

RFP:

**IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 Part C – Capability
Development Management Support (DCMS)**

Reference:

Q & A #1

Date of Issue:

13 MAR 2024

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

Questions	Responses
<p>1. For Labour Category 31:- In the SOW and Matrix it asks for a requirements writing sample (5-pages max), can the purchaser please provide more detail on the sample that they expect to see? Naturally, the requirements documents that contractors have written/edited previously for national/international defence organisations will be classified and not available in the public domain. Thus, it may not be possible for contractors to provide samples from their previous positions in defence organisations. Would the purchaser consider a sample of generic requirements based on an example case study?</p>	<p>1. The requirements document sample provided is expected to have been written/edited by the proposed candidates. The sample requirements document is expected to be readily available on open-source website and the link can be provided for consideration. If the writing sample is classified, provide the name of the Contracting Officer's points of contact for verification. Alternatively, in lieu of a requirements document, other technical documents written by the proposed candidate may be submitted for consideration.</p>
<p>2. For Labour Categories 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. Is there any option for home working, and if so, how much would be possible please?</p>	<p>2. Each home working request shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.</p>
<p>3. For providing evidence of work, can the candidate share their portfolio? I.e. my graphics designer needs to showcase his work, can you do that via a link or separate PDF.</p>	<p>3. All inputs need to be in PDF.</p>
<p>4. SoW, LC 18 - 22, pg. 59-87: Could you kindly confirm whether the LCs specified (LC18-22) are still expected to be proposed as a group, similar to Phase B, or if individual proposals for each LC are now acceptable?</p>	<p>4. LC 18 – 22 are eligible for split award.</p>

<p>5. Amendment_2, LC 9, pg. 40 - 42 Amendment_2, LC 10, pg. 46 - 47 Amendment_2, LC 11, pg. 52 - 55 Amendment_2, LC 29, pg. 111 - 114 Amendment_2, LC 30, pg. 117 – 119: The total score in the compliance matrixes of the 5 LCs currently reaches fewer points than the expected 100. Could you please confirm whether the last amendment shows the maximum achievable score, or if there are additional changes expected for those LCs?</p>	<p>5. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>6. Amendment 2: Can the purchaser provide 1-week extension to the deadline based on the newly introduced labour category 33, in order to allow the bidders sufficient time to resource candidates?</p>	<p>6. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3. Bid closing date extended to 04APR24 @ 0900.</p>
<p>7. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 40: LC 9, requirement 2, there is a discrepancy between the essential requirement of a minimum of 7 years' experience, and the scoring range, which indicates 5 years or more. Could you please clarify which duration accurately reflects the required experience?</p>	<p>7. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>8. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 40-42: The maximum number of points for LC 9 is only 98. Could you please confirm this is the correct maximum?</p>	<p>8. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>9. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 47: Related to LC 10, requirement 2, could you please clarify the specific criteria that determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 3 for the option 'PMI CAPM'?</p>	<p>9. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>
<p>10. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 47: Related to LC 10, requirement 2, could you please clarify the specific criteria that determine the allocation of points within the range between 6 and 15 for the option 'Prince2 Practitioners / PMI PgMP/PfPM'. Does each listed certification carry different point values?</p>	<p>10. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>

<p>11. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 47: LC 10, requirement 3, could you please clarify the specific criteria that determine the allocation of points within the range between 4 and 10 for the option 'Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP), GIAC Security Expert or ISACA Certified Information Security Manager (CISM) - Certificate'. Does each listed certification carry different point values?</p>	<p>11. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>
<p>12. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 46-47: The maximum number of points for LC 10 is only 90. Could you please confirm this is the correct maximum?</p>	<p>12. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>13. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 52: In reference to LC 11, requirement 8, the essential requirement specifies "A Bachelor Degree and 5 years of recent experience in concept development, validation and verification will be considered." Could you please clarify a timeframe of what is considered a 'recent experience' in this context?</p>	<p>13. 5 years within the last 7 years</p>
<p>14. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 54: LC 11, requirement 11, the hyperlink referenced in footnote 8 leads to a page that cannot be found. Could you please provide the correct link?</p>	<p>14. NATO-ACT-CDE-Handbook A Concept Developers Toolbox-1.pdf</p>
<p>15. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 52-55: The maximum number of points for LC 11 is only 98. Could you please confirm this is the correct maximum?</p>	<p>15. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>16. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 79-80: Considering the last item from the Best Value Criteria for LC 20 (page 79-80), which requests either "A Bachelors (BS/BA) degree in computer science or graphic design" or "minimum of five years of vocational training in computer science multimedia or related subjects in the educational domain", could you please provide clarity on the types of vocational programs that meet this requirement,</p>	<p>16. Any vocational training that contributes to professionalism or certification in multimedia graphic design.</p>

