

IFIB: IFIB-ACT-SACT-22-09 COUNTER TERRORISM ADVISOR
CONTRACTOR SUPPORT

Reference: Q & A # 2

Date of Issue: 15 March 2022

The following questions were raised with respect to subject IFIB. Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
<p>IFIB section 6 (Estimated level of Effort) subsection C (additionally) specifies that the contractor provides direct support to the (2-Star) Deputy COS SPP and the (4-Star) Supreme Allied Commander.</p> <p>The issue/concern is that the Best Value grading matrix in no way weights a candidate that has actually provided strategic and national policy input at the Two-Star or Four-Star level (or higher). Instead, the matrix contrasts distinctly from the role stated in section 6.C. by maximizing the point values for a significantly lower thresholds of experience that can in no way have ever been the senior advisor to a combatant commander or secretary/deputy secretary at the Department of Defense or the State Department.</p> <p>Would NATO change the weights for the role described in section 6.C. as follows?</p> <p>Less than 2 years: 0 2 – 4 years: 2 4 – 10 years: 5 10 – 14 years: 10 15+ years: 15</p>	<p>Unfortunately, no, the scoring cannot be amended.</p>
<p>2. The issue/concern is that the Best Value grading matrix in no way weights a candidate that actually has relevant counterterrorism experience. The current grading system is binary; a candidate either has no experience or everyone with 2 or more is equal. It is contended that when advising the 2-Star DCOS or the Supreme Allied Commander (4-Star) the difference between 2 years' experience and 15 years is significant.</p> <p>Would NATO change the weights for the role described in serial 9 as follows?</p> <p>Less than 2 years: 0 2 – 4 years: 2 4 – 14 years: 5 15+ years: 10</p>	<p>Unfortunately, no, the scoring cannot be amended.</p>