

# STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Revenue



## Dividend Application Information System

2025-0400-0038

**Amendment #1**

September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024

**This amendment is being issued for *the State to respond to submitted questions.***

**Important Note to Offerors:** You must sign and return this page of the amendment document with your proposal. Failure to do so may result in the rejection of your proposal. Only the RFP terms and conditions referenced in this amendment are being changed. All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain the same.

Kristie Ely  
Procurement Specialist  
Phone: (907) 465-2313  
Email: [Kristie.ely@alaska.gov](mailto:Kristie.ely@alaska.gov)

---

COMPANY SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

---

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

---

DATE

**Questions submitted by potential offerors and answers from the state:**

1. Is there any submission wherein leveraging an existing COTS solution be entertained by the State of Alaska?

Answer: Yes, the Department is willing to entertain any COTS solution that is cloud hosted and meets our business needs.

---

2. It is stated within the RFP that the contractor is responsible for providing hardware and software. Does this requirement extend to hosting and other ancillary costs related to application test, staging and pre-production environments, ahead of go-live?

Answer: Yes.

---

- After production go-live, is a maintenance contract expected to handle hosting cost as well as
3. provide application support and any relevant software patches?

Answer: Ongoing costs for cloud hosting services are expected. The Department is expecting to receive training and certification for our IT staff to provide ongoing support and patching internally as described in section 3.01 and 3.03. Anything beyond the implementation phase would be handled separately from this RFP.

---

4. Will the State of Alaska be open to prioritizing the replacement of the PowerBuilder portion of the application, with the integration of the remaining 22 legacy applications after that date through contract modifications or extensions?

Answer: While they are their own applications, they work within the framework of the system to provide DAIS functionality. We are not open to prioritizing the replacement of the PowerBuilder portion of the application since together they work as a whole.

---

5. Will a dedicated DOR subject matter expert be made available to assist with requirements gathering and if so what is their expected availability on a weekly basis?

Answer: Yes, this project is led by the Office of the Commissioner and is a high priority. Department subject matter experts will be made reasonably available to assist the successful offeror with requirements gathering, and the DOR Project Manager will have this project as their primary focus. Availability will vary depending on competing department priorities.

---

6. Will “scrubbed” datasets be available for the Production data for testing/migration use?

Answer: No.

---

7. Can the State of Alaska provide basic requirements for scanned documents, such as crop, rotate, etc?

Answer: Yes, we can provide that to the successful offeror.

---

8. Will the winning bidder be provided all existing source code from legacy applications?

Answer: Yes.

---

9. Are there any legacy applications which do not leverage a Microsoft .Net code base? If so, what other languages are leveraged?

Answer: Yes, DAIS is PowerBuilder. All other apps use .NET.

---

10. It is mentioned that “Offeror will need to illustrate in proposal how much on-site access is necessary to complete project and when this access will be granted.” Does the State of Alaska have a goal for onsite versus offsite time ratio?

Answer: See section 3.09 of the RFP.

---

11. Can the State of Alaska provide a count of users that will require training, not to include public portions?

Answer: Yes, the DOR Permanent Fund Dividend has 65 staff. DOR Criminal Investigations Unit has 6, DOR Child Support Enforcement has 2, and around 3,000 stakeholders doing business with the state that use a variety of subsystems.

---

12. Can the State of Alaska provide the type of current database(s) and version used for the Powerbuilder and remaining 22 applications?

Answer: We can provide that to the successful offeror.

- 
13. Do existing contracts with external vendors (DFCS/DMV/Vital Statistics/IRS/etc) exist? If so, will they be reciprocal to this engagement? If not, what timeframes are typical to procure access to them?

Answer: We have memorandum of agreements and memorandum of understanding (MOU) with some entities. Other entities are covered in statute and so have no MOU. Yes, they would be reciprocal to this engagement in the sense that any changes to the platform or interconnection will need to work with current partners.

---

14. There is mention of the state having a main development platform of Microsoft .NET. Are there specific requirements the state is putting in place for new development? Specific requirements about cloud provider choice? AWS/GCP/Other?

