

To: All Prospective Bidders

Subject: Request For Proposals (RFP) – RFP-CO-424373-ON-X – Operational Network – Extension Amendment 1

References:

- A. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X, NCIA/ACQ/2026/07559, dated Friday, 31 July 2026
- B. NCIA/ACQ/2026/07442, dated Monday, 13 July 2026
- C. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X – Book I Appendix B – Questions and Answers, issued 4 September 2026.

1. Dear Prospective Bidder's, we are writing to inform you of the release of Amendment 1 of the subject RFP.
2. The purpose of this Amendment 1 is to:
 - 2.1. Give effect to the amendments announced in Reference C and make the related corrections expressly shown in the enclosed documents, with two additional Q&A lines added (serials 97 and 98) after the version sent out on 4 September 2026.
 - 2.2. As a direct or indirect result of questions received by industry in accordance with General Bidding Instructions (GBI) section 2.8, the following documents under RFP RFP-CO-424373-ON-X are here-by amended and re-issued in their entirety:
 - a. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Book I - Project Specific Bidding Instructions
 - b. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Book I - Appendix A - Prime Accountability and Reference Lock
 - c. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Book I - Appendix D - Corporate Experience Reference Form
 - 2.3. Prospective Bidders are strongly advised to carefully review the revised documents. The changes within the Project-Specific Book I are denoted in red for ease of traceability. The enclosed Project-Specific Book I is issued as the operative hard redline against the version issued on 31 July 2026. Red text without strikethrough is added text, red text with strikethrough is deleted text all other text is retained.
 - 2.4. Some of the key amendments include:
 - 2.4.1. The Prime Entity restriction which is a proportionate measure intended to preserve open and fair competition by preventing one global group of companies from holding more than one Prime Entity position, consistent with NPP provisions 3.2 and 3.5.
 - 2.4.2. The revised revenue requirement is intended to ensure that the Prime Entity position is supported principally by the financial standing of the Prime Entity or its guaranteeing parent, while retaining limited reliance on other consortium members.
 - 2.4.3. The CER and Critical Reference Provider provisions are intended to ensure that relied-upon past performance is verifiable, attributed to the exact legal

entity that performed the work and accompanied by the commitment required from that entity under Appendix A.

2.4.4. Some submission and evidence instructions have been added or clarified such as the optional, non-evaluated Executive Summary, CER and supplementary evidence attribution.

2.4.5. Appendices A and D are issued as clean replacement forms. Each replaces only its corresponding previously issued version and is provided without redline markings for completion and submission.

2.4.5.1. The replacement Appendix D removes the electronic per-field character limit and provides three independently fillable CER sections in a single nine-page form. Amendment No. 1 therefore supersedes the permission in Q&A Serial 8 to convert or edit the previously issued Appendix D. Bidders shall use the enclosed replacement Appendix D in accordance with its instructions.

2.4.5.2. The replacement Appendix A is issued to reflect the amended Prime Entity, CER-attribution and required signatories.

2.5. Additionally, also in accordance the GBI section 2.8, we take this opportunity to enclose Attachment D, a current copy of the questions received from industry and the answers provided by the NCI Agency. Please note that this amendment relates to question and answers serial number(s) up to serial 98.

2.6. In accordance with GBI section 2.3, the bid closing date has been extended to provide reasonable time to reflect the amendment in their Step 1 submission. The revised bid closing date and time is:

Friday, 09 October 2026 at 12:00 hours Central European Time (CET).

3. By virtue of this Amendment 1, the enclosed document(s) replace and supersede all previous version issued in the context of this RFP-CO-424373-ON-X.
4. Prospective Bidders are advised that the NCI Agency reserves the right to cancel, withdraw, or suspend this RFP at any time in its entirety without incurring any repercussions, or liabilities.
5. The NCI Agency bears no liability for solicitation preparation costs incurred by firms or any other collateral bid preparation costs.
6. Except as provided herein, all other terms and conditions of RFP-CO-424373-ON-X documents remain unchanged.
7. Your Point of Contact for all information concerning this RFP is Anil Rao, NCI Agency Contracting Officer who may be reached at:

RFP-CO-424373-ON-X@ncia.nato.int
8. In accordance with the NATO Management of Non-Classified NATO Information policy (C-M(2002)60), this RFP-CO-424373-ON-X shall not be published on the internet.
9. Thank you for your interest in this important NCI Agency business opportunity.

FOR THE CHIEF OF ACQUISITION:

Anil-Jacob Rao

Digitally signed by Anil-Jacob
Rao
Date: 2026.09.11 16:33:20
+02'00'

Anil Rao
Contracting Officer
NATO Communications and
Information Agency (NCI
Agency)

Enclosures (form part of Amendment No. 1):

1. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Book I - Project-Specific Bidding Instructions – Amendment No.1 (Redlined)
2. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Book I Appendix A - Prime Accountability and Reference Lock - Amendment No. 1 (clean replacement).
3. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Book I Appendix D - Corporate Experience Reference Form - Amendment No. 1 (clean replacement).

Attachment to the Cover Letter:

- A. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Attachment A - Acknowledgement of Receipt of Solicitation Amendment
- B. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X – Updated Bidders List
- C. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Distribution List
- D. RFP-CO-424373-ON-X - Book I Appendix B – Questions and Answers serials 1-98

Attachment A - ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF SOLICITATION AMENDMENT

Attached separately as a PDF form.

ATTACHMENT B: UPDATED BIDDER'S LIST – RFP-CO-424373-ON-X

Country	Nominated bidder
Belgium	Sopra Steria Group
Belgium	IBM BELGIUM
Belgium	MICROSOFT
Belgium	NOKIA BELL
Belgium	NTT BELGIUM
Belgium	ORACLE BELGIUM
Belgium	PROXIMUS
Belgium	ACCENTURE
Belgium	AKKODIS BELGIUM
Belgium	ATOS BELGIUM
Belgium	BRESCO SERVICES
Belgium	CISCO SYSTEMS BELGIUM
Belgium	DELOITTE CONSULTING AND ADVISORY BV
Belgium	DEUTSCHE TELEKOM GLOBAL BUSINESS SOLUTIONS BELGIUM
Belgium	ERNST & YOUNG ADVISORY SERVICES
Belgium	Hewlett-Packard Enterprise Belgium
Belgium	Skyline Communication
Belgium	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPER (PWC) ENTERPRISE ADVISORY
Belgium	CEGEKA
Spain	GMV aerospace and defence
Spain	ALTIA CONSULTORES, S
Spain	NTT DATA Spain SLU
Spain	Indra Sistemas S.A
Spain	SISTEMAS INTEGRALES DE REDES Y TELECOMUNICACIONES
Spain	TELEFONICA SOLUCIONES DE INFORMÁTICA Y COMUNICACIONES DE ESPAÑA
Spain	Laberit Sistemas SL
Spain	Augmented Reality Software S.L.
Spain	S2 GRUPO, SOLUCIONES DE SEGURIDAD, SLU
Italy	Aruba spa

Country	Nominated bidder
Italy	Leonardo spa
Italy	Fastweb spa
Italy	Moveax Srl
Italy	TELECOM ITALIA s.p.A
UK	Fujitsu services ltd UK
UK	Spektrum Management group ltd UK
UK	Reply Ltd UK
UK	Shield Reply Ltd UK
UK	IBM & IBM SiXworks UK
UK	Second Front systems
UK	BAE Systems (Defence Systems) Limited
UK	Sopra Steria - UK
UK	Deloitte UK
UK	Google cloud public sector UK
UK	Nortal UK Limited
US	L3Harris Technologies, Inc
US	Smartronix, LLC
US	Saliense Consulting LLC
US	E-Logic Inc
US	Parellel works Inc
US	ViaSat, Inc.
US	Leidos
US	Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc.
US	Amazon Web Services, Inc.
Germany	Bechtle GmbH & Co. KG
Germany	secunet Security Networks AG
Germany	Hewlett-Packard GmbH
Germany	PwC Strategy& Germany GmbH
Germany	Reply Deutschland SE
Germany	Schwarz digits
Germany	CGI Deutschland B.V. & Co. KG
Germany	NTTCable Deutschland KG

Country	Nominated bidder
Germany	genua GmbH
Germany	CompuSafe Data Systems AG
Germany	Airbus Defence and Space GmbH
Norway	Sopra Steria (AS)
Bulgaria	Telelink Business services (Bulgarian)
Bulgaria	Lirex
France	Bull SAS - French
France	Capgemini technology services
France	Airbus defence and space
France	Thales Six GTS France SAS
Turkey	Tubitek Bilgem
Turkey	Dt iletisim hizmetleri A.Ş
Turkey	OBSS teknoloji Anonim Sirketi
Turkey	DataFlowX Teknoloji A.S
Turkey	Aselsan Elektronik San.Tic.A.Ş
Turkey	HAVELSAN Hava Elektronik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S.
Netherlands	DXC Technology B.V.
Netherlands	Itility B.V.
Denmark	ATEA A/S
Poland	Cloud Ferro SA
Greece	INTEROPERABILITY SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL HELLAS SINGLE MEMBER S.A. (SCYTALYS SA)
Greece	Hellenic Telecommunications Organization S.A.



