.7.3.1.3**	Section 3.7.3.1.3 of the SOW states "The Contractor shall work to the NATO AirC2 Lifecycle Configuration Management Plan (LCMP) and supporting SOP at Reference L for the delivery of CM. " Reference L lists the LCMP Core and subordinate BMD Programme SOP however the SOP is not listed in Bidder's library (item 6.7). Would NATO please provide the subordinate SOP.	The subordinate SOP is not required at this stage for Bidders to develop in their bid and will not be provided as part of the IFB package The subordinate SOP will be harmonized with other NCI Agency SOPs (in particular within the AMDC2 Directorate) before the award of the contract.	Amdt 1
T.2	**SOW 8.4.2, Annex B, Annex B-14**	Please confirm the ITB Lab Manager is considered Key Personnel. We note that Annex B and Annex B-14 list the ITB Lab Manager as Key; however, SOW 8.4.2 does not list ITB Lab Manager as Key. Will the SOW 8.4.2 will be revised to list the ITB Lab Manager as Key?	The ITB Lab Manager is indeed considered as a Key Personnel. The SOW sections 8.3 and 8.4 are revised accordingly in Amendment 1.	Amdt 1

		Technical		
Serial NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Status
T.3	SOW para 8.3.2.4	SOW para 8.3.2.4. states the Engineering Lead requires "At least five years as project manager for an effort of similar scope and complexity, including the application of a formal project management methodology such as PRINCE2." Since the Engineering Lead position's role is "…support the Purchaser in supervising the work of architecture definition, design, integration, test, and implementation team", we are requesting NATO to clarify whether the 5 years' project manager experience is relevant to this position. Additionally, the requirement for the Project Manager position is only 3 years (less than that of the Engineering Lead). Request that NATO consider and confirm/change/delete the 5 years' experience requirement.	Engineering Lead is in the Key Personnel. There are four five-year requirements in para 8.3.2.4: *Experience: At least **five** years in system architecture, design, implementation of C2 systems, including at least **five** years in the technical leadership of systems engineering or integration activities. At least **five** years in the management of the preparation and execution of tests of system of systems, preferably in the Air and Missile Defence domain. At least **five** years as project manager for an effort of similar scope and complexity, including the application of a formal project management methodology such as PRINCE2.* NCI Agency confirms that only the five years in red above can be reduced to three to align with the PM role, The other requirements should remain as five years. The SOW section 8.3.2.4 is revised accordingly in Amendment 1.	Amdt1

Technical				
Serial NR	**IFB REF**	**QUESTION**	**ANSWER**	**Status**
T.4		This IFB is mostly focused on management and technical domain knowledge. Is the visualization of the Ballistic Missile Defence System Engineering and Integration & Test is part of the scope of work of this IFB or will this separately be decided by NCIA?	As per the BMD Capability Package (CP) explained in the SOW section 1.2, the BMD NATO Staff Requirement (NSR) describes the functional and performance requirements for the following areas: Core Architecture Capability, Consultation, Active Defence, Situational Awareness, Intelligence, Passive Defence, Training and Exercise Support, and Support (including Communications, User Interface, Logistics Support, Interoperability, Safety, CIS Security, Mission Data Recording and Storage, Integration, Test, Analysis and Validation, Architecture Upgrade and Deployed Systems). Several projects (section 1.2.2.3 of the SOW) are required to **implement** the BMD functionalities into the NATO BMC3I systems (like the Situational Awareness). However, as per the SOW 1.2.2.4, the SE&I support contract is authorised against two projects related to "System Engineering Support for BMD" and "Integration and Test Support for BMD". Therefore the **development** of the visualisation (of shared situational awareness) or any other BMD capability is **not** part of the scope of work of this IFB	Amdt1

		Technical		
Serial NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Status
T.5	IFB Section 3.2.1, Section 3.6.3.3 (page 38/448) & (IFB 3.6.17)	IFB Section 3.2.1 requires the submission of 1 pdf file for each of the major sections (Engineering, Management, Supportability, etc.). However, IFB Section 3.6.3.3 (page 38/448) states that the proposed updates to the PMTP may be provided in any appropriate format (" commented changes on existing PMTP, dedicated file in Word, Excel, pdf etc."). Thus, Section 3.2.1, as written, does not allow submitting a document other than in pdf and outside of the section files. a. In order to facilitate NATO's evaluation of the proposed updates, is it acceptable to submit the proposed update as a stand-alone Word document (that is, separate from the pdf file for the Engineering Section per Section 3.2)? Providing a separate Word document will allow NATO to easily view the changes to the original document from the bidders library. This will also allow flexibility to the Bidder for making appropriate changes to the document benefiting NATO in terms of a more detailed evaluation. b. Will NATO allow the proposed update to the existing PMTP document to be excluded from the page limit of 500 pages (IFB 3.6.17) because the existing PMTP from the bidders library is more than 90 pages and, with additional proposed changes, will take up a significant portion of the	NCI Agency does not accept this proposed Word document update. The PMTP, SDP and ILSP were only provided to Bidders as PDF. The proposed updates should not contain track changes but demonstrate how Bidders intend to change/improve the existing documents. These updates are to be included in the 500 page limit as NCI Agency does not want to receive the complete updated documents at this stage of Bid Evaluation.	Amdt2

Technical				
Serial NR	IFB REF	QUESTION	ANSWER	Status
		allowable page count. c. Same question for the SDP and ILSP (which also require the same updates to existing NATO provided documents). Recommend that NATO allow all updates to be provided separately and outside of page count.		