Answer: This project does not have specific technical or platform requirements except those articulated within the RFP language. The Department does have technical staff who are proficient in multiple stacks. The Department standard is .NET and the Microsoft technical ecosystem.

---

15. The solicitation seems to indicate that questions and answers will be answered, after award. Is this correct or will they either be answered earlier or will the solicitation be delayed based on the quantity and types of questions received?

Answer: The State issues out their response to submitted questions while the solicitation is active. The State will not be extending the solicitations close date.

---

16. Is the list of interfaces, on page 11 of the RFP, inclusive of all current internal/external system integrations, to include API's interfaces, and any other third party data exchange systems?

Answer: The list is accurate. We have no API's. Data transfer is by various file transfer mechanisms.

---

17. Roughly how many reports will be needed to recreate existing functionality?

Answer: We currently have about 200 reports as well as a dynamic reporting system. The number of reports needed in the new system depends on the solution offered by the vendor and the requirements gathering process of the successful offeror.

---

18. Will access to existing/completed backlogs be available prior to the proposal due date? E.g. Jira, TFS, etc.

Answer: No.

---

19. Regarding RFP 1.03, 1.06, due to time to mail and appropriately take into account the Department's response to questions, will the Department extend the submission deadline by 1 week to September 20, 2024?

Answer: No.

---

20. Has the Department received or had any demonstrations, sales presentation, or exploratory discussions with any Vendor regarding this capability prior to the release of this RFP? If so, which Vendor(s)?

Answer: The Department has not received or had any demonstrations, sales presentation or exploratory discussions in relation to the scope of services identified in this RFP.

---

21. Has the Department received any assistance in the creation of requirements from any Vendor? If so which Vendor?

Answer: No. The department did not receive assistance in creating RFP requirements.

---

22. Regarding RFP 1.02, can the Department confirm if the Department has budgeted \$7.5M for the expected 15-month implementation or is this the expected biennium cost for FY25 and FY26?

Answer: The \$7.5 million is the available approved budget for FY25. Additional funding beyond the FY25 Budget will be subject to legislative appropriation and approval.

---

23. Regarding RFP 6.11, 6.12, 6.13, can an out of state Vendor serve as the Prime and still receive Alaska State Preference or Alaska Veteran preference if the Vendor has partnered with Vendors (as a proposal team or a subcontractor) who qualify for one or both of these preferences?

Answer: No. The main Contractor/Offeror has to meet requirements for outlined for the Alaska Bidder Preference and Alaskan Veteran Preference per AS 36.30.990, AS 16.05.415 (a)(2), AS 16.05.415 (a)(3), AS 16.05.415 (a)(4), and AS 36.30.321. Review the Alaskan Bidder Preference

Certification Form.

---

24. Regarding Attachment 4 Cost Proposal, does the Department anticipate leveraging currently available or existing cloud resources, or does the Department anticipate needing to acquire additional cloud resources?

Answer: The Department is open to either using the State of Alaska Azure platform, or a different vendor cloud hosting solution. It is recognized that even in the State of Alaska's Azure environment additional cloud resources will be required.

---

25. Regarding RFP 2.04, what level of handoff does the Department expect for the administration and continuous improvement of the system? Does the Department anticipate taking full ownership and responsibility of the maintenance, operations, and enhancement of the system or does the Department anticipate to have ongoing O&M costs?

Answer: See Sec. 3.01 and Sec. 3.04 of RFP.

---

26. If the Department intends to take full ownership and responsibility of the maintenance, operations and enhancement of the system, does the Department have any special considerations regarding technology type and resource background that the Vendors should account for in the proposed technology and solution?

Answer: The Department is expecting to receive training and certification for our IT staff to provide ongoing support and patching internally as described in section 3.01 and 3.03. Anything beyond the implementation phase would be handled separately from this RFP.

---

27. Regarding RFP 2.04, does the Department have a preferred cloud provider (e.g. Microsoft Azure, AWS) or preferred technology stack?

Answer: We have no preference for a vendor's cloud stack and back-end services. In an effort to minimize training, we prefer the Microsoft Software environment, including SQL Server and

.NET. Specifications will be discussed with the successful offeror during a requirements analysis phase.