NATO UNCLASSIFIED

NCIA/ACQ/2026/07718

ATTACHMENT C
Distribution List - RFP-CO-424373-ON-X

NATO Delegation (Attn: Infrastructure Adviser):

- Albania
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Canada
- Croatia
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Iceland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Montenegro
- The Netherlands
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Slovenia

NATO UNCLASSIFIED



NATO UNCLASSIFIED

NCIA/ACQ/2026/07718

NATO Communications
and Information Agency

Spain

- Sweden
- Türkiye
- United Kingdom
- United States

Strategic Commands

- HQ SACT Attn: R&D Contracting Office

ACO Liaison Office

All NATEXs

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

ATTACHMENT D
Book I Appendix B – Questions and Answers



Purchaser Issued
Issue Date: September 11, 2026

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FORM							
RFP-CO-424373-ON-X							
Serial #	Category	Solicitation Source Document	Solicitation Paragraph Reference	Bidder's Question	NCIA's Answer	Solicitation Package Amended	Answer Released in AMD #
GR-01	Administration	n/a	Book I, Appendix B - Questions and Answers	General Response	A question that concerns the draft Book II or another later-stage matter is not determined through this Step 1 Q&A. No content addressing this matter is required in, or evaluated as part of, the Step 1 Bid. NCIA has recorded the point for consideration in preparing the Step 2 baseline. This answer does not accept the proposed approach or change, or commit the content of Step 2. Bidders admitted to Step 2 will have the opportunity to submit questions on the Step 2 baseline in accordance with the process set out in the Step 2 amendment.	No	//
PN-01	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 3.2(b)(1), Table 4, item 2	Purchaser Notice	Amendment No. 1 will retain the minimum average annual global-revenue requirement of 500 MEUR and will also require at least 375 MEUR of that average to be revenue of the Prime Entity (sole Bidder or Principal Contractor under GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2)) as reported in its own financial statements or of a parent company of the Prime Entity that provides the required parent-company guarantee. Revenue of another consortium members of the Bidder may satisfy only the balance required to reach 500 MEUR, subject to the applicable guarantee, signature and financial-evidence requirements. Revenue of a Critical Reference Provider, subcontractor or supplier will not count.	Yes	1
1	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	GBI SECTION 2.12 Project-Specific Book I SECTIONS 1.3 and 1.6	GBI SECTION 2.12 states that requests for alteration to, waivers of, or deviations from the terms and conditions of the solicitation may not be considered after the questions and answers period. The Project-Specific Book I states that Bidders admitted to the Step 2 Competitive Range will receive a detailed Contractual Compliance Table through which they may indicate compliance with, or propose deviations from, contractual provisions, and that Step 2 initial offers include proposed red-lines against Book II negotiable terms. Please confirm that the closure of the Step 1 questions and answers period does not preclude a Bidder admitted to the competitive range from requesting waivers or deviations from the GTC and STC through the Step 2 Contractual Compliance Table and red-line process, and that a separate questions and answers period will be opened under the Step 2 RFP amendment.	Yes. Bidders admitted to Step 2 will have a further Questions and Answers period on the Step 2 baseline. The Step 2 amendment will issue a Contractual Compliance Table covering the GTC and STC provisions identified for Bidder response with the initial offers and will identify provisions that are non-negotiable and those for which proposed changes may be submitted. Bidders shall record their compliance and, where permitted by the Step 2 instructions, any proposed changes in the Contractual Compliance Table. Any accepted change affecting the application or effect of a GTC provision for ON-X will be implemented through the project-specific STCs. Submission of a proposed change does not imply its acceptance or create an entitlement to dialogue or negotiation concerning that proposal	No	//
2	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions	SECTION 2.1(a)(2)	Could you confirm whether and entity from one Nation with the same corporate name as an entity from another Nation can both submit a bid?	A common or similar corporate name, or incorporation in different Nations, does not by itself determine whether two entities may each submit a Bid. Under GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2), the same exact legal entity may participate in only one Bid, whether as sole Bidder or as a member of a consortium. In addition, for purposes of NATO Procurement Policy (NPP) Principle of Open and Fair Competition (ref. NPP provision 3.2), Amendment No. 1 will specify that legal entities belonging to the same "global group of companies" may hold only one Prime Entity position for this Solicitation. The Prime Entity is the sole legal-entity Bidder or, where the Bidder is a consortium, the member designated as Principal Contractor. Where one legal entity of a group submits a Bid as sole Bidder or is designated Principal Contractor of a consortium Bidder, no other legal entity of that group may submit another Bid as sole Bidder or be designated Principal Contractor. Amendment No. 1 will specify the meaning and application of "global group of companies" and any Bid affected by a breach of this rule will be rejected. This restriction applies only to the Prime Entity position. It does not, solely because of group affiliation, prevent a different legal entity of the same group from participating in another Bid in any capacity other than as Prime Entity, subject to all other Solicitation requirements.	Yes	1
3	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	GBI SECTION 2.3 Project-Specific Book I SECTION 2.2	Could the authority extend the bid closing date?	Yes, as notified on 01/09/2026, Purchaser has decided to extend the Bid Closing Date. The new date & time is Friday October 9th, 12:00 Central European Summer Time.	Yes	1
4	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix E – Customer Validation Form	GBI SECTION 3.6 Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(v)–(x) Appendix E, Sections E.5–E.6	Could the Contracting Authority please clarify whether a declaration signed by the Customer, confirming the relevant project reference and the accuracy of the information provided, would be accepted as equivalent evidence to the Customer's signature on Appendix E of Book 1?	Yes. A standard formal institutional declaration issued by the customer, confirming the relevant project reference and the accuracy of the information provided, will be accepted as equivalent to the customer's signature on Appendix E. The customer shall submit the declaration directly to NCIA together with the completed Appendix E.	Yes	1
5	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix D – Corporate Experience Reference Form	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(ii)(A) Appendix D, Sections D.1–D.2	This reference states "Provide a summary description of contract work, for each cited reference." The CER does not provide an area to address this requirement. Are bidders allowed to include a brief summary description in the beginning of Volume 3 outside the page limit?	No. Subparagraph (A) does not require a separate narrative or additional page. The completed Appendix D provides the summary of each reference: D.1 identifies the customer/contract, performance period, role, share and accountability; D.2 records the relevant work performed, including its scale, period and the claimed entity's accountability. Those D.2 entries also demonstrate relevance under subparagraph (B). No separate summary outside Appendix D is permitted. The three-page limit per CER and nine-page total remain.	No	//