<p>especially because the typical vocational training durations are commonly less than five years in length.</p>	
<p>17. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 82: Regarding LC 20, requirement 6, as specified on page 82, there seems to be a discrepancy concerning requirement 6 for the Multimedia Designer (Graphic Specialist), which states “Demonstrate (example screen shots or story board pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by the instructional systems designer”. Could you please provide clarification on the accurate requirement for this item, especially because it is related to the Multimedia Designer (Graphic Specialist), but it requests courses developed by the instructional systems designer?</p>	<p>17. Changed to “Demonstrate screenshots of graphics (max 4 per course) from three courses that have been developed by the multimedia designer.” Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>18. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 86-87: Considering the last item from the Best Value Criteria for LC 21 (page 86-87), which requests either "A Bachelors (BS/BA) degree in computer science or graphic design" or "minimum of five years of vocational training in computer science multimedia or related subjects in the educational domain", could you please provide clarity on the types of vocational programs that meet this requirement, especially because the typical vocational training durations are commonly less than five years in length.</p>	<p>18. Any vocational training that contributes to professionalism or certification in multimedia video design.</p>
<p>19. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 89: Regarding LC 21, requirement 6, as specified on page 89, there seems to be a discrepancy concerning requirement 6 for the Multimedia Designer (Video Specialist), which states " Demonstrate (example screen shots or story board pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by the instructional systems designer". Could you please provide clarification on the accurate requirement for this item, especially because it is related to the Multimedia Designer (Video Specialist), but it requests courses developed by the instructional systems designer?</p>	<p>19. Changed to “Demonstrate screenshots of graphics (max 4 per course) from three courses that have been developed by the multimedia designer.” Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>

<p>20. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 99: LC 26, requirement 1 states "A University Degree in engineering, management, information systems, accounting, economics, finance, business administration, public administration, operations research, programme and project management or related disciplines". Could you please clarify the specific criteria that will determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 5 for the option 'Yes'? Does each of the listed disciplines have different point values?</p>	<p>20. Allocation of points are based on the type/level and amount of education and relevance to the requirement.</p>
<p>21. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 99: LC 26, requirement 1, there seems to be an overlap in the point values for the options 'No' and 'Yes', as both can be assigned a value of 1 point. Could you please clarify this inconsistency?</p>	<p>21. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>22. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 99: LC 26, requirement 2 states "Five years' experience in the last 10 in the field of requirements engineering and/or requirements management to include elicitation, capture, development, analysis and evaluation of requirements, including the management of requirements traceability, quality and change". Could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 30 for the option 'Yes'? More specifically, if the allocation is based on the length of required experience, could you please also clarify the required number of years' experience necessary to receive the maximum allocation of points, which is 30 in this case?</p>	<p>22. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>
<p>23. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 99: LC 26, requirement 2, there seems to be an overlap in the point values for the options 'No' and 'Yes', as both can be assigned a value of 1 point. Could you please clarify this inconsistency?</p>	<p>23. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>24. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 99-100: LC 26, requirement 3 states "Experience in the evaluation of requirements traceability across comprehensive lines of development; i.e. doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, personnel, facilities, and interoperability (DOTMLPFI)", could you please specify which criteria will</p>	<p>24. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>