---

28. Regarding RFP 2.04, does the Department prefer a cloud-native, custom developed solution or does the Department have a preference for cloud-native configurable low-code/no-code solutions?

Answer: We have no preference, both of those are viable options.

---

29. Regarding RFP 2.04, does the Department prefer a cloud-native, from the date of submission, what is the expected length of time to approve the System Security Plan?

Answer: While the Department prefers a cloud native solution, we are also open to other innovative, cloud hosted solutions. System Security Plan progress will be iterative throughout the project, involving the Chief Technology Officer, Chief Risk Officer, and State Security Office, to minimize both costs and the timeframe for final review. The final review timeframe will be 2 weeks.

---

30. Does the Department intend this solution to be built on a Government or Commercial cloud environment (e.g. Azure Government Cloud, AWS GovCloud, or Azure or AWS Commercial)? If so which cloud environment is preferred? Does the Department or another agency within the State currently leverage the preferred environment?

Answer: The Department is open to either using the State of Alaska Azure platform, or a different vendor cloud solution. We are currently using State M365 and Azure Commercial resources.

---

31. Regarding RFP 3.01, does the Department currently house all data for migration in a central warehouse? Is this data uniform across the years of historical data, both schema and values? Can the Department provide the schema and valid values of the data expected to be migrated?

Answer: No, no, yes, respectively. We have multiple databases used for different purposes.

---

32. Regarding RFP 2.03 and the referenced 22 DAIS Support Application's functionality, is the functionality of these 22 Support Applications included in the requirements provided in the

Attachment 2-PRDD\_Attachment 1-DAIS RFP Requirement.pdf document? Can the Department confirm if the functionality is included in the requirements in scope to this implementation or is the expectation that the new system will interface with these legacy applications?

Answer: The 22 DAIS Support Applications outlined in Attachment 2- PFDD\_Attachment 1 - DAIS RFP Requirements consist of core DAIS functionality that was created as ancillary modules over many years. Examples include screens for recordation and/or reconciliation that were not originally incorporated into the core DIAS system due to technology or resource limitations. It would be expected that the functionality of these modules will be incorporated into the core feature set of the DAIS rewrite.

---

33. Regarding F.D.056, does the Department have a current integration with Infosys? Does the Department anticipate ingesting this data set into the DAIS application or just leverage an interface to search the Infosys data? Is the Department open to alternative matching and entity resolution services or is the requirement to leverage Infosys data/services?

Answer: The InfoSys term is an internal classification used by PFD to describe our process for data gathering. It is also a module we developed and use to process imported files for eligibility use. DOR is open to alternative matching and entity resolution services that comply with State and Federal requirements.

---

34. Regarding F.D.073, can the Department elaborate on this requirement and further define the Vendor(s)?

Answer: Vendors are banks. Staff need to be able to edit the data as needed, which can include routing numbers, addresses, codes, Alaska 529 program identifiers, and other data points.

---

35. Regarding F.D.088 & 093, does the Department expect suspicious Fraud to be flagged, and prevented, at the point of intake or does the Department expect suspicious Fraud to be flagged after?

Answer: At the point of intake.

---

36. Regarding F.D.103, does the Department expect Fraud Case Management delivered in this solution or is the Case Management for suspected fraud handled through another system? If it is through another solution, can the Department define the requirements for the Fraud investigation and workflow in DAIS?



Answer: Fraud Case Management is expected to be delivered in this solution.

---

37. Regarding F.D. 132-140, does the Department expect the DAIS implementation to deliver a Payments module? Does the Department currently leverage a current Payments module or solutions that DAIS is expected to interface with? If so, what is the solution?

Answer: We expect payment functionality and have that in the current DAIS system. PFD staff must be able to use this in coordination with the State Integrated Resource Information System (IRIS) system. The State of Alaska uses IRIS as our Enterprise Resource Planning solution.

---

38. Regarding F.D.143-148, does the Department expect the DAIS implementation to deliver a Collections module? Does the Department currently leverage a current Collections module or solutions that DAIS is expected to interface with? If so, what is the solution?