6	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(ii)(A) Risk Map tab	Paragraph states: "Part B tests the Bidder's own risk foresight. The Bidder shall itself identify the risks it considers most critical to the success of a program of the nature and scope described in this Solicitation, including risks that originate on the Purchaser's side. The Risk Map in the Masterfile is" Please provide the missing text in the last sentence.	The missing text is: "a non-exhaustive and unranked contextual aid. It neither prescribes a coverage checklist nor limits the Bidder's own identification and prioritisation of the risks it considers most critical."	Yes	1
7	Administration	Book I: Appendix D – Corporate Experience Reference Form	Sections D.2–D.3.3	Appendix D specifies both an overall 3-page limit for the completed form and individual character limits within each response field. In several fields, the character limit is more restrictive than the physical size of the response box, preventing offerors from making full use of the space provided. Given that the form already enforces an overall page limit, would NATO remove the per-field character limits and allow the 3-page limit to govern the length of offeror responses, along with an updated Appendix D reflecting this change?	Yes. Amendment No. 1 will provide a corrected Appendix D without the per-field character limits. The specified three-page limit per CER remains.	Yes	1
8		Book I: Appendix D – Corporate Experience Reference Form	Sections D.2–D.3.3	The PDF form as issued has a per-field limit of 100 characters restricting clarity of answer - are bidders permitted to convert or edit the form to remove that cap? We note the overall page limit per form.	Yes, bidders are permitted to convert or edit the form to remove the cap as long as the overall page limit per form is respected. Purchaser will release a corrected version with Amendment 1 as well.	Yes	1
9	Administration	Book I: Appendix D – Corporate Experience Reference Form	Sections D.3.2–D.3.3	Appendix D Section D.3 requires offerors to provide a Customer Evidence Locator or Validating ID and an Evidence Locator to support their performance claims. Would NATO clarify what these fields are intended to capture and provide an example of a properly completed entry?	These fields request a concise pointer to an existing customer-controlled or mutually recognised record that may be used to corroborate the claim, for example a report title and date, KPI or customer reference. They do not require an attachment or a bidder-created evidence ID. The fixed [CER-ID]-P1 through P5 identifiers remain the ON-X evidence IDs.	No	//
10	Administration	Policy Package	AC/322-D(2026)0024	The following document appears to be missing from the published policy set: AC/322-D(2026)0024 – NATO Secret in the Cloud. Could you please provide a copy?	Purchaser will provide a copy of AC/322-D(2026)0024 to all prospective bidders in a sperate attachment along with this Q&A file.	No	//
11	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix A – Prime Accountability and Reference Lock	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(C) Appendix A	Does providing an additional claim by way of supplementary evidence require the sub-contractor to sign the Reference-Lock Joint Statement (as it does with a CER)?	No additional signature is required solely because supplementary evidence is used because no additional entity may be introduced solely to provide supplementary evidence. Supplementary evidence may be attributable only to the exact legal entity who's CER is one of the three Volume 3 CERs in that Bid.	Yes	1
12	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(C) and (F)	What validation is required for supplementary evidence? What is the definition of a verifiable customer and how do we verify the claim for supplementary evidence?	A verifiable customer contact is a named representative of the customer organisation who has direct knowledge of the cited work and result and can be reached through official organisational contact details. The Bid shall identify the customer, project or contract, relevant period, representative's name and title, official contact details and the claim or example to be verified. NCIA may contact the representative or request corroborating information.	No	//
13	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	GBI SECTION 3.5(c) Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(2), Table 5	Section 3.5 (c) of the "General Bidding Instructions" states that Bidders may provide an executive summary, and that, if included, it shall not exceed a two-page PDF file. The "Project-Specific Bidding Instructions" does not appear to carry this forward. Section 3.2, Table 5, lists only Part A (max 15 pages) and Part B (max 10 pages), for a total maximum of 25 pages for Volume 2. We are convinced that a concise executive summary would be of value to the Contracting Authority. We would therefore be grateful if the Contracting Authority could confirm whether Bidders may include a non-evaluated executive summary of no more than two (2) pages at Step 1, in accordance with Section 3.5 (c) of the "General Bidding Instructions".	Yes. GBI Section 3.5(c) applies, keeping in mind that it states: "An executive summary is not mandatory and shall not be evaluated. This summary (if included) shall not exceed a two paged PDF file.". It may be included in the bid and shall not count towards any of the limitations stated in the Bidding instructions.	Yes	1
14	Technical	Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile Book II: Contract Special Provisions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	Implementation Requirements tab, IR-02 ONX.7 Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(D)(1)	IR-02 requires "private multi-cloud deployment model, disconnected from any network not controlled by NATO or an Ally." The Industry Day states Physical Separation uses "dedicated, fully disconnected private (commercial) data centers." STC ONX.7 states infrastructure may be hosted in "industrial facilities under national oversight." For the Physical Air-Gap deployment model, are commercially owned contractor-furnished data centers (operating under national oversight) an acceptable hosting model? Or must the physical facilities be NATO-owned or government-owned premises?	Book I section 1.3 provides that commercially owned, contractor-furnished data centres may be acceptable. NATO or government ownership is not mandatory. For the Step 1 submission, Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(D)(1) permits factual readiness information about existing facilities and environments regardless of commercial or public ownership.	No	//
15	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix E – Customer Validation Form	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(C) and (F); SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(v)–(x) Appendix E	Where a Bidder uses supplementary evidence from work outside the three Volume 3 Corporate Experience References, please confirm whether the provision of the verifiable customer contact specified in Book I is sufficient, or whether a separate Customer Validation Form is required.	The verifiable customer contact is sufficient; a separate Appendix E is not required for supplementary evidence. Appendix E remains required for each of the three Volume 3 CERs. Supplementary evidence cannot replace the required CER support.	No	//
16	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix A – Prime Accountability and Reference Lock Book I: General Bidding Instructions	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iii) Appendix A GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2)	Please clarify the definition of 'critical subcontractor' for Step 1.	For Step 1, the term "critical subcontractor" means "Critical Reference Provider": a legal entity outside the Bidder under GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2) to which one of the three Volume 3 CERs is attributable. It signs Appendix A in that capacity. A consortium member whose CER is used remains part of the Bidder and signs Appendix A in its consortium-member capacity; it is not a Critical Reference Provider.	Yes	1
17	Technical	Book II: Performance Work Statement Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	PWS paragraph [0036] Implementation Requirements tab, IR-22	IR-22 states that, as a minimum, the solution should span two distinct private-cloud technology platforms with meaningful workload distribution and portability. Please confirm whether this is a mandatory contractual requirement and define: (a) "distinct private-cloud technology platform"; (b) whether the platforms must be supplied by different CSPs or technology vendors; (c) "meaningful workload distribution"; and (d) the minimum required level of platform and workload portability.	IR22 is contained in draft Book II issued for information at Step 1. No ON-X solution, architecture or technology-stack response is required or evaluated at Step 1. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
18	Technical	Book II: Performance Work Statement Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	PWS paragraph [0034].B and PWS Appendix A paragraphs [0037]–[0040] Implementation Requirements tab, IR-22	Must both private-cloud technology platforms required by IR-22 be operational within the initial PoC increment, the Full PoC Target Reference Case, or only during subsequent implementation? Is an asymmetric design acceptable in which one platform provides the principal managed-service catalogue and the second hosts an agreed subset of portable workloads, or must every mandatory service operate on both platforms?	No platform-composition, sequencing or symmetry response is required or evaluated at Step 1. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
19	Technical	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(D)(1) and (F)	Without presenting an ON-X architecture or proposed solution, may bidders identify factual characteristics of currently operational facilities and environments—including exact services, disconnected operating status, accreditation, scale, available capacity and the independence of sites, availability zones or failure domains—to demonstrate current readiness, transferability and mobilisation risk under TM1?	Yes. Book I expressly permits factual current facility and environment readiness information under TM1, subject to the one-page TM1 readiness limit and the 15-page Part A limit as well as all other solicitation requirements.	No	//

20	Administration	Book I: Appendix A – Prime Accountability and Reference Lock Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	Appendix A, Bidder Identification and Declaration; Other Signatory Entities GBI SECTIONS 1.4(b) and 2.1(a)(2) Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(1), Table 4, items 1–2; SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iii)	Approach for the completed, signed Form to be provided as part of the Admin Volume (“Prime Accountability and Reference-Lock Joint Statement”): An entity has engaged and acquired Declaration of Eligibility as confirmed for the legal entity, representing a Group and relevant full affiliates belonging to the same group, specifically and relevant for both corporate experience and main delivery centers towards ON-X. Hence, and considering the specific language in the RFP on legal entities, we plan to submit our candidacy (Step 1 and further progression) as a consortium of 3 legal entities, all belonging 100% and reporting into the same group. To this end, we propose to put the details of one National entity into the Prime Accountability and Reference-Lock Joint Statement Form and to add a duly signed appendix (signed by due and authorized management for the consortium) appointing that national entity to legally and contractually represent these companies in this engagement. In the remaining company fields in the Form, we would add our selected Business Partners from outside the Group. Can you please confirm this would satisfy your requirements for a compliant submission?	NCIA does not confirm the compliance of a proposed submission before evaluation. Legal entities submitting together can be a Bidder under GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2) as long as one member shall be designated Principal Contractor and evidence of its authority to represent and bind every consortium member shall be provided with the Bid. Each consortium member shall be identified and satisfy the applicable eligibility requirements as a Declaration of Eligibility covers only the exact legal entity or entities named in it. The Prime Entity restriction described in Serial 2 applies. At least one of the three CERs shall be attributable to the exact Prime Entity (sole Bidder or Principal Contractor under GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2)) and concern a contract on which that Prime Entity performed as a prime contractor. A non-Principal consortium member whose CER or revenue is relied upon signs Appendix A in its consortium-member capacity. A legal entity outside the consortium whose CER is relied upon is a Critical Reference Provider and signs Appendix A in that capacity. The full subcontracting supply chain is not requested at Step 1.	Yes	1
21	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 3.2(b)(2), Table 5	Table 5 refers to “item 12 in Table 2”, but Table 2 ends at item 11. Please provide item 12.	The reference to "item 12 in Table 2" is an error and shall read "item 10 in Table 2." Amendment No. 1 will correct both instances in Table 5.	Yes	1
22	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(A), (C) and (F)	Could the Purchaser please confirm whether claims based on work outside the three Volume 3 references may be submitted as supplementary evidence, provided that a verifiable customer contact is included, and clarify how this exception aligns with the requirement that every claim must be traceable to Volume 3?	Yes, but supplementary evidence may concern only work performed by the Prime Entity (the sole Bidder or Bidder's Principal Contractor) or by a legal entity whose CER is one of the three Volume 3 CERs in that bid and which signs Appendix A in its actual capacity. A verifiable customer contact shall be provided. Each applicable Volume 2 criterion must remain supported by at least one of the three CERs.	Yes	1
23	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(ii)(A) Risk Map tab	The sentence ends “The Risk Map in the Masterfile is” and is incomplete. The referenced Risk Map/status is missing. Please provide full sentence.	See response to serial 6	Yes	1
24	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	GBI SECTION 1.4 Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iii)(A)	Can a bidder propose critical subcontractors contributing to the references that are not established in a NATO member state?	No. Under GBI SECTION 1.4, a legal entity from a non-participating nation may not participate as a Bidder or serve as a contractor or subcontractor for this Solicitation. A Critical Reference Provider commits to a relied-upon contract role and must therefore be a Firm of a Participating Nation.	No	//
25	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 1.5, Security Classification of the Solicitation and Planned Contract	Will critical subcontractors and subcontractors also be required to have FSC?	No FSC or PSC evidence is required at Step 1 of the Solicitation. The planned Contract is NATO SECRET (Section 1.5(b) of the Project-Specific Bidding Instructions). NATO security policy applies to contractors and sub-contractors alike. For Contract performance, the applicable clearance requirements for a sub-contractor and its personell will depend on their role and access to classified information. Further details will be specified at Step 2.	No	//
26	Administration	Book I: Appendix A – Prime Accountability and Reference Lock Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	Appendix A, Continuity; Other Signatory Entities Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iii)	Are legal entities providing references bound to deliver scope under the prospective contract?	Yes. Each exact legal entity other than the Prime whose CER is used signs Appendix A page 2 and commits to its stated relied-upon role throughout the competition and, if awarded, contract performance. A consortium member signs in its consortium-member capacity; an external entity to the Bidder signs as the Critical Reference Provider.	Yes	1
27	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix A – Prime Accountability and Reference Lock Book I: General Bidding Instructions	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iii) Appendix A GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2)	Background & Context Section 3 (3)(iii) stipulates that references may be drawn from the Bidder and/or from up to two (2) named critical subcontractors. Specific Clarification Questions 1) With reference to Book I, Section 3.2(b)(3)(iii) and Appendix A, could the Purchaser please clarify whether a subcontractor designated as a 'Critical Subcontractor' (or 'Critical Reference Provider') is permitted to sign the Appendix A joint statement for more than one Prime Bidder's proposal during Step 1? If a Critical Subcontractor is found to have executed Appendix A Reference-Locks for multiple competing bids, will this result in the administrative non-compliance or rejection of the affected Prime Bidders' bids? 2) Could the Purchaser please clarify if the inclusion of a Subcontractor's past performance contract via a Corporate Experience Reference (CER) form in Volume 3 ipso facto classifies that Subcontractor as a 'Critical Subcontractor' under Book I, Section 3.2(b)(3)(iii)? Specifically, if a Prime Bidder submits a Subcontractor's CER only for supplementary or informational purposes, is that Subcontractor therefore mandated to sign the Appendix A Reference-Lock? 3) In the event that a Subcontractor is permitted to support multiple competing Prime Bidders in Step 1 with CERs without becoming an exclusive locked Critical Subcontractor, is that Subcontractor permitted to utilize the same past performance project/contract reference (CER) across multiple bids? Or must each submitted CER represent a unique, non-overlapping contract reference?	1. Yes, a Critical Reference Provider may support more than one Step 1 Bid and sign Appendix A for each, provided each commitment is genuine and capable of being performed. The definition set out in GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2) remains unchanged. The additional restriction described in Serial 2 applies only to Prime Entity positions. 2. Where one of the three Volume 3 CERs is attributable to a legal entity outside the Bidder, that entity is a Critical Reference Provider and signs Appendix A in that capacity. A CER-owning consortium member signs in its consortium member capacity and is not a Critical Reference Provider. Supplementary evidence is not a CER and may not introduce another evidence-providing legal entity. 3. The same Critical Reference Provider and the same accurately attributed CER may be included in more than one Step 1 Bid. The underlying customer contract need not be unique to each Bid. Every claim must be attributable to the exact legal entity that performed the work.	Yes	1