be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 25 for the option 'Yes'? More precisely, is the allocation based on the length of experience or are other factors also considered? If the length of experience is a determining factor, could you please also clarify the required number of years' experience necessary to receive the minimum and maximum number of points (1 and 25 respectively) for the option 'Yes'?	
25. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 99-100: LC 26, requirement 3, there seems to be an overlap in the point values for the options 'No' and 'Yes', as both can be assigned a value of 1 point. Could you please clarify this inconsistency?	25. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.
26. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 100: In reference to LC 26, requirement 4 states "Experience in requirements development, either as a hands-on requirements author and/or facilitator of requirements development sessions", could you please specify which criteria determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 25 for the option 'Yes'?	26. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.
27. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 100: LC 26, requirement 6 states "Experience with IBM Rational DOORS Next or equivalent", could you please specify the criteria which will be used to allocate points within the range between 1 and 10 for the option 'Yes'? Will the point allocation be dependent on the length of experience, the usage of specific tools or other factors?	27. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.
28. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 100: LC 26, under requirements 4, 5 and 6 there seems to be an overlap in the point values for the options 'No' and 'Yes', as both can be assigned a value of 1 point. Could you please clarify this inconsistency?	28. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.
29. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 105: LC 28, requirement 2 states "Minimum 5 years in the last 10 in the field of M&S management to include initiation, planning, and execution of M&S projects at the capability level". Could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within	29. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.

the range between 1 and 10 for the option '5 years'?	
30. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 106: LC 28, requirement 4 states "Demonstrable 5 years' experience in the last 10 in M&S programs in the defence sector. In particular, experience, designing architecture that incorporates a scope and depth to capture a wide variety of user requirements". Could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 7 for the option '5 years'?	30. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.
31. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 106: LC 28, requirement 5 states "Demonstrable 5 years' experience in the last 10 in M&S supporting the design, development, planning and reporting of wargames, exercises, experiments, seminars, simulations, workshops, or other similar events". Could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 7 for the option '5 years'?	31. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.
32. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 106: LC 28, requirement 6 states "Demonstrable 5 years' experience in the last 10 in supporting the collection and analysis of M&S user and capability requirements". Could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 7 for the option '5 years'?	32. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.
33. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 106: In reference to LC 28, requirements 7 and 8, could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 10 for the option 'Yes'? Considering the binary nature of the response, where individuals either have or lack the required experience, the provided scoring range for the 'Yes' option introduces ambiguity regarding how points will be allocated. Could you please provide clarity on this matter?	33. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.

<p>34. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 106-107: In reference to LC 28, requirements 9, 10 and 11, could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 5 for the option 'Yes'? Considering the binary nature of the response, where individuals either have or lack the required experience, the provided scoring range for the 'Yes' option introduces ambiguity regarding how points will be allocated. Could you please provide clarity on this matter?</p>	<p>34. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>
<p>35. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 113: Related to LC 29, requirement 1, it seems that there is an ambiguity regarding the scoring ranges for the 'Yes' option and it is not clear whether points will be assigned based on possession of Bachelor's, experience or a combination of both and how these points will be assigned. Could you please provide further clarification on this matter?</p>	<p>35. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, relevance to the requirement and whether candidate possesses a Bachelor's degree.</p>
<p>36. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 113: LC 29, requirement 2, there seems to be an overlap in the point values for the options 'Less than 2 years' and '2+ years', as both can be assigned a value of 5 points. Could you please clarify this inconsistency?</p>	<p>36. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>37. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 113-114: In reference to LC 29, requirements 3 and 4, could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 5 for the option 'No' and within the range between 5 and 20 for the option 'Yes'? Considering the binary nature of the response, where individuals either have or lack the required experience, the provided scoring range for both options introduces ambiguity regarding how points will be allocated. Could you please provide additional clarity on this matter?</p>	<p>37. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>
<p>38. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 114: In reference to LC 29, requirement 5, could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 5 for the option 'No' and within the range between 5 and 10 for the option 'Yes'? Considering the binary nature of the response, where individuals either have or lack the required experience, the provided scoring range for both options</p>	<p>38. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>