Answer: We expect collections functionality and have that in the current DAIS system. PFD staff must be able to use this in coordination with the State Integrated Resource Information System (IRIS) system. The State of Alaska uses IRIS as our Enterprise Resource Planning solution.

---

39. Regarding Tech.D.031, does the Department expect the vendor to provide a DevOps tool to manage the pipelines and builds or does the Department expect to leverage their own internal DevOps tool (e.g. AzureDevOps)? If it intends to leverage the Department's tool, what is it?

Answer: We expect the vendor to use the PFD AzureDevOps environment to provide a smooth transition to PFD IT allowing for continuity of development notes, repos, branches, bugs, testing results, etc.

---

40. Does the Department intend to provide public dashboards and reports or strictly internal dashboards and reports? If internal, can the Department provide the expected number of users/viewers?

Answer: Dashboard and reports for both internal and the public, including dashboards and alerts for PFD staff, the capacity for public dashboards and reporting, and for PFD applicants regarding their application status and information required for application processing. Approximately 3,100 internal users/viewers, and approximately 630,000 applicants.

---

41. Will the department provide the current total user counts: Public users (by entity/type), Internal Users (by user type)?

Answer: 3,100 internal users/viewers, and approximately 630,000 applicants.

---

42. 1.01-Budget-Within the proposal, there are references for future-forward innovation services such as automation, and artificial intelligence - in order to build a "future-proof" scalable solution. Additionally, there are base requirements outlined as per the requirements document, within Attachment "PFDD\_Attachment 1 - DAIS RFP REQUIREMENTS." Note that no AI or automation requirements exist under desirable or optional.
- For all cost proposal evaluations, how will the proposals be assessed?
- As an example, one proposal could be provided with a specific cost to develop the appropriate system with base level requirements. And another proposal could be provided with a higher cost that encompasses the base level requirements AND automation and AI-enabled services. How would the two be compared in the cost proposal evaluation criteria under section 5.10 Contract Cost.

Answer: Cost will be evaluated per section 5.10 of the RFP for all submitted proposals based of total project cost submitted.

---

43. Sec. 2.04-Requirement Summary-Sec.3.09- Location of Work- Sec.3.12-Right to Inspect Place of Business-In Sec 2.04: "Leverage a robust security framework to ensure data protection and regulatory compliance," Sec. 3.09, "The contractor is responsible for providing their own computers, mobile devices, smartphones, and software. The contractor will ensure all their electronic devices and media are encrypted and securely configured. Contractors will keep current with security patches by ensuring their operating systems, software, and firmware are patched within 72 hours of the release of a security patch," and Sec. 3.12, "At reasonable times, the State may inspect those areas of the contractor's place of business that are related to the performance of a contract. If the State makes such an inspection, the contractor must provide reasonable assistance," there are implications and assumptions of policy requirements. Can the policies be provided to address these needs, specifically related to:
- The state's cyber security policy so that proposals can satisfy regulatory compliance.
  - OIT hardware/laptop policy
  - Place of business requirements that need to be satisfied for a potential inspection The right to inspect is state law per AS 36.30.410 and 2 AAC 12.150.

Answer: State level information security policies have been added as attachments to address the first two bullet points. An NDA is required to receive a copy of these policies. No specific place of business requirements are outlined in Sec. 3.01 or Sec 3.04. Security policies for place of business have been added as attachments. An NDA is required to receive a copy of these polices.

---

44. Sec. 3.01-Scope of Work--In Sec 3.01 "Summary analysis report on necessary steps to complete the New DAIS update project, including timeline to complete remaining items", what are the remaining items? Can details of any remaining items be shared?

Answer: This statement refers to iterative development and regular cadence-based updates on "remaining items" in the project schedule.

---

45. Sec. 3.01-Scope of Work Aside from this one statement, there is no reference to a mobile application for Alaskan Residents throughout the document nor are there requirements in Attachment 1. Please specify mobile application requirements. Alternatively, please determine if a mobile application can be incorporated into a future phase with a separate budget that can be estimated for this proposal, or whether the request is for a mobile responsive capability.