28	Technical	Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile Policy Package	Implementation Requirements tab, IR-22 AC/322-D(2024)0072, paragraph 14; AC/322-D(2025)0061, paragraphs 28.5 and 51	Background & Context IR-22 mandates that the proposed solution spans at least two distinct private cloud technology platforms to ensure platform portability and supply chain resilience under a single accountable Prime Contractor. To ensure full alignment with NCIA's architectural, security, and risk mitigation expectations, we request explicit clarification on the boundaries of this requirement. Specific Clarification Questions 1) Vendor/Technology Diversity (Platform Portability Abstraction). To ensure alignment with the core non-lock-in principles of the NATO Cloud and Edge Computing Policy (AC/322-D(2024)0072, Paragraph 14), which seeks to "increase resilience and mitigate vendor lock-in", does the Purchaser evaluate "distinct private cloud technology platforms" at the workload abstraction tier? 2) OCI-compliant containers. Specifically, if a bidder proposes geographically separated, multi-region private cloud enclaves built on a unified, open-standards platform (e.g., CNCF-conformant Kubernetes APIs) that guarantees 100% workload and data portability via standard OCI-compliant containers, does this satisfy the intent of IR-22 by programmatically eliminating proprietary technology lock-in? 3) Supply Chain & Hardware Isolation boundaries. Regarding "supply chain resilience" as specified in IR-22: Does the Purchaser require physical hardware-level diversity (e.g., independent server OEMs, CPU silicon architectures, and storage controllers from separate manufacturers to prevent common-mode hardware supply chain failures)? Or is supply chain resilience evaluated at the software/platform abstraction tier (e.g., containerized workload portability across standardized, compliant infrastructure)? 4) Operational Model and SIAM Alignment. The NATO Cloud and Edge Computing Directive (AC/322-D(2025)0061, Paragraph 51) explicitly acknowledges that multi-sourcing distinct proprietary enclaves introduces severe Service Integration and Management (SIAM) overhead and difficulty in managing end-to-end services. 5) Architectural Standards. Furthermore, Paragraph 28.5 of the same Directive charges the NCIA to "establish architecture standards... to reduce technical debt and foster reuse". Given these operational constraints, could the Authority confirm whether hosting workloads across physically air-gapped, geographically separated private cloud enclaves using a unified, standardized technology stack satisfies the resilience and non-lock-in intent of IR-22, while actively minimising	IR22 is part of draft Book II issued for information at Step 1. No ON-X technical solution, architecture or technology-stack response is required or evaluated at Step 1. NCIA does not determine through this Q&A whether the described approach satisfies IR22. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
29	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	GTC G.3; GTC G.10; GTC A.5.3(b)–(c) Outcomes tab, HLO-8	Background & Context: Under HLO-8 (AI platform services) and GTC G (General Terms for AI), the Supplier must ensure "legality of data collection" for all training datasets and grant broad rights to "Results". Specific Clarification Questions Regarding GTC G.3 (Use of Data Sets and Bias Mitigation) and GTC G.10 (Intellectual Property): Could the Authority confirm that for pre-trained Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) Artificial Intelligence models and Large Language Models (LLMs) hosted locally within the private cloud platform, the requirement to verify and audit training datasets is satisfied by the supplier's standard commercial compliance attestations? Additionally, please confirm that the pre-trained weights, architectures, and base algorithms of such COTS models remain strictly classified as Contractor Background IPR, and that the Authority's ownership rights under GTC G.10.9 apply exclusively to Foreground IPR specifically created for NATO and the specific inputs/outputs (Results) generated by the Authority's operational use?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
30	Technical	Book II: Performance Work Statement Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	PWS SECTION 1.7 Outcomes tab, HLO-14; Implementation Requirements tab, IR-06; QASP tab	Background & Context IR-06 (Accreditation) and HLO-14 (Continuous Compliance) mandate a "live, up-to-date compliance evidence pack" with continuous monitoring and automated alerting. Specific Clarification Questions Regarding the requirement for continuous compliance and dynamic evidence mapping under HLO-14 and IR-06: Will the Security Accreditation Authority (SAA) accept automated, system-generated digital telemetry, machine-readable compliance artifacts (e.g., Open Security Controls Assessment Language - OSCAL JSON feeds), and real-time security dashboards as primary verification sources for the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)? Confirming that automated, continuous digital verification is acceptable in lieu of traditional, static, paper-based documentation will enable Bidders to propose modern, software-defined compliance architectures that significantly reduce administrative Operations & Maintenance overhead.	No QASP or compliance-evidence response is required at Step 1. NCIA does not approve any evidence format or substitute for security assessment or accreditation through this Q&A. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
31	Technical	Book II: Performance Work Statement Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile Policy Package	PWS SECTION 1.5.5 Outcomes tab, HLO-6; Implementation Requirements tab, IR-02 and IR-14 AC/322-D(2026)0024, paragraphs 4–5	Background & Context IR-14 (Development Environment) requires integration with the NATO Software Factory (NSF) and the Electronic Definitive Media Library (EDML). Specific Clarification Questions Regarding IR-14 (Development & Reference Environment) and HLO-6 (Cloud Platform and Engineering): Under the strict Physical Air-Gap model required by IR-02 and D24, real-time external network connections to public-facing development services are prohibited. Could the Authority clarify the integration boundaries between the platform's local, tenant-isolated DevSecOps pipelines and the external NSF/EDML? Specifically, will the private cloud solution be permitted to operate a fully disconnected local container registry and CI/CD environment that consumes signed software enablers asynchronously imported via unidirectional transfer paths (e.g., data diodes) from the EDML?	No development-environment architecture or integration design is required at Step 1. NCIA does not approve the described registry, transfer mechanism or technology through this Q&A. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//