introduces ambiguity regarding how points will be allocated. Could you please provide additional clarity on this matter?	
39. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 113-114: LC 29, requirements 3, 4 and 5, there seems to be an overlap in the point values for the options 'No' and 'Yes', as both can be assigned a value of 5 points. Could you please clarify this inconsistency?	39. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.
40. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 113-114: The maximum number of points for LC 29 is only 90. Could you please confirm if this is the correct maximum?	40. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.
41. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 118: Related to LC 30, requirement 1, it seems that there is an ambiguity regarding the scoring ranges for the 'Yes' option and it is not clear whether points will be assigned based on possession of Bachelor's, experience or a combination of both and how these points will be assigned. Could you please provide further clarification on this matter?	41. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, relevance to the requirement and whether candidate possesses a Bachelor's degree.
42. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 118: LC 30, requirement 2, there seems to be an overlap in the point values for the options 'Less than 2 years' and '2+ years', as both can be assigned a value of 5 points. Could you please clarify this inconsistency?	42. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.
43. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 118-119: In reference to LC 30, requirements 3 and 4, could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 5 for the option 'No' and within the range between 5 and 20 for the option 'Yes'? Considering the binary nature of the response, where individuals either have or lack the required experience, the provided scoring range for both options introduces ambiguity regarding how points will be allocated. Could you please provide additional clarity on this matter?	43. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.

<p>44. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 119: In reference to LC 30, requirement 5, could you please specify the criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of points within the range between 1 and 5 for the option 'No' and within the range between 5 and 10 for the option 'Yes'? Considering the binary nature of the response, where individuals either have or lack the required experience, the provided scoring range for both options introduces ambiguity regarding how points will be allocated. Could you please provide additional clarity on this matter?</p>	<p>44. Allocation of points within all ranges are based on the number of years, type/level and amount of experience, and relevance to the requirement.</p>
<p>45. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 118-119: LC 30, requirements 3, 4 and 5, there seems to be an overlap in the point values for the options 'No' and 'Yes', as both can be assigned a value of 5 points. Could you please clarify this inconsistency?</p>	<p>45. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>46. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 118-119: The maximum number of points for LC 30 is only 90. Could you please confirm if this is the correct maximum?</p>	<p>46. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>47. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 125: In relation to LC 31, requirement 10 which states "University degree (Bachelors)" and assigns different points for degrees in related and unrelated fields, could you please clarify which fields are considered related in this context?</p>	<p>47. Examples include Creative Writing, English, Communications, Journalism, Computer Science, Engineering</p>
<p>48. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) – Amendment 2, p. 138: In relation to LC 33, requirement 10 which states "3 or 4 year university degree or equivalent national academic qualification" and assigns different points for degrees in directly related and other fields, could you please clarify which fields are considered directly related in this context?</p>	<p>48. Examples include Creative Writing, English, Communications, Journalism, Computer Science, Engineering</p>
<p>49. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 C Amendment 2, Annex A, Page 21: The purchaser states "Candidates previously proposed for the above labour categories on Part A and Part B will not be considered without written permission from the Contracting Officer." Is it authorised to re-propose a candidate, if the bidder previously proposed a candidate with a strong resume however lost the role</p>	<p>49. Bidders are encouraged to seek confirmation before submitting candidates previously considered for the same labour category to ensure that the board evaluation reflected the candidate met the minimum score for compliance.</p>

due to a winning bidder with a very low price who in turn did not deliver?	
50. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART B) - Award Letter: In the award letter for Part B it was identified that all positions not awarded as part A/B would be rereleased in Part C, the bidder notes that IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART B)-LC13B is not included in this procurement can you clarify?	50. Added in LC13. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.
51. IFIB-ACT-SACT-24-01 (PART C) - Amendment 2, Bidding Instructions 9: The bidder would like to request a 1 week extension to the current bid closing date of 19th March to the 26th March.	51. SACT will extend the closing date to 02 April 2024.
52. LCAT 18: The compliance matrix criteria requests demonstration (example screen shots or story board pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by the instructional systems designer. If we are proposing a candidate who does not currently work for our company they may not be allowed to share previous work completed while being employed by another company. Would ACT accept a written description of work?	52. The requirements document sample provided is expected to have been written/edited by the proposed candidates. The sample requirements document is expected to be readily available on open-source website and the link can be provided for consideration. If the writing sample is classified, provide the name of the Contracting Officer's points of contact for verification. Alternatively, in lieu of a requirements document, other technical documents written by the proposed candidate may be submitted for consideration.
53. LCATs 29 and 30: The Compliance Matrix scoring does not equal 100. There are only 90 total points available. Can you please clarify the scoring?	53. Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.
54. Request clarify what is required of native English speakers in order to provide "Demonstrated proficiency in English as defined in STANAG 6001 (Standardized Linguistic Profile (SLP) 3333 - Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) or equivalent."	54. Bidders must self-certify candidate meets language requirements.
55. On page 21 of the Statement of Work (SOW) for Re-Advertised Labour Categories, it states, "in accordance with the General Terms and Conditions, Clause 24; no proposals shall be accepted or considered for candidates already assigned to an existing contract with HQ SACT, without the prior permission of the Contracting Officer."	55. If the contract period of performance shall end before the start of this period of performance, then prior permission to bid is not required. If, however, the contractor is in a similar position on another ACT contract or if there is overlap in the periods of performance, prior permission to bid is required.

