

Subject: **RFP-ACT-SACT-25-52 – MS CCDIII**

Reference: **Q&A**

Date of Issue: **6 Jun 2025**

The following questions were raised with respect to subject **RFP-ACT-SACT-25-52 MS CCDIII**. Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
1. Is it possible to propose more than one candidate for consideration under this tender?	1. Yes. Given that this is a deliverables contract, you may choose to elect a team approach to delivery. .
2. Could the Contracting Authority clarify the page limit applicable to the Technical Proposal as outlined under Point 11: Content of Proposal? Specifically, is our understanding correct that only points (a), (b), and (c) are subject to the 10-page limit, while points (d) and (e) are not constrained by a page limit?	2. Correct.
3. We would appreciate confirmation from the Contracting Authority regarding the service delivery, will all services be provided remotely, without any requirement to be physically present at the HQ SACT site in Norfolk? If so, would performance of duties from within the EU area be acceptable?	3. This is correct. The place of performance is the contractor’s facility.
4. In the event that remote work is permitted, could the Contracting Authority please clarify the expected work schedule? Should the contractor ensure availability for virtual meetings with HQ SACT during standard office hours (Monday to Friday, 08:00–16:00, Virginia local time)?	4. Meetings should be supported on as needed basis during normal HQ SACT working hours and will be coordinated with the COTR.

<p>5. Could the Contracting Authority provide further details on access to HQ SACT systems, particularly the ADL Course Platform? Additionally, we understand that HQ SACT will not supply laptops or other IT equipment, could you kindly confirm whether this understanding is correct?</p>	<p>5. ADL Course Platform access will be guaranteed to the contractor in the moment when the content is implemented by HQ SACT Team and when the contractor is requested to provide feedback on the implementation.; as per Deliverable#3 {Contractor doesn't implement the content in ADL platform</p>
<p>6. Partial Awards Clarification – Can bidders propose to develop content for only one of the two courses (ie VV&A or standardization) and still be considered for the contract award?</p>	<p>6. Yes</p>
<p>7. Proposal Requirements – Is the 10-page limit for the technical proposal inclusive of cover pages, resumes and tables, or are those considered appendices?</p>	<p>7. Those are considered appendices</p>
<p>8. Enclosure 1 – Proposal Checklist – Should all checklist items be submitted as one complied PDF for the technical volume or can they be submitted as sperate attachments?</p>	<p>8. Either by PDF or sperate attachments. Both are fine to do.</p>
<p>9. SOW – Are contractors permitted to propose alternative instructional strategies or instructional design models (eg ADDIE or SAM) provided they meet CCDIII standards?</p>	<p>9. Any strategy for delivering the course content is permitted; however, only the design and development phases fall within the scope of the contract. Implementation is the responsibility of HQ SACT. Consequently, the content must be fully developed before it can be implemented on the NATO ADL platform. The Systems Approach to Training in BiSC 75-7 describes all the phases of a course production.</p>
<p>10. SOW - Can CCDIII frameworks include best practices or structures used by NATO allies (e.g., U.S. DoD CCD formats), as long as they meet the required performance standards?</p>	<p>10. No</p>
<p>11. Scope - Will NATO provide access to SMEs or review points from the MSLT Branch or NMSG during course development, or is SME support fully the contractor's responsibility?</p>	<p>11. No, NATO will not provide access to any SME's.</p>
<p>12. SOW - Is there a technical guidance document for the NATO ADL platform that outlines SCORM specs, content templates, and accessibility standards?</p>	<p>12. Contractor doesn't implement the content in ADL platform. It is done by HQ SACT Team. The content to be provided by the contractor is in the form of Slides with Speaking Notes in PowerPoint.</p>