Answer: See section 3.01 of the RFP. Mobile friendly web browsing will work for the purposes of this RFP. A separate iOS and Android application project may be a future enhancement, subject to future budget appropriations.

---

46. In Sec 3.03 Deliverables- Are these deliverables required prior to the project commencing? If not, does the proposal evaluation committee (PEC) wish to see templates?

Answer: These documents will be created by the successful offeror as part of the project. Per Sec. 3.03 Deliverables- Contractor/Offeror will propose deliverables that meet the objective of this project. Proposals submitted in for RFP 2024-0400-0038 will require Contractor/Offeror to provide deliverables that meet project objectives in Sec. 3.03- Deliverables.

---

47. In Sec 3.03 Deliverables-Please provide the State's change management procedures and roles.

Answer: Change management will involve PFD input and Office of the Commissioner approval. Detailed process will be defined as part of the project kickoff.

---

48. Sec. 3.07-Contract Payment-This section says DOR will pay no interest; however it also references a 1.5% interest on unpaid balances. Please confirm.

Answer: A late payment is subject to 1.5% interest per month on the unpaid balance.

---

49. Sec. 40.2-Proposal Contents-Is the vendor tax ID the same thing as an Employer Identification Number? If not, is there a different identification number that should be used?

Answer: Taxpayer ID is SSN number or EIN number.

---

50. Sec. 4.09 Cost Proposal- "Proposed costs must include all direct and indirect costs associated with the performance of the contract, including, but not limited to, total number of hours at various hourly rates, direct expenses, payroll, supplies, overhead assigned to each, person working on the project, percentage of each person's time devoted to the project, and profit. The costs identified on the cost proposal are the total amount of costs to be paid by the State. No additional charges shall be allowed." This project is a fixed price professional services contract, why are details such as hourly rate, direct expense, payroll, overhead assigned to each person working on the project, percentage of each person's time devoted to the project, and profit being asked, and how is this question relevant to the delivery of a solution?

Answer: Updated Cost Proposal has been issued as additional information is not needed for evaluation.

---

51. In Attachment 2 - Requirements TECH.D.047 regarding WCAG compliance - As DAIS is a platform for the PFD team and not publicly facing, do accessibility standards like WCAG still apply? If so then is the assumption that the DAIS platform should adhere to the latest version of WCAG level 2 AA conformance ?

Answer: Yes, all services provided must also comply with WCAG.

---

52. In Attachment 2 - Requirements- F.P.004 - Please explain what myAlaska's Agency Subscription Page and the PFD Agency are. Additionally, could you elaborate on when this redirection is supposed to occur?

Answer: myAlaska is a system for Secure Single Sign-on and Signature for Citizens, or, an authentication and electronic signature system allowing citizens to interact with multiple State

of Alaska services through a single username and password. The redirection occurs during sign-on and during the e-signature portion of the application.

---

53. In Attachment 2 - Requirements- F.P.005 to F.P.032 - Within the RFP, there are references solely to the modernization of the DAIS system. However, the requirements outlined in Attachment 2 include the existing online filing application, which was already developed in .NET. We would like to confirm whether the requirements F.P.005 to F.P.032 for the online filing application are indeed within the scope of development.

Answer: Yes, modernization and integration between the existing online filing application and DAIS is a requirement.

---

54. In Attachment 2 - Requirements-F.P.033 to F.P.046 - Within the RFP, there are references solely to the modernization of the DAIS system. However, the requirements outlined in Attachment 2 include the existing myPFDFInfo application, which was already developed in .NET. We would like to confirm whether the requirements F.P.033 to F.P.046 for the myPFDFInfo application are indeed within the scope of development.

Answer: Yes, modernization and integration between the existing myPFDFInfo application and DAIS is a requirement.

---

55. In Attachment 2 - Requirements-F.P.047 to F.P.063 - Within the RFP, there are references solely to the modernization of the DAIS system. However, the requirements outlined in Attachment 2 include the existing RPFInfo application, which was already developed in .NET. We would like to confirm whether the requirements F.P.047 to F.P.063 for the RPFInfo application are indeed within the scope of development.