<p>If we are bidding people for a position that are currently in the position, do we need the permission of the Contracting Officer to re-bid the current staff?</p>	
<p>56. On page 78 of the SOW under the requirements for LCAT #20, Multimedia Designer/Programmer – Graphic Specialist, it states, we must “Demonstrate (example screen shots or storyboard pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by the multimedia systems designer.”</p> <p>However, on page 82 of the SOW under the Requirements Matrix section it states, “Demonstrate (example screen shots or storyboard pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by the instructional systems designer.”</p> <p>Will NATO update the Requirements Matrix for LCAT #20, Multimedia Designer/Programmer – Graphic Specialist to match the position description requirements on page 78 to read, “Demonstrate (example screen shots or storyboard pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by the multimedia systems designer – graphic specialist”?</p>	<p>56. Changed to “Demonstrate screenshots of graphics (max 4 per course) from three courses that have been developed by the multimedia designer.” Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>
<p>57. On page 85 of the SOW under the requirements for LCAT #21, Multimedia Designer/Programmer – Video Specialist, it states, “Demonstrate (example screen shots or storyboard pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by the multimedia systems designer.”</p> <p>However, on page 89 of the SOW under the Requirements Matrix section it states, “Demonstrate (example screen shots or storyboard pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by the instructional systems designer.”</p> <p>Will NATO update the Requirements Matrix for LCAT #21, Multimedia Designer/Programmer – Graphic Specialist to match the position description requirements on page 89 to read, “Demonstrate (example screen shots or storyboard pages (max 4 per course)) from three courses that have been developed by</p>	<p>57. Changed to “Demonstrate screenshots of graphics (max 4 per course) from three courses that have been developed by the multimedia designer.” Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3.</p>

the multimedia systems designer – video specialist”?	
58. Would NATO consider granting a two-week extension?	58. Submission deadline has been extended to 04 April 2024 – Please see IFIB-SACT-ACT-24-01 Part C Amendment 3
59. Page 1: Understanding IFIB-ACT SACT 24-01 states location will be “ON-SITE - Norfolk, VA” or “ON-SITE – Mons, BELGIUM”, request clarify what the opportunity for remote work for each Norfolk position is, to include number of days allowed per week for remote work.	59. Each home working request shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
60. Pages 39 and 42 (#5, post-grade education): Please clarify if the three listed certifications are the only ones that are able to earn more than 1 point or if other security certificates would be considered. For instance, if a practitioner has the Security+ certificate, would he/she still only receive a 1 for cyber certificate points?	60. No, the list are examples and are not all-inclusive. Other types of Cyber security certifications will be evaluated.
61. Pages 45 and 48 (#3, expert-level post grade certification): Please clarify if the three listed certifications are the only ones that earn more than 1 point or if other security certificates would be considered for more than 1 point. For instance, if a practitioner has the Security+ certificate, would he/she still only receive a 1 for cyber certificate points?	61. No, the list are examples and are not all-inclusive. Other types of Cyber security certifications will be evaluated.
62. Pages 51 (#23) and 55 (#12) (post-grade education): Please clarify if the three listed certifications are the only ones that are able to earn more than 1 point or if other security certificates would be considered. For instance, if a practitioner has the Security+ certificate, would he/she still only receive a 1 for cyber certificate points?	62. No, the list are examples and are not all-inclusive. Other types of Cyber security certifications will be evaluated.

63. Pages 103 and 108 (#11, IBM DOORS):
Will familiarity with Requirements
Management Tools other than IBM DOORS
be acceptable and result in a score higher
than 0?

63. Yes.