<p>13. Scope - Are there specific NATO VV&A standards (e.g., STANAGs, AMSP documents) that must be integrated into the content, or is identifying and referencing them part of the development task?</p>	<p>13. Identification and referencing are parts of the development task; however, it is straightforward process. NMSG is the NATO M&S Standardization Body of Knowledge. https://nmsg.sto.nato.int/</p>
<p>14. Partial Awards Clarification - Since partial bids are allowed, would NATO accept a proposal focused only on one course (e.g., Standardization) with an option to team for the other?</p>	<p>14. HQ SACT will award each course separately therefore you may bid on one or both, but not one with an option to team for the other.</p>
<p>15. Partial Awards Clarification - Are there plans to issue additional ADL course development RFPs in related domains (e.g., cyber, C4ISR, or operational planning)? If so, is there a way for vendors to express capabilities proactively?</p>	<p>15. There are no plans in 2025 to request industry support for the development of additional M&S-related courses.</p>
<p>16. Set-Aside - Is there any specific designated set-asides?</p>	<p>16. No</p>
<p>17. Could the Authority please confirm deliverables are only to be provided in English or any other required languages?</p>	<p>17. Only in English</p>
<p>18. Could the Authority please confirm the anticipated duration (in terms of duration - i.e. 60 mins, half day, full day) for each of the courses, and total course length (1 session / 2 sessions / 3 sessions) ? Are courses expected to be divided across modules for each of the Performance Standards (PS1,PS2,PS3)?</p>	<p>18. This is a part of the CCDIII production and related analysis.</p>
<p>19. Can the Authority confirm that the delivery scope does not include delivering training to students and that there us no requirement to 'train the trainer'?</p>	<p>19. There is neither delivery to students nor to trainers. These courses are standalone ADLs solutions.</p>
<p>20. Could the Authority please confirm if courses are to be provided as e-learning or classroom-led / teacher delivered. If</p>	<p>20. These courses are standalone ADLs solutions. No teacher/instructor involvement.</p>

classroom based, what is the anticipated size are the classes?	
21. We note that Annex C 'Standards for PS3' part 3 refers to taking actions relating to enhancing model performance. Please can the Authority confirm that the training course scope covers theoretical concepts and does not involve course work including building a model?	21. It is not just about theoretical concepts. Part 3 is about practical experience. There is nothing written about building a model, but about modification of existing model under VVA.
22. Can the Authority define the training audience that the courses will be provided for in terms of rank, role and function (e.g. Wargaming)?	22. Training Audience are NATO M&S SMEs. (OF1-OF4 and civilian equivalent)
23. Can the Authority define the NATO bodies that will use the training - i.e. JWC / JFT / STO and how these courses will align with existing M&S training offerings across organisations (e.g. M&S Rome CoE training)?	23. As #22. These two courses' requirements are aligned with the requirements that are covered by the current NATO accredited M&S E&T solutions in accordance with NATO Global Programming.
24. Can we have sight of the full CD II (in addition to the CDII extract already provided)?	24. Essential extract from CCDII is already provided.
25. What M&S software and capability is currently in use in NATO and is this expected to form part of the course content?	25. There is no such requirement to include any NATO existing M&S "SW".
26. Can the Authority share the current NATO-specific M&S terminology prior to RFP submissions?	26. Yes! https://nso.nato.int/natoterm/Web.mvc Official approved M&S terms are the ones approved by NMSG!
27. Does NATO have an established M&S toolset that should be covered during the training?	27. There is no requirement to include any specific M&S toolset. It is up to the contractor.
28. What is the expected course duration (number of student hours)?	28. It is part of CCDIII production and related analysis.

<p>29. What grading metric or feedback mechanism does ADL use to manage student performance feedback?</p>	<p>29. NATO ADL platform itself does not prescribe a single grading metric or feedback mechanism; instead, it supports a range of methods e.g. Quizzes, Tests, Multiple choice etc.</p>
<p>30. Is there an existing scenario that NATO has developed an ecosystem around for M&S and training?</p>	<p>30. There is no scenario that would be used for ADL M&S solutions development.</p>
<p>31. Is there is any lower level M&S content already in existence within NATO’s course content or will contractors two courses cover 100 and 200-level content and build to 300-level?</p>	<p>31. There is no NATO M&S context covering 100, 200 or 300 level.</p>
<p>32. Are these 2 new ADL courses part of an “as needed” approach in which NATO individuals can go to NATO’s ADL learning site and take the courses or are they a part of an overall certification process?</p>	<p>32. In theory, anyone from NATO could take the course, even if specifically designed to cover M&S NCS needs. There is no overall certification process!</p>
<p>33. In Paragraph 11, Content of Proposal, does the phrase “company description portion of its technical proposal shall be limited to 10 pages” indicate that the Offeror is permitted to submit additional Technical / Management information beyond items 11(a)-(e)?</p>	<p>33. Yes.</p>
<p>34. In Paragraph 11(d), does “provision of technical and price volumes” indicate the Offeror’s acknowledgement that both volumes have been submitted to NATO and constitute our complete submission? If not, can you clarify the meaning?</p>	<p>34. Yes</p>