Answer: Yes, modernization and integration between the existing RPFInfo application and DAIS is a requirement.

---

56. In Attachment 2 - Requirements-TECH.P.001 to TECH.P.064 - Within the RFP, there are references solely to the modernization of the DAIS system. However, the requirements outlined in Attachment 2 include user experience and technical requirements for public facing sites, which were already developed in .NET. We would like to confirm whether the requirements TECH.P.001 to TECH.P.064 for the public facing websites are indeed within the scope of development.

Answer: Yes, modernization and integration between the existing user experience and technical requirements for public facing sites and DAIS is a requirement.

---

57. Attachment 5-Please provide confidentiality agreement that is referenced.

Answer: See Updated Attachment 5- DOR Confidentiality Agreement.pdf.

---

58. Sec. 3.03-Deliverables- System Security Plan-NIST CSF 2.0 has been listed. Has the Commissioner's Office or the Chief Risk Officer determined which Tier with NIST CSF 2.0 that they anticipate the platform and the program to be operating at?

Answer: We anticipate that the platform and program will need to operate at a minimum of Tier 3: Repeatable. This Tier level reflects an expectation that the system security plan will demonstrate formalized, documented, and consistent cybersecurity risk management practices that are integrated into our broader organizational risk management strategy.

---

59. General Question-Has the potential of adhering to or achieving Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) been contemplated as part of this RFP or in the near future? CMMC Reference: <https://dodcio.defense.gov/CMMC/About/>

Answer: No, but any security certifications and standards relevant to proposals by prospective offerors are of interest to us.

---

60. General Question-Is there transactional data captured from the resident application system (myPFD) vs only application records (eg. behavioral data audit trail) for integration with DAIS?

Answer: Yes.

---

61. Section 1.04 Prior Experience o Will the proposal be disqualified if a certain level of experience is not met in the "Scope/Level of Experience Plan Form" attachment? Or is disqualification just based on the completion of the form?

Answer: Vendors will be deemed non-responsive if they do not submit the Scope/Level of Expertise Plan form with their proposal. Vendors experience will be scored based off information provided on the Scope/Level of Experience Plan Form.

---

62. The Budget has been established for \$7.5M. Should the baseline estimate fall under this amount, will the State of Alaska add to the scope? If the estimate falls above this amount, either via initial estimate or additional scope, is there a process we will have to accommodate to get additional funding?

Answer: The \$7.5 million is the available approved budget for FY25. Additional funding beyond the FY25 Budget will be subject to legislative appropriation and approval.

---

63. Could you explain the difference between the “Original Proposal” and “Public Document Proposal”?

Answer: Original Proposal contains sensitive company information, including proprietary details, employee data, and trade secrets, intended for internal review or specific clients. Public Document Proposal is a redacted version that omits all confidential information to protect the company's interests. This sanitized proposal is suitable for public disclosure, providing only essential project information without compromising sensitive data.

---

64. Current Technical Environment -Suggests there are enhancements that are not able to be executed on the current system. Is there a backlog of enhancements to consider for this project? How many different SSRS reports exist today and do those need to be recreated?

Answer: Yes, there is a backlog that will be discussed with the successful offeror. Almost 200 SSRS reports exist today. Their functionality will need to be part of the new system.

---

65. Regarding approval by DOR’s Chief Risk Officer.

- Is the expectation we have the project completed and acquire this approval by January 1, 2026? if so, how long will the CRO need for the approval process?
- If the project for any reason moves past the January 1, 2026, deadline, will the approved funding for the project carry over to 2026?

Answer: The expectation is that the vendor will have the system completed and receive authority to operate by January 1, 2026. System Security Plan progress will be iterative throughout the project, involving the Chief Technology Officer, Chief Risk Officer, and State Security Office, to minimize both costs and the timeframe for final review. The final review timeframe will be 2 weeks.

66. Section 2.04 states a completion date of January 1, 2026, while Section 3.02 may indicate a completion date of June 30, 2026. Could you please clarify?