32	Price	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book II: Contract Special Provisions Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	Project-Specific Book I SECTIONS 1.3 and 3.2(b)(4) ONX.4.5 Instructions, Service Catalogue, Task Orders – Overview and Task Orders – Breakdown tabs	Background & Context AC/322-D(2025)0061 (Paragraph 60) emphasizes "pay-per-use, on-demand" models as a key cloud benefit, but Book I Section 1.3(b) requires Task Orders to be Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP). Specific Clarification Questions Regarding the Cloud Cost Management principles in AC/322-D(2025)0061 (which mandate pay-per-use and FinOps practices) and the requirement in Book I, Section 1.3(b) that Task Orders be issued as Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) instruments: Could the Authority confirm that Bidders may structure their Service Catalogues (Sheet 8) using dynamic, consumption-based cloud pricing metrics (e.g., price per vCPU/hour or GB/month), provided that individual Task Orders are funded as FFP instruments with defined 'Not-to-Exceed' capped budgets, under which actual consumption is tracked, billed, and reconciled monthly?	No Task Order proposals or Service Catalogue is requested or evaluated at Step 1. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
33	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions Book II: Contract Special Provisions	GTC D.9; GTC G.11; GTC A.3.8 ONX.2; ONX.7.5	Background & Context GTC D.9 (Audits) restricts the vendor's ability to audit COTS licensing, while GTC Subset 5 (Cloud Services) and ONX.2 grant NATO broad auditing rights. Specific Clarification Questions Regarding GTC D.9 (Audits) and GTC G.11 (AI Audits): Given the strict security enclaves and physical air-gaps required to process NATO SECRET data, standard commercial, internet-dependent licensing verification calls ('home-calling' telemetry) are prohibited. Can the Authority confirm that local, system-generated cryptographic license verification tools or self-reporting administration dashboards running natively inside the disconnected private cloud are accepted as fully compliant evidence of license utilisation, satisfying the intent of GTC D.9 and GTC G.11 without requiring physical audit access by external, uncleared software compliance personnel?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
34	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book II: Contract General Provisions	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 1.4; SECTION 2.1, Table 2, item 7 GBI SECTION 1.4 GTC A.1.3(a)(54)–(55); GTC A.1.8(b); GTC A.3.5(a), (d)–(e)	Background: Eligibility rules require prime contractors to originate from NATO member nations. For the upcoming RFP, we anticipate a partner-led consortium where the lead bidder is an eligible entity incorporated in a NATO member state. Specific Clarification Questions: Could the Purchaser please clarify the eligibility criteria regarding the country of origin for subcontractors and third-party software/infrastructure vendors? Specifically, where the Prime Contractor is an eligible entity incorporated within a NATO member nation, is an entity incorporated in Ireland (an EU / Partnership for Peace nation) permitted to act as: (a) A formal subcontractor delivering cloud and hosting services, or (b) A third-party Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) / infrastructure platform provider? Please confirm whether this requires any specific waiver or if routing via an affiliate in a NATO member nation is required.	(a) No. GBI SECTION 1.4 excludes an entity from a non-Participating Nation (even if Partnership for Peace) from serving as a subcontractor.. (b) The description “COTS or infrastructure platform provider” does not, by itself, determine whether the entity is a Subcontractor under the GTCs. If it is a Subcontractor, paragraph (a) applies. Otherwise, its proposed use is a later-stage matter subject to the applicable GTC and STC provisions. This response grants no approval or waiver. However, routing through an affiliate does not by itself establish compliance.	No	//
35	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions Book II: Contract Special Provisions	GTC F.10 Source Code Escrow; ONX.9.2	Background: STC Clause 24 and Clause ONX.9.2 mandate third-party escrow of platform source code and configurations, which presents an operational mismatch for proprietary, hardware-integrated cloud platforms that cannot run independently on standard commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) hardware. Specific Clarification Questions: With reference to STC Clause 24 and Clause ONX.9.2, which mandate that the Contractor establish a third-party escrow agreement containing 'source code, configurations, documentation, and any other materials necessary for the continued use or migration of the Services': For proprietary Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) cloud platform components where the underlying hypervisor, control plane software, or physical microcode is hardware-dependent and cannot be executed on standard commercial-off-the-shelf servers, could the Purchaser confirm that this escrow requirement is satisfied by the deposit of high-level API schemas, Infrastructure-as-Code (IaC) deployment templates, and data migration/export scripts, in lieu of proprietary platform source code?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//

36	Administration	Book II: Contract Special Provisions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	STC J.1; ONX.7.5 Project-Specific Book I SECTION 1.5	Background: Although STC Clause J.1 and Clause ONX.7.5 mandate NATO SECRET clearances for performing personnel and ban remote administration, the physical air-gap deployment model and hardware-level cryptographic isolation ensure that background hardware maintenance and physical replacement personnel have zero logical access to classified NATO information. Specific Clarification Questions: With reference to STC Clause J.1 and Clause ONX.7.5, which prohibit remote administration and mandate that all performing personnel hold valid NATO SECRET Personnel Security Clearances (PSCs): In a Physical Air-Gap deployment model where all NATO data and encryption keys remain under exclusive NATO logical control, and data-at-rest and in-use are cryptographically isolated utilizing hardware-rooted Confidential Computing, is a formal NATO SECRET PSC required for global background platform maintenance personnel (such as Site Reliability Engineers or hardware technicians) who perform physical component replacements or automated platform-level software updates but have zero logical access to classified NATO information? Please clarify if equivalent national-level clearances are acceptable for these background maintenance roles.	Technical isolation does not by itself waive a clearance requirement and it shall be noted that specific administrator tiers will require even higher clearance (see Project Specific Bidding Instructions Section 1.5). General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
37	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix D – Corporate Experience Reference Form	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iii)–(iv); SECTION 4.7 Appendix D, Sections D.2 and D.7	Background: The Step 1 Volume 3 evaluation instructions require past performance references (CERs) to demonstrate complex secure deployment capabilities, but the text remains ambiguous on whether these references must be restricted to the exact proposed private cloud platform OEM architecture—which would trigger the restrictive Appendix A Reference-Lock—or if general, platform-agnostic defense IT integration experience is sufficient. Specific Clarification Questions: With reference to the Step 1 Volume 3 evaluation criteria, could the Purchaser please clarify the required level of specificity for past performance references submitted via the Corporate Experience Reference (CER) forms? Specifically, must a submitted reference demonstrate the successful deployment and operation of the exact, specific private/air-gapped cloud platform software and hardware architecture being proposed for the final ON-X solution (which would require the specific platform OEM/vendor to act as a 'Critical Subcontractor' and execute the Appendix A Reference-Lock)? Or, will the Purchaser accept general, platform-agnostic corporate experience demonstrating a Prime Bidder's capability to deploy and integrate complex, highly secure enterprise IT networks, sovereign virtualization layers, or hosting infrastructures in the defense and national security sector? If general, platform-agnostic defense integration experience is deemed compliant for Volume 3, please confirm that the underlying cloud platform technology provider (e.g., the CCSP/OEM) is not required to be designated as a 'Critical Subcontractor' or to execute an Appendix A Reference-Lock solely by virtue of their commercial platform software being specified in the proposal.	CERs are evaluated against the published recency, relevancy, and quality requirements. Relevancy is assessed against the totality of the dimensions in Section 3.2(b)(3)(iv), Table 7, and no single dimension is an automatic pass/fail threshold. A reference that does not specifically concern an air-gapped environment is not non-compliant on that account. It is rated for relevancy on what it demonstrates across those dimensions, using the adjectival scales in Section 4.7. No specific ON-X solution is requested at Step 1. A technology provider outside the Bidder is a Critical Reference Provider only where one of the three Volume 3 CERs is attributable to it. Merely identifying or using its technology does not create that role.	No	//
38	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	GBI SECTION 2.11(a)(3) Project-Specific Book I SECTION 1.6	Background: While the Step 2 evaluation mandates a technical demonstration of the proposed multi-cloud capabilities, the RFP does not clarify whether this demonstration must be executed on dedicated, newly procured physical hardware or if virtual sandboxes and/or pre-existing physical testbeds are acceptable. Specific Clarification Questions: Could the Purchaser please clarify the physical infrastructure baseline required for the Step 2 technical demonstration? Specifically, is the Bidder permitted to conduct the required technical demonstrations utilizing virtualized emulation platforms or software-defined sandbox environments (such as the Google Distributed Cloud Sandbox)? If the demonstration must run on physical hardware, is the Bidder required to deploy brand-new, dedicated, and isolated physical hardware nodes solely for the Step 2 evaluation, or is the Bidder permitted to leverage existing, pre-established physical hardware platforms (such as active pilot installations or joint innovation enclaves) to satisfy the demonstration criteria?	Step 1 neither requests nor evaluates a technical demonstration. No demonstration environment or hardware baseline is specified or approved through this Q&A. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//

39	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	GBI SECTION 2.11(a)(3) Implementation Requirements tab, IR-01 and IR-06	Background: Under IR-01 and IR-06, Bidders must demonstrate compliance with the D24 directive across the full technology stack, but the RFP remains unclear regarding whether the Step 2 technical demonstration environment must undergo a full security review/accreditation or if a logical controls mapping and self-attestation package is sufficient for this evaluation step. Specific Clarification Questions: With reference to the Step 2 technical demonstration and the compliance enforcements outlined in PWS Appendix B (IR-01 and IR-06) regarding the D24 directive (AC/322-D(2026)0024): Could the Purchaser please clarify the expected scope and depth of the security accreditation and compliance verification required for the Step 2 technical demonstration platform? Specifically, is the Bidder required to submit the demonstration environment (hardware and virtualization layer) to a formal, independent security compliance review, audit, or Interim Authority to Operate (IATO) assessment prior to or during the Step 2 evaluation? Or, is the Step 2 compliance requirement satisfied solely by the submission of an indicative security control mapping, compliance crosswalk, and self-attestation package demonstrating the theoretical path to D24 compliance for the final proposed architecture?	Step 1 neither requests nor evaluates a technical demonstration. No demonstration evidence, accreditation or self-attestation approach is specified or approved through this Q&A. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
40	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	GBI SECTION 2.11(a)(3) Implementation Requirements tab, IR-22	Background: While the PWS mandates the use of two distinct cloud platforms (IR-22), it remains unclear to what extent real-time, cross-platform integration or Cross-Domain Gateway (CDS) functionality must be actively operational and shown during the Step 2 technical demonstration. Specific Clarification Questions: With reference to the requirement to deploy two distinct cloud platforms (IR-22) and the Step 2 technical demonstration guidelines: Could the Purchaser please clarify the expected depth of active, real-time integration between the two proposed cloud platforms that must be demonstrated during the Step 2 evaluation? Specifically, is the Bidder required to demonstrate live, functional interoperability and data synchronization between the two platforms during the demonstration? Furthermore, are there special requirements to showcase a functional Cross-Domain Gateway or Cross-Domain Solution (CDS) transferring data across platform boundaries during the live demo, or will a conceptual architectural blueprint and security mapping in the written proposal satisfy the Step 2 evaluation criteria for these integration points?	Step 1 neither requests nor evaluates a technical demonstration. No interoperability, data-synchronisation or cross-domain approach is specified or approved through this Q&A. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
41	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 1.5	How does NATO envisage the accreditation process for the current set of approved cloud providers and what role NATO will play for the same?	The Step 1 material does not identify or approve a solution or set of cloud providers for ON-X, and no accreditation plan is requested at Step 1. No provider or accreditation route is approved through this Q&A. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
42	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(D)(5), TM5	What are the plans and process that will be supported by NATO to on board future cloud providers which may be eligible for air gapped hosting later?	TM5 requests evidence from prior work showing the Bidder's ability to integrate new technologies or respond to changing standards or directives; it does not request an ON-X provider-onboarding plan. No provider-onboarding process or approval is established through this Q&A. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
43	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix D – Corporate Experience Reference Form	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iv), Table 7, D7 Appendix D, Sections D.2 and D.7	Since this is a 10-year contract, what are the vision and guidance on upgrading to the latest version of the technology platform that will be used for the ONX solution from NCIA?	Appendix D dimension D7 requests facts from cited past performance concerning technological currency, refresh, obsolescence and end-of-life replacement; it does not request an ON-X technology-upgrade plan. No versioning or upgrade rule is approved through this Q&A. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
44	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book II: PWS Appendix B – Masterfile	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 1.3 PFP tab	Will NATO directly work with the cloud providers for best possible commercial and contractual option ? and enable the shortlisted system integrator to use the same?	Bidders shall not assume that NCIA will procure or make available third-party terms, pricing or capacity, except to the extent expressly identified as Purchaser-Furnished Property (PFP) in the Solicitation. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
45	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix D – Corporate Experience Reference Form	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iv), Table 7, D7 Appendix D, Sections D.2 and D.7	What happens when a technology platform or cloud provider discontinues a product or there is a change in technology / hardware for AI compute etc. how would NCIA work with the selected vendors for mitigation of any issues?	Appendix D, dimension D7, requests past-performance evidence concerning lifecycle change, obsolescence and continuity and it does not request an ON-X-specific proposal. General Response GR-01 otherwise applies.	No	//
46	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: General Bidding Instructions	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(C) and (F), Table 5 GBI SECTION 3.3(c), Page Limitations	Supplementary evidence from work outside the three Volume 3 references may be included "if a verifiable customer contact is provided." Please clarify the acceptable format for providing such contacts - should they be embedded in-line within the Part A narrative, or listed in a separate annex excluded from the 15-page limit?	The verifiable customer contact (see also answer to serial 12) may be provided either in line with the relevant supplementary-evidence example or in a clearly labelled annexe placed immediately after the 15-page Part A response in the same Volume 2 Part A PDF. Inline contact information will count within the 15-page limit but a separate and properly labelled annexe may be submitted and will not be counted within the 15-page limit. The annexe must provide clear traceability and contain only: (i) unambiguous reference to the specific example; (ii) the exact legal entity that performed the work and (iii) the official contact details. The annexe is provided solely for traceability and factual validation and is not separately evaluated. The complete substantive example shall remain within the 15-page Part A response. Supplementary evidence remains limited to the entities identified in the answer to Serial 11.	Yes	1

