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# The following questions have been raised with respect to the subject IFIB. Response is to provide clarification;

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | | **Response** |
| 01 | Can the liaison function of the IDMI be the same individual for more than one SCT, or does this have to be a separate individual for each SCT? | | For bidding purposes there is one IDMI function per SCT. If, however, one provider is awarded more than one SCT, the IDMI function for the SCT’s could be subject to negotiations. |
| 02 | (1) With regards to the World Fact Book, is this a replacement for country books/studies? (2) In order to calculate effectively the amount of time and manning required, can you please confirm how many fictitious countries are envisaged within the FIKSO setting? | | (1) The factbook is a realistic-looking web-based platform, which – on the surface provides generic data on actors and systems of actors. It contains links to more detailed packages of information, which lead to relevant sections and parts of the ‘traditional’ country-book. (2) There will be the requirement to develop two new fictitious countries for the scenario. There are more countries involved in the setting, but they have already been developed in recent years. |
| 03 | Can you confirm how many hours 1 work unit represents? | | The basis for 1 work unit is a regular working day at JWC from 0730 to 1530. |
| 04 | Will there be the ability to request, through the COTR, support in certain areas from NATO COE so that the very latest NATO doctrine can be incorporated into the products? | | Yes … through Chief Scenario. |
| 05 | Are individual resumes of our consultants we would use to support the development required within our proposal? | | No individual resumes are required, but the provider must demonstrate that the company has access to the required skillsets. |
| 06 | What is the level of expectation regarding JWC ‘JOKER’ / Hub articles? These are not mentioned within the SOW so are we to presume there will be no input into these? | | See footnote Annex B “Strategic Setting SCT” – supplementary documentation. |
| 07 | With regards to setting infrastructure and Geo, will this be created by the JWC Geo Cell? | These requirements are not covered by this contract. | |
| 08 | There is no mention of the need to feed and build up the CAX datasets to support the simulation aspects of the exercise. Are we to presume that this will continue to be done by the JWC in-place CAX team, with support from the contracted Mil Int and Tgt SME? | | Correct. |
| 09 | For the LOGFAS requirement, who will create the datasets? Will the blue book and other essential data be provided by JWC to then be loaded onto LOGFAS or is this also an expected deliverable? | | It is not an expected deliverable from this contract. |
| 10 | Regarding the Systems & Systems-of-Systems analysis for which under current circumstances the SCT3 SME does not feel he is in a position to assess the amount of work required.  The request in itself is understood, but the scale and scope of the deliverable (which in real life would keep a whole team of analysts busy for at least a week) is not detailed enough, which may be reflected in the absence of footnote for this specific item.  The “mandate” is too vague and we request greater detail as to the requirement including but not stopping at:  a. What is the expected format: Word/Acrobat or TOPFAS?  b. Is there a min/max pages constraint?  c. Does the data need to be fed into TOPFAS?  (1)  Then all the exercise data must be fed into SAT/OPT since the very beginning.  (2)  Then access to the software needs to be arranged for the SMEs – modalities? | **a.** Primarily word/Acrobat IOT ‘feed’ TOPFAS operators at the strategic level [SHAPE] with the raw information [normally harvested from Intel FS, open sources etc.]. In extremis, if JWC has to replicate all SHAPE functions during strategic and operational planning, this will have to be conducted in TOPFAS. As the final degree of SHAPE’s commitment within a JUPITER paradigm is unknown, the amount of work cannot be precisely quantified.  **b.** Not at this stage of scenario planning. The requirement will become more visible during the world factbook development … when fictitious players take shape.  **c.** see a.  (2) “swivel chair”: content will be produced in an unclassified environment “outside” the FAS and fed into the classified environment at a later point in time via the IDMI and / or the IKM function. | |
| 11 | Planning reference for the work is COPD v2.0. As COPD has been under review for months and as a v2.x is now circulating for comments inside the NFS and NCS planner community, it is likely that a revised version of the COPD will have superseded the one used as reference. If we keep as an assumption that the players will use the up-to-date version, part of the work (formats, planning factors…) may need review subject to the approval date of the next COPD version. Has this been considered? | | YES! JWC’s basis for the planning of products is the agreed, signed and in-effect doctrine, NOT as draft. |
| 12 | It is suggested that it should be plainly stated that the Training Audience OPLAN is to include SORs and ROEREQ. | | True. |
| 13 | The task “Input to Scenario Wargaming” is too vague. The wargame in itself is a huge JOPG effort and a major event during the CRP.  Does JWC need supporting documents, advice, mentoring, etc? | | A. “scenario wargaming” is an internal non-SOP activity aiming at synchronizing development and content delivery sequences, internal logic interdependencies, etc. … not to be compared with a full, formal JOPG wargaming process.  B. NO. |
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