- What is the approximate audience size for “Business Training”?
- What is the approximate audience size for “IT Training”?
- Is there a need for any reference guide documentation for Residents?
- Are there post-implementation support requirements beyond the Go-Live date for break/fix issues and/or enhancements?

Answer: Business training size is 73 staff. IT training and certification is 9. Yes, a reference guide for residents is needed. Yes, January 1, 2026 is when we expect the system to go live, and June 30, 2026 is when the contract ends. During this 6-month timeframe, we expect break/fix and enhancement support, addressing any remaining issues.

---

67. Scope/Level of Expertise Plan Form-A list of “Key Staff Positions” is requested (Name, Role, Years of Experience), is it acceptable to exchange resources with an individual who has an equivalent level of experience prior to the project start date?

Answer: No, that is not acceptable.

---

68. Cost Proposal-How would you define or calculate the “Total Offered Overhead Percentage Rate”?

Answer: Please see attached updated Cost Proposal that does not include overhead percentage rate.

---

69. Data Ingestion / Export

- Does batch data and image processing need to happen without a user present or is this a supervised process?
- Would this be a physical fax machine or e-Fax Integration?
- Do users generally save scans to personal computers, network drives, or FTP?
- What types of sensitive data need to be masked when printing?

Answer: Image processing requires a user to be present. We currently use a standard fax machine but are open to e-Fax integration. We have scanners that process paper forms that are saved to the ILINX server. We ingest to an electronic version. No masking is needed.

---

70. Data Entry



- Does the current document scanning system (ILINX) have APIs available to support integration?
- What platform is currently used for Web-filing / electronic submissions?
- Do you leverage an eSignature platform like DocuSign or Adobe Sign for electronic submissions?
- Do hand-written signatures need to be automatically validated?

Answer: ILINX does not have APIs available. Internal SOA .NET application supports web-filing. E-signature is provided through myAlaska a DOA application used by 80% of Alaskans for submitting PFD apps. Handwritten signatures are not validated.

---

#### 71. Mobile Experience

- Do users have mobile devices that can be IT-managed through a Mobile Device Management solution?
- Do users need the ability to access the application from a native iOS or Android application, or just simply from a Web interface on a mobile device?

Answer: State staff expect to have a mobile device management solution in place by end of year. Resident applicants have personal devices, so there is no overarching mobile device management solution for them. Mobile friendly web browsing will work for the purposes of this RFP. A separate iOS and Android application project may be a future enhancement, subject to future budget appropriations.

---

#### 72. Application Management

- What type of Payment Methods need to be supported (Credit Card, ACH, Etc.)?
- Does the Eligibility Processing Engine need rules that are configurable by administrators?
- For technician case assignment, how is “case difficulty” determined?
- When auto-clearing undeliverable mail, is the address changed notification an automated system within the US Postal Service, or is this a manual, user driven process?

Answer: ACH payment or check is used for application payout. The Eligibility Processing engine rules are set in code and managed by PFD IT. Case assignment is handled manually, each issue is assigned a difficulty level that helps categorize what and how records get distributed with a pinwheel process and manual distribution. The highest difficulty level active on a record displays. The range is from 0 through 5. PFD uses a NCOA process which is verified periodically.

---

#### 73. Dashboard

- What metrics need to be tracked for the Staff Performance Dashboard?

- What metrics need to be tracked for the Supervisor Performance Dashboard?

Answer: These metrics will be discussed with the successful offeror during a requirements analysis phase.

---

#### 74. Infrastructure

- What authentication providers need to be supported (Forms Based, Active Directory/Entra ID, Social Identity Providers, 3rd Party SAML, Anonymous)?
- What single sign-on platform is currently in use (Entra, Okta, Ping, etc.)?
- What is your current email delivery platform (SMTP, Exchange On-Premises, Exchange Online, SendGrid, etc.)?
- Are there any Access Control restrictions needed (By IP Address, By Location, By Device)?
- Is there documentation supporting the current integration into the current PFD system with each external system or interface?