47	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.15(e)(1)–(3), (h)(2)(ii)	A4.15(e)(2) allows recovery of subcontractor termination costs only where Contractor has included a flow-down T4C clause. For a 10-year IDIQ, Contractor will enter long-term hardware procurement contracts, telecom connectivity agreements, and colocation/hosting agreements whose cancellation terms may not allow a full pass-through of a NATO T4C termination. Can NCIA confirm that: (a) A4.15(h)(2)(ii) covers stranded costs from supplier agreements Contractor could not terminate without penalty (including hardware, connectivity, and colocation), irrespective of whether a formal T4C flow-down clause exists — unless to the extent Contractor has identified other opportunities for which those supplier agreements could be used? (b) The 6-month calculation window under A4.15(e)(1)/(3) does not apply to stranded long-term supplier costs that extend beyond 6 months and were committed in good faith for the contract's full lifecycle?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
48	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.5.2	Clause GTC A.5.2 requires the Contractor to keep all Supplies and Services current with technological developments, propose substitutions for obsolete COTS at equivalent or better performance, and absorb all related refresh, integration, migration, and data transition costs without price increase. The Contractor seeks clarification on the following four points: (1) Version currency standard. Industry best practice for long-term managed services contracts defines version currency as maintaining systems, software, and COTS components at N-1 - i.e. one version behind the latest officially released and supported version from the vendor - as the standard of compliance, rather than continuous currency with the absolute latest release. Can NCIA confirm that N-1, relative to the vendor's officially supported release, constitutes compliance with the "latest version" and "keep pace with technological developments" obligations under GTC A.5.2?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
49	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.5.2; GTC A.4.3	Clause GTC A.5.2 requires the Contractor to keep all Supplies and Services current with technological developments, propose substitutions for obsolete COTS at equivalent or better performance, and absorb all related refresh, integration, migration, and data transition costs without price increase. The Contractor seeks clarification on the following four points: (2) Vendor-driven price increases. The obligation to absorb refresh costs "without increase in price" is reasonable where the Contractor controls procurement costs. However, over a 10-year IDIQ, vendor list prices for hardware, software licences, and support contracts will increase due to market conditions entirely outside the Contractor's control. Can NCIA confirm that where the Contractor can demonstrate a verifiable vendor price increase (e.g. published vendor price lists, CPI indexation, or end-of-availability of a product line), an equitable price adjustment through the Changes mechanism (GTC A.4.3) is available to recover the differential?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
50	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.5.2; GTC A.4.3	Clause GTC A.5.2 requires the Contractor to keep all Supplies and Services current with technological developments, propose substitutions for obsolete COTS at equivalent or better performance, and absorb all related refresh, integration, migration, and data transition costs without price increase. The Contractor seeks clarification on the following four points: (3) Major technology transitions as Change Orders. Clause GTC A.5.2 distinguishes between routine version updates and the broader obligation to "cause the Supplies and Services to evolve." Where a technology refresh involves a major transition - such as a change of product generation, platform architecture, or integration layer requiring significant re-engineering, re-testing, and re-acceptance - rather than a minor version update within the same product family, can NCIA confirm that such work constitutes a Change under GTC A.4.3, subject to a formal Change Order and equitable adjustment to price and schedule? Service parity for the Cloud instances are subject to the available updates from the CSP.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
51	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC B.6; GTC A.4.21	The Contractor notes that Clause GTC B.6 provides that payment or operational use of Services by the Purchaser does not constitute implied acceptance. For a Secure Data Centre delivery, the Contractor seeks confirmation that: (a) Where a defect manifests in the production environment, the Purchaser will identify and document the specific non-conformance against agreed Acceptance Criteria, and the Contractor's liability is limited to defects traceable to the Contractor's delivered components and services - excluding failures attributable to interfaces with non-Contractor-controlled systems, networks, or infrastructure not specified in the Contract. (b) In the event of repeated rejection of the same deliverable, the Contractor may invoke the Disputes mechanism under GTC A.4.21 prior to any termination-for-default action by the Purchaser, where the Contractor disputes the technical basis for rejection	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
52	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC E.4	Where the Purchaser requests go-live for urgent operational reasons prior to completion of the full acceptance testing procedure, and the Contractor issues a written caveat identifying known risks, can NCIA confirm that such caveat, once acknowledged in writing by the Contracting Authority, shall be taken into account in any subsequent assessment of the Contractor's liability for defects that were specifically identified in that caveat?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//

53	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.3(b), (e)	Clause GTC A.4.3(e) provides that the Contractor shall submit its Change proposal within thirty (30) Days of receipt of a written Change Order. The Contractor fully supports this standard timeline for routine Changes and recognises the importance of timely responses to maintain programme momentum. For a contract of the scope and duration of ON-X, however, certain Changes may have significant impact on the solution architecture, programme plans, subcontract commitments, or security accreditation requirements. In such cases, submitting a proposal within 30 days risks producing an incomplete or inaccurate assessment - which would ultimately not serve either Party's interest in reaching a sound and well-founded agreement on the Change. Can NCIA confirm that, where the nature and scale of a Change Order warrant a more thorough assessment than can reasonably be completed within 30 days, the Contractor may flag this to the Purchaser and that both Parties will agree in good faith on an extended period - consistent with the principle stated in GTC A.4.3(b) that all Changes are to be discussed and managed in a constructive manner?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
54	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(10) and (13); SECTION 2.12 Project-Specific Book I SECTION 1.3	Since we do not have details of the technical RFP yet we would request NCIA to have the flexibility to discuss the GTC (NCIA Contract General Terms and Conditions) at a later point of time along with STC?	See response GR-01 and Serial 1	No	//
55	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions	SECTION 2.18	As part of the required solution and managed cloud services, we will, next to potentially engaging with one or more subcontractors, have to engage with vendors for IT equipment, software and SaaS. These existing vendors in the marketplace (some/most of which are already vendors to NATO), deliver their products and services only on the basis of their standard terms and conditions, and are not in a position to confirm or abide by general or specific NATO terms, conditions and requirements. Therefore, and without prejudice to our duty to select the right providers that will be able to deliver the required scope, we will as per Section 2.18 referenced here identify such IP and reference the standard terms of the related vendors (i.e. meaning that this will not be in accordance with the definitions and rights set forth in GTC and STC). Such terms will have to be "flown up" to NATO. This is without prejudice to the bidder's duty to comply with GTC and GTC as finalized for the BAFO. Please confirm NATO's understanding and agreement as a matter of principle with such approach?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
56	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.1.9(a)–(b); GTC A.4.21(a), (c)	Reference is made to "the Purchaser equitably adjusting any affected provision (...)". This language remains unilateral / one sided. The usual mechanism in IT contracts when certain situations arise that require adjustments, is for both parties to mutually adjust the relevant provisions (rather than Purchaser doing it one-sided). And then indeed in case no such mutual agreement can be reached, the dispute procedure can be launched. Please your confirmation to adapt this accordingly?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
57	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.1.12(e)–(f)	We suggest to adjust this clause in way that it only applies to the incidents to which the warranty claims/discussions relate. It would be unreasonable for warranty periods to be extended in full in case of correction/replacement or suspended while a warranty claim is being negotiated. We request to amend Clause 12 (e) and (f) accordingly.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
58	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.1.14(c)	Contractor would appreciate our commercial and company interests to be protected in a common and industry compliant way and protect our interest in terms of competition, data integrity and third party intervention. We therefore kindly request to (a) to restrict the third party intervention to independent third parties, , and (b) restrict the access to only that Contractor information and data that is strictly necessary for the scope of the intervention, and (c) to provide 1 month prior notice.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
59	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.2.4(g)	We agree with the principle of set off. However, to avoid accounting issues, please confirm the set-off will be limited to (a) amounts that are confirmed to be due for the ONX project and which are not being challenged, and (b) under the same contract.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
60	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.3.8(a)(5), (b)–(e), (h)	We accept and agree with audit and access rights as a matter of principle. However, to make certain requirements more balanced, and bring them in line with IT industry standards, we request Purchaser to confirm the following clarifications and amendments: (a)Clause 8 (a) (5): should be limited to prices, excluding cost information and cost structure information (which is confidential to Contractor) (b)Clause 8 (b): an efforts obligation is not sufficient. We ask for a firm obligation not to disrupt the Contractor or delay the provision of Services. (c)Clause 8 (c): we request that audits are done only by Purchaser or independent third parties, and subject to a non disclosure agreement with terms not less restrictive than the confidentiality terms of these GTC conditions. Also, we request to limit the duty to provide records to those records or information that are necessary or relevant for the scope of the audit (d)Clause 8 (d): audits are only effective and productive in case Contractor is prepared (e.g. people are available for providing access, information, can prepare for the audit etc). A mere 'efforts obligation' to provide 15 days notice (with no firm commitment) is therefore not helpful. We therefore request a firm commitment for a 1 month prior written notice for any audit. (e)Clause 8 (e): same comment as under (d) above. We request to limit the duty to provide records to those records or information that are necessary or relevant for the scope of the audit. (f)Clause 8 (h): we suggest a mutually agreed time period for us to correct non-compliances, or – alternatively, we request to obtain a reasonably sufficiently long period of time for the associated work and efforts for remedying such non-compliance. Please confirm either of both options?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//

