



Making the Internet work better

New Participants Online Training Questions & Answers

2026-08-31

IETF Executive Director
exec-director@ietf.org

Questions and Answers

1. Deliverable numbering

The Statement of Work describes a single "Deliverable", but the Additional Details section refers to material "linked under Deliverable 1" and to "the assessment plan in Deliverable 3". Could you clarify how many deliverables are expected, and confirm whether an assessment component (for example, knowledge checks or module quizzes) is in scope? If so, is there an expected format or depth?

ANSWER: The "Deliverable" section is correct and complete. The "Assumptions" item in the "Additional Details" section should read:

"Assumptions: bidders should state any assumptions made about the audience's technical setup (for example, Internet bandwidth or devices used to access content), and should note any third-party tools (survey platforms, analytics services, etc.) they intend to rely on to deliver the training."

The RFP document has been updated to reflect this.

2. Source file formats and independent updatability

The requirements state that content must be delivered in "editable, widely-supported formats" and structured so that individual modules can be updated independently. To scope this accurately, could you confirm:

(a) whether closed captions and transcripts are expected as separate timed-text files (for example WebVTT or SRT) rather than burned into the video image;

(b) whether narration scripts are expected as separate structured text assets, distinct from slide decks;

(c) whether the IETF Administration LLC has any preference regarding source formats that would allow a module's text layer to be revised or adapted without re-rendering the full video.

ANSWERS:

(a) The details of delivery for learners using the on-demand course is left to the proposer. As source files, closed captions and transcripts should be delivered as separate files and not burned into the source video image.

(b) Yes, narration scripts should be separate from and complementary to slide decks. E.g. a slide may show a diagram or image while the script would describe key aspects of or elaborate on the diagram or image to convey a set of coherent ideas.

(c) There is no advance preference about source formats beyond the requirements provided in the RFP and the clarifications provided here.

3. *Audience assumptions regarding bandwidth and devices*

The RFP invites bidders to state assumptions about the audience's technical setup, including Internet bandwidth and devices. Could you indicate whether provisions for constrained-connectivity contexts, for example lower-bitrate renditions, downloadable files for offline viewing, or audio-only versions of modules, would be considered in scope and of value, or whether the intended baseline is a standard broadband, desktop-based learner? A significant share of prospective new IETF participants access content on mobile devices over metered or intermittent connections, and the answer materially changes the delivery approach proposed.

ANSWER: Proposals need not make accommodations for constrained learner environments beyond those provided by the platforms to be used for general delivery.

4. *Bid structure and budget*

(a) Are bids from a consortium, or from a prime bidder working with named subcontractors, acceptable under this RFP?

(b) Is an indicative budget range or a target order of magnitude available for this engagement? Fixed-price bids are stated as preferred, and an indication would help bidders calibrate scope against cost.

This affects both the cost of future maintenance and the effort required to update a single module, and it would help bidders price the work on a consistent basis.

ANSWERS:

(a) Yes, consortia/subcontractors are acceptable.

(b) We do not provide specific budget details for projects other than to note that this project is fully funded as part of our overall budget.

5. *The RFP references "Deliverable 1" and an "assessment plan in Deliverable 3," but numbered deliverables are not provided. What is the complete intended deliverable list?*

ANSWER: The reference to "Deliverable 1" is an error. The "Existing materials" item in the "Addition Details" section should read:

Existing materials: the current one-day, in-person program consists of the source slides and recorded video sessions described under the Deliverable section.

Bidders should review this material to scope the volume and complexity of the adaptation work involved.

The RFP has been updated to reflect this.

See our answer above to the question about "Deliverable 3".

6. *Should bidders treat the existing recordings as: A) footage to be edited and repurposed/utilized, B) source material for newly produced videos, or C) may bidders recommend a hybrid approach?*

ANSWER: Bidders may but are not required to use existing footage as they see fit.

7. *The New Participant Program Slides are not accessible from the RFP. Can you provide those another way or make them easily accessible?*

ANSWER: [Slides used during the last edition of the in-person New Participant Program](#) are available online.

8. *Are the New Participant Program Slides meant:*

- (a) *to be 'on-screen' while video voiceover plays, or*
(b) *to give content source material (but should not be shown on screen as is)?*

ANSWER: We do not have an in-advance view of how source material and new content such as voiceovers ought to be presented.

9. *What is the target total running time or anticipated number of modules/videos?*

ANSWER: We have no *a priori* expectations about running time or number of modules and understand adapting the material used in-person to online format will require a rethink of both of these dimensions.

10. *What is the desired final project completion date?*

ANSWER: We expect the online program to be deployed no later than 31 January 2027.

11. *The RFP references "assessment content" and an "assessment plan," but does not specify how these components should be delivered in relation to the standalone videos. Should knowledge checks be presented within the videos as unscored reflection or comprehension prompts, or should they be delivered as interactive questions outside the video through a webpage or broader online learning experience? Similarly, should the program include a separate final assessment, and if so, does IETF expect it to be scored or tracked, or is its primary purpose to provide learners with immediate feedback and reinforce key concepts?*

ANSWER: No learner assessment is expected as part of this project. The RFP has been updated to reflect this.

12. *Does IETF expect to track individual learner participation, progress, completion, or assessment results? If so, please describe the required tracking and reporting capabilities and any existing platform through which these functions should be delivered. Alternatively, would anonymous, untracked knowledge checks that provide immediate feedback to learners meet IETF's needs?*

ANSWER: No tracking is expected as part of this project.

13. *In addition to delivering each video as a standalone asset for use through YouTube, Cloudflare Stream, and other channels, would IETF welcome a proposal that organizes the videos into a single, cohesive, self-paced online learning experience? This experience could guide learners through the program's sections and combine the videos with brief supporting content, knowledge checks, relevant resources, and practical next steps. If so, should vendors propose the platform and hosting approach for this experience, or would IETF prefer that it be designed for integration into IETF's existing website and infrastructure?*

ANSWER: The RFP (as updated) includes all requirements proposals should meet.

ENDS