

## RFI011 NavyPODS – Clarification Log

**Version: 30/06/21**

Clarification Question #	Received Date	Question	Reply Date	Answer
1	10/06/21	<p>Is the focus of this RFI on the available technology to provide a NavyPODS shelter system in ISO form or is looking at technologies that can be deployed within a NavyPODS system?</p> <p>The RFI initially reads that Navy is seeking a PODS system as a modular portable deployable building but Section 3:RFI Outcomes asks for information on what can be included within a PODS system.</p>	15/06/2021	<p>This RFI is intended to aid RN understanding of the ‘art of the possible’ in order to help us determine the potential utility of a range of deployable mission modules, and doing so in a way that opens our mind to novel and innovative ideas and concepts in capability design, build, deployment and operation.</p> <p>Although the intent is a physical container that can be lifted and moved, there’s no reason why this couldn’t be a physical container containing IT infrastructure enabling deployment of instances of NELSON, Naval Strike Network, other Navy IT, or even other Supplier defined systems - especially when considering the potential need for operational deployment of such capability in denied or degraded environments.</p> <p>We’re absolutely open to ideas from digital / software focussed companies as to what a deployable digital capability could provide. We’d suggest that respondents focussing on digital capability should provide at a very high level a recommendation on the minimum technical systems requirement that would likely be needed to deliver such digital capability. This should be contained within the maximum response length (not in additional to).</p>
2	10/06/21	<p>Can you help to clarify your definition of an ISO container is it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A physical container that can house various appliances</li> <li>b. An IT container (i.e. a non physical software based solution)</li> </ul>	15/06/2021	<p>Either would be acceptable and welcome. We’d be just as interested in understanding the state of the art in relation to how to build the POD systems themselves, as we are in understanding what may go in the box. Equally, systems providers need not have knowledge of how to build a container – we would welcome responses from organisations that can see a benefit in deployment of their systems in the way inferred by the RFI, but that that have no knowledge or experience of actually building such system.</p>
3	10/06/2021	<p>If we submit our 3 pages and also include drawings as a separate document</p>	15/06/2021	<p>With the aim of RFI responses being concise and focused, 3 pages is the maximum acceptable amount including all diagrams and drawings.</p>

## RFI011 NavyPODS – Clarification Log

**Version: 30/06/21**

		<p>a. Is that acceptable (on the assumption the drawings may not be read)</p> <p>b. Will adding the drawings take over the 3 page allowance resulting in our 3 page response then not being read</p>		As in section 5 of the original notice, we may not read submissions that exceed this.
4	15/06/2021	<p>Please clarify the current capability &amp; the underpinning technology referenced in the question below.</p> <p>In section C. question 3; How will the proposed system improve upon current capability?</p>	15/06/2021	We'd like suppliers to tell us why making their proposed technology modular and deployable is a good idea.
5	15/06/2021	Could you provide dimensions for the ISO equivalent container stated in the RFI?	15/06/2021	8' (2.43m) wide and 8.5' (2.59m) tall
6	15/06/2021	Is there a limit to the number of submissions by a single organisation?	15/06/2021	<p>Respondents are welcome to submit more than one response, although we would ask that such responses are materially different and not minor variations of the same thing.</p> <p>For clarity, we re-iterate that this is not a contract opportunity and the Authority cannot commit to providing feedback to individual responses due to the level of expected interest in this RFI. Therefore we would recommend that you do not spend disproportionate effort and cost in your response.</p>
7	16/06/2021	Could you please help me understand what sort on environment these PODS work in?	18/06/2021	<p>We operate all over the world, as such the PODS need to be carried on and/or operated from a range of Naval vessels and shore side locations. Sea air will likely be a constant factor.</p> <p>We are open to all suggestions including potential extreme environment PODS - a purely hypothetical example: A capability for use in arctic climate</p>

## RFI011 NavyPODS – Clarification Log

**Version: 30/06/21**

				could be applicable. The concept would be that that POD would be deployed only for relevant missions. Suppliers should identify any known constraints in the appropriate manner in your response.
8	16/06/2021	[follow up on Q4] the question asks how the PODS system will improve on the situation. We understand that but was hoping you can clarify what the existing capability is.	18/06/2021	Sharing the current capability is slightly difficult as it links heavily to sensitive and secret information.  We are open to any systems being submitted as they could all provide new ideas or potential improvements.
9	16/06/2021	Is the intended container the 20ft or 40ft length variant?	18/06/2021	We are currently looking for 20ft containers.
10	21/06/2021	Is it possible to submit supporting datasheets/brochure (of no more than 2 pages) for our products?	21/06/2021	As Clarification question 3 - we are seeking concise responses and may not read submissions that exceed a total of 3 pages.
11	21/06/2021	Does this RFI relate only to the provision of maritime autonomy solutions or are you looking for a wider range of ideas? Section 2 of the RFI refers to maritime autonomy but we've seen a recent presentation from OCTO that referred to RN Mission Modules including embassy-in-a-box, remote weapon station, autonomy etc. We'd appreciate clarification so we can tailor our submission appropriately.	21/06/2021	We are not exclusively seeking autonomy based solutions. As in previous clarification responses we are open to all suggestions for systems or the PODS themselves.  If there are any service areas suppliers think their solutions would be particularly suited to they are welcome to note this in their submission.
12	21/06/2021	If [we have] more than one idea, do we complete Annex A for each idea separately? We note the request to limit responses to no more than 3 pages so would like to clarify this relates to each individual idea?	21/06/2021	Please submit a version of Annex A for each separate solution, the 3-page total applies for each individual version of Annex A submitted. They can be submitted in one email but should be separate attachments.  Additionally, as in Clarification question 6, we would ask that such responses are materially different and not minor variations of the same thing.

## RFI011 NavyPODS – Clarification Log

**Version: 30/06/21**

13	29/06/2021	Could you please outline possible marking criteria for our RFIs?	30/06/2021	<p>RFI responses will not be formally marked or scored. They will be reviewed and used to inform us on possible solutions within the supply market, which may then inform our potential future requirement planning.</p> <p>For clarity, we re-iterate that this is not a contract opportunity and the Authority cannot commit to providing feedback to individual responses.</p>
14	29/06/2021	Could you please indicate what Security Grading our responses should be?	30/06/2021	<p>Responses should ideally be kept unclassified or Official.</p> <p>If necessary Official Sensitive responses can be submitted, these responses should be marked '-OS' at the end of their file names so their classification is clear.</p>