61	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.2(j)	Pricing for each customer is determined by the specific transaction and may reflect several factors. These include scope, volume commitments, service levels, delivery schedules, risk allocation, contract duration, payment terms, geographic requirements, and the overall commercial relationship. The clause would also require us to compare transactions that may not be commercially equivalent. Terms such as "similar quantities" and "similar conditions" do not provide sufficient certainty for that comparison. In addition, monitoring and disclosing pricing offered to other customers could conflict with confidentiality obligations and create a significant administrative burden. The automatic price-adjustment mechanism could also reduce pricing without accounting for material differences in the relevant transactions. We will price any additional or follow-up Supplies or Services in good faith based on the agreed scope and applicable commercial circumstances. Please confirm our understanding and replace the clause with the aforementioned sentence.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
62	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.4; GTC A.4.7(c)	The GTC are subject to Belgian law, including civil law. Civil law provides in clear and balanced mechanisms and statutory prescription rules for raising claims. Adding specific, detailed restrictions and time limits actually substantially impacts the ability to raise a claim in good faith. We therefore kindly request to remove Clause 4 and Clause 7 (c) from the GTC.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
63	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.9(f)	To reduce the exposure of liquidated damages to a reasonable percentage, and in view of the other remedies available to Purchaser (e.g. damages), we propose to lower the percentages as follows: (a) from 20% to 10% of the specific delayed deadline or milestone, and (b) from 15% to 5% of the total value of the contract for the total duration of the contract.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
64	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.9(k); GTC A.4.14(a)	We request to remove the reference to termination and rely on termination for material breach as per the conditions of clauses 14 (a).	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
65	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.10	We understand that liability limitation and exclusions shall apply as per the STC (and subject to negotiation in Step II). These will prevail as per the order of hierarchy of documents over this A.4 clause 10 of GTC. Please confirm our understanding?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
66	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.13	Except where force majeure applies (see relevant GTC clause), we therefore suggest to amend this clause for it to require mutual agreement for such a limited (max 90 days) suspension of activities, and that such agreement will include notice and related modalities, and that Contractor shall not unreasonably withhold such agreement. By doing that, we will adopt the usual industry practice. Please your agreement with such adjustments.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
67	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.14(f)	We propose to remove Clause 14 (f), because we do not see the direct lien between a change of control and a right to termination. An alternative could be to limit the termination right to situations where after the change of control, the contractor is in substantial breach of its obligations (as an example: non NATO country involved). Please your agreement with one of the suggestions.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
68	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.15	Because the duration of this agreement is for a long (10 year) term, we would like to request at least a 12 months prior notice for termination for convenience during the first contract year, and 6 months notice after the first year til year 3, and 90 days notice for the remainder of the contract period.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
69	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.15(p)	We request to specify and agree with NATO that any further data retention beyond the termination date would have to be agreed between Contractor and NATO.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
70	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.18	To preserve service continuity, step-in should remain a exceptional and temporary remedy. Clear boundaries will reduce operational, security, licensing, and cost risks for both parties. They will also help ensure that any intervention resolves the issue without disrupting unaffected services or creating additional liability. Would you therefore agree to clarify and amend this clause as follows? 1.Serious triggers: Could step-in apply only where a material Contractor failure creates a serious and immediate risk to critical services or NATO operations? 2.Objective criteria: Could deadlock or non-acceptance trigger step-in only where it results from such a material failure? 3.Remediation opportunity: Could the Contractor have a reasonable opportunity to implement its remediation plan before step-in? 4.Urgent circumstances: Could immediate step-in remain available where waiting for remediation would create a serious and imminent operational risk? 5.Proportionate scope: Could step-in cover only the affected critical services, systems, facilities, and resources needed to address the triggering event? 6.Time limit: Could step-in last only as long as reasonably necessary, subject to an agreed maximum period of 60 days? 7.Exit mechanism: At the end of that period, could the Purchaser either return the affected services or exercise its applicable termination rights, if the conditions thereto are fulfilled? 8.Resumption: Could the Contractor resume performance after remedying the triggering event and demonstrating its ability to perform? 9.Access safeguards: Could the Purchaser and its nominee comply with applicable security, confidentiality, licensing, safety, and access requirements? 10.Third-party restrictions: Could required assistance remain subject to intellectual property rights, third-party licences, applicable law, and confidentiality obligations? 11.Responsibility for nominees: Could the Purchaser remain responsible for its nominee's conduct and any damage or disruption caused during step-in? 12.Cost allocation: Could recoverable substitution costs be limited to reasonable, documented, incremental costs directly caused by the Contractor's material failure? 13.No duplicate recovery: Could the clause confirm that the Purchaser cannot recover the same	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//

71	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.4.21(d)	We request to amend “unless otherwise instructed (...)” and replace by “unless jointly agreed”.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
72	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.5.3(b)(2)–(6)	We agree with the principle to provide a license to Background IPR. However it is not acceptable for such license to be the same as for Foreground IPR (except commercialization). Background IPR typically comes with restrictions on user rights, is not irrevocable (e.g. when NATO would breach the conditions), and is for the duration of the agreement (since we will provide managed services under the agreement) and not for the duration of the IPR protection. Also providing access to other parties than NATO, e.g. competitors of ours, would not be acceptable. Therefore, please your approval of the above modalities? We also suggest to identify for each relevant Task order the Background IPR so as to avoid any misunderstanding.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
73	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.5.3(d)	Third Party IPR comes with restrictions and standard terms. We cannot agree with this clause and therefore request to confirm that the standard terms and conditions, to be identified by Contractor for Purchaser shall apply for Third Party IPR.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
74	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.5.4(a)–(d)	We agree with the principle of Contractor being responsible and indemnifying NATO for IP violations. We kindly ask to add, in line with industry standards the following conditions: (1)Liability and indemnity under (a) is conditional upon Purchaser informing Contractor immediately in writing, providing all requested information and assistance, and granting Contractor the sole control over the defense (including right to settle) (2)Add under (b) that if options a and b as mentioned are not commercially feasible, Contractor shall be entitled to refund the amounts paid by Purchase for the infringing materials as an alternative (3)Add under (d) the following additional exclusions: 1.use of Supplies, Software, Deliverables or Services by Purchaser not in compliance with the terms of the Contract; 2.use of Supplies, Software, Deliverables or Services by Purchaser in combination with any of Purchaser’s products or services or any third party products or services not permitted by the Contractor. (4)Add that there shall be no liability for infringements in relation to open source software where only the open source terms and conditions shall govern.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
75	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC A.6.8(a)	The underlying hosting services from market cloud providers (e.g. Google) are only offered by the relevant cloud providers on the basis of their standard agreements / terms and conditions. Therefore, this Clause 8 (a) is unacceptable where it requires the Contractor to deliver such hosting services in accordance with the terms of the contract. We therefore require Purchaser to confirm that this clause will be removed or amended accordingly? For clarity, this is without prejudice to Contractor’s duty to deliver the services in accordance with the contract, but – where it regards the standard market cloud providers – subject to the restrictions of their standard agreement / terms and conditions.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
76	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC B.6.2	We propose to refer to “mutually agreed remediation periods” rather than “Purchaser identified remediation periods”.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
77	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC B.6.6	It is industry standard that payment and use of services or deliverables implies the acceptance. Please your agreement to adjust accordingly?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
78	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC B.6.9(c)–(d)	We request to remove the reference to termination in Clause 9 (c) and (d) and rely on termination for material breach as per the conditions of clauses 14 (a).	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
79	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC B.8.2	We propose to remove the words at the end “as dictated by Purchaser” and write instead “as mutually agreed”.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
80	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC B.8.4	We propose to remove since the specifications are clearly set out in Clause 4 (1), (2) and (3).	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
81	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC D.4	In line with an earlier question, we cannot accept that COTS license terms will be overruled in case of conflict or inconsistency with contract or GTC. It is inherent to the provision of COTS software that this is exclusively subject to the standard terms and conditions of the COTS license provider/editor. In line with what the bidding instructions allow we need to be able to identify COTS in the proposal. Please your confirmation?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
82	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC D.5	In line with the question here above any elements such as revoke, termination or suspension will only be subject to the standard terms and conditions of the COTS license provider/editor (not the terms of the NATO contract). Please your confirmation?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
83	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC D.7	In line with the question here above, version changes, functionality changes etc will only be subject to the standard terms and conditions of the COTS license provider/editor (not the terms of the NATO contract). Please your confirmation?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
84	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC D.8	In line with the question here above, renewal will only be subject to the standard terms and conditions of the COTS license provider/editor (not the terms of the NATO contract). Please your confirmation?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
85	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC D.9.1(b)	In line with question above, we request to remove 1 (b)	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
86	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC D.11	In line with question above, we request to remove Clause D.11	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
87	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC E.4.5	It is industry standard that payment and use of services or deliverables implies the acceptance. Please your agreement to adjust accordingly?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
88	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC E.4.8(c)	We propose to remove Clause 4 (8) (c). Termination is arranged GTC Section A.4 Clause 14 (a).	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//

89	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC E.9	Standard software (COTS) comes with restrictions and standard terms. We cannot agree with this clause and therefore request to confirm that both customisation and configuration of standard software as well as source code will be treated as per the standard terms and conditions of the software provider?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
90	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC E.11.2	Termination assistance if delivered by Contractor is a payable service. We request to adjust this clause accordingly.	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
91	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC E.11.4	Where it regards standard software, extension can only be subject to the restrictions and modalities of the software vendor/editor. The price for the extension should also be paid. Please confirm agreement with this request?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
92	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC F.1–F.10	As a CSM, Contractor would transfer and stand by the agreed terms and conditions with the cloud provider(s) / CSP. Therefore, this Section F is not applicable to Contractors acting as a CSM. Please confirm this understanding?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
93	Administration	Book II: Contract General Provisions	GTC G.1–G.11	We welcome and agree the need to have certain AI terms in place. However, to make this realistic and workable in the current state of the AI developments in the marketplace, a numbers of adjustments and clarifications are required to make it suitable and acceptable to the IT services provider: 1.Scope: Can the AI Terms apply only to GenAI expressly identified in each Task Order, rather than every system containing any AI functionality? 2.Definitions: Can we replace the broad definitions with use-case-specific definitions of GenAI, Input, Output and Training Data? 3.Third-party tools: Can the agreement state that applicable GenAI provider terms prevail and that the Contractor's obligations cannot exceed those provider commitments? 4.Results: Can GTC G.9.2 be removed and replaced with disclaimers covering the accuracy, completeness, ownership and non-infringement of GenAI Results? 5.IP: Can GTC G.10 limit assignment to rights that exist and that Contractor owns, subject to third-party terms and Contractor Background IP? 6.Data responsibilities: Can each party warrant its rights in the Inputs and Training Data it supplies, with appropriate indemnity for third-party claims? 7.Indemnity and liability: Can we add GenAI-specific provisions excluding Output claims, except for agreed Contractor-provided data or Contractor-caused modifications under the general liability cap? 8.Policies and changes: Can obligations depend on fixed, mutually agreed specifications, with change control for later policies, standards or additional compliance work? 9.Technical access: Can explainability, logging, documentation and audit duties apply only where technically available and within Contractor's control under third-party terms? 10.Purchaser obligations: Can the Purchaser accept applicable provider policies, lawful-use restrictions, human-review duties and prohibitions on unacceptable or high-risk uses? Please your confirmation of the above?	General Response GR-01 applies.	No	//
94	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(10) and (13); SECTION 2.12 Project-Specific Book I SECTION 1.3	Since we do not have details of the technical RFP yet we would request NCIA to have the flexibility to discuss the GTC (NCIA Contract General Terms and Conditions) at a later point of time along with STC?	See response GR-01 and Serial 1	No	//
95	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions Book I: Appendix A – Prime Accountability and Reference Lock	Project-Specific Book I SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iii) Appendix A	Section 3.2(b)(3)(iii) states: "Work claimed shall be clearly attributed to the legal entity that performed it. Corporate-group experience is not attributed to the Bidder without a demonstrated performance nexus (role, decision rights, workforce and outcomes controlled)." International groups commonly deliver through national operating entities that are entitled, under binding intercompany arrangements, to draw upon the credentials, delivered solutions, assets and workforce of affiliated entities of the same group. Where such arrangements are in place and evidenced, the Bidder understands that: •an evidenced binding intercompany right to rely on an affiliated group entity's credential satisfies the demonstrated performance nexus required by Section 3.2(b)(3)(iii), and •accordingly, the affiliated performing entity does not need to be separately declared or sign Appendix A. Can the Contracting Authority confirm that this understanding is correct?"	No, not as stated. A binding intercompany arrangement giving the Bidder a right to cite or access an affiliate's credentials, delivered solutions, assets or workforce does not, by itself, transfer that affiliate's historical performance to the Bidder or satisfy the demonstrated performance nexus required by SECTION 3.2(b)(3)(iii). Each CER, role and outcome shall be attributed to the exact legal entity that performed and controlled the claimed work. An entity that held the customer contract may claim its actual prime-contractor role and accountability, and any delivery it actually performed and controlled. Delivery performed and controlled by an affiliate remains attributable to that affiliate. The formal employer of the personnel involved or the formal owner of the assets or solutions used, is not by itself decisive. An intercompany arrangement may form part of the evidence of the actual role and control exercised, but is not a substitute for them. Where one of the three Volume 3 CERs is attributable to an affiliate, Amendment No. 1 will require that affiliate to be identified and to sign Appendix A in its actual capacity: as a consortium member forming part of the Bidder under GBI SECTION 2.1(a)(2), or as a Critical Reference Provider outside the Bidder (see Serial 16). If it is a consortium member, the CER may be one of the references drawn from the Bidder, while remaining attributed to that member. The separate requirement in Serial 20 is satisfied only by a CER attributable to the Prime Entity itself for work it performed as prime contractor.	Yes	1

96	Administration	Book I: Project-Specific Bidding Instructions	SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(A), (B), (D) and (F)	“Book I – Project-Specific Bidding Instructions SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i) sets out the requirements for Volume 2, Part A (Transformation Management, maximum 15 pages). Sub-paragraph (A) requires each of the five sub-criteria TM1–TM5 to be supported by at least one Volume 3 Corporate Experience Reference; sub-paragraph (B) prescribes a five-element structure for every example; sub-paragraph (D) specifies the content to be addressed for each sub-criterion; and sub-paragraph (F) requires every claim to be traceable to a Volume 3 reference. The Solicitation does not prescribe a document structure for Part A. Bidders are considering two approaches: 1.organising Part A into five sections, one per TM sub-criterion, and delivering each section's response through one or more examples (CER(s) + Supplemental), each written to the five-element structure of SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(B); or 2.organising Part A into five sections, one per TM sub-criterion, providing in each a narrative response of the Bidders approach to the content specified for that sub-criterion in SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(D), and substantiating each claim with cross-referenced examples (CER(s) + Supplemental), that carry the identifiers and traceability required by SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i)(B) and (F). Please confirm whether the Contracting Authority expects a particular one of these structures. The Bidder raises this question to help establish a common understanding across all Bidders and a level playing field, and to enable Bidders to present Part A in the manner the Contracting Authority considers preferable, thereby making the evaluation as straightforward as possible.”	The Solicitation does not prescribe or prefer a proposed structure. Either may be used, provided the response complies with all requirements of SECTION 3.2(b)(2)(i).	No	//
97	Administration	Book I: General Bidding Instructions	Section 1.4	Can an entity still submit a DoE and if so, until when?	A Declaration of Eligibility (DoE) for any additional legal entity may be submitted directly by the appropriate National Authority, provided NCIA receives it no later than the Bid Closing Date.	Yes	1
98	Administration	NCIA's email from September 1, 2026, stated that “Supplementary evidence as indicated in (2).(i).(C) Project Specific Bidding Instructions is only available for a party that has also provided a CER.”		The Bidder seeks to provide the Purchaser / NCIA with the fullest possible visibility of available facilities. Restricting facility descriptions to CER-submitted parties may prevent NCIA from receiving a comprehensive list of facilities, availability zones, and geographic distribution the Bidder's team can mobilize through supplier partnerships. Please confirm whether the TM1 Facility Readiness response may reference facilities operated by an identified service provider that has not submitted a CER but can be mobilized through the Bidder?	Yes NCIA can confirm. The TM 1 Facility Readiness response may identify facilities or environments operated by a provider regardless of whether that provider provides Past Performance evidence (CER) to the Bid. The response shall address the requirements of section 3.2(b)(2)(i)(D)(1) but is not subject to the Past Performance (CER) evidence requirements as it addresses current-readiness information.	Yes	1