Answer: Authentication providers are not used other than myAlaska and MFA through that product. myAlaska is the single sign-on platform but is not required as applicants can file by paper or without myAlaska. For Internal apps, Active Directory and MFA through Microsoft are used. O365 is the State email platform. Access control restrictions are needed for some components by IP and device. Yes, there is documentation regarding our current integration which will be discussed with the successful offeror.

---

#### 75. Security & Compliance

- What is the supported / approved “State Technology Stack”?
- What security compliance needs to be met (SOC 2, HIPAA, ISO, NIST, etc.)?
- Does the state follow-up any specific compliance standard for financial transactions?

Answer:

The State of Alaska supported and approved Technology Stack includes:

- Network: Cisco LAN/WAN, PaloAlto & F5 parameter (on premise and in Azure), ExpressRoute
- Compute: Windows Server, MS SQL
- Storage: Azure native, NetApp and other storage options in the Azure store
- Identity: Entra/AAD for state employees/support staff. Azure B2C P2 for public identities.
- Platform: Azure Commercial Cloud in West and West 2
- Development: .NET and associated

Security compliance that needs to be met includes:

- NIST CSF 2.0. We anticipate that the platform and program will need to operate at a minimum of Tier 3: Repeatable. This Tier level reflects an expectation that the system security plan will demonstrate formalized, documented, and consistent cybersecurity risk management practices that are integrated into our broader organizational risk management strategy.

Compliance standard:

- NACHA (National Automated Clearing House Association) Operating Rules and Guidelines
- Alaska Personal Information Protection Act are required.

Specifications will be discussed with the successful offeror during a requirements analysis phase.

---

76. Can you elaborate on the State's main technology stack? (Front-End/Back-End/Integration stack and security tooling).

Answer:

Technology Stack:

- Network: Cisco LAN/WAN, PaloAlto & F5 parameter (on premise and in Azure), ExpressRoute
- Compute: Windows Server, MS SQL
- Storage: Azure native, NetApp and other storage options in the Azure store
- Identity: Entra/AAD for state employees/support staff. Azure B2C P2 for public identities.
- Platform: Azure Commercial Cloud in West and West 2
- Development: .NET and associated

Specifications will be discussed with the successful offeror during a requirements analysis phase.

---

77. Is the budgeted \$7.5M intended to cover the full scope of work over a five-year period or are there multiple phases expected or planned?

Answer: Per Sec 1.05, "The \$7.5 million is the available approved budget for FY25. Additional funding beyond the FY25 Budget will be subject to legislative appropriation and approval. "The contract period is provided in Sec. 302. The length of the contract will be from the date of award, approximately October 2024, until the completion of the project approximately June 30, 2026."

---

78. Are we correct in our assumption that the new system is a complete re-write – and without leveraging any existing code?

Answer: We are looking for an efficient, comprehensive, and standardized solution. We are open to reusing some code if it makes business and technical sense and avoids technical fragmentation.

---

79. Can you please confirm that 100% of all work needs to be performed domestically, i.e., no offshore sourcing?

Answer: The State of Alaska has a process for reviewing and approving offshore sourcing. As long as the successful offeror is able to meet State procurement requirements, this is feasible.

---

80. Will all personnel responsible for development be required to pass a Federal background check (APSIM) and, if so, what is the expected turn-around for those checks?

Answer: No background check is required.

---

81. Will DAIS be architected as a Web App with Cloud-native technologies as part of this RFP?

Answer: This RFP is asking the vendor to propose a solution to move forward. Cloud-native or Cloud hosted is preferred.

---

82. Can you help us understand the discrepancy between the system delivery date of Jan 1, 2026 and the approximate project completion of June 30, 2026? What will be the team's primary responsibilities during that interim time period after the delivery date?

Answer: The Department plans to thoroughly review proposals. Per the RFP section 3.01 and 3.03, the awarded contract will have a go-live date of January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026.

---

83. Are the adjacent applications currently in MS C# .NET, like Online Filing, myPFDInfo, RPF, being absorbed into DAIS as part of this effort or will they stay independent as they are today?

Answer: Depending on the solution proposed these could continue to be stand alone or incorporated.

---

84. Will reporting have to stay in SSRS?

Answer: A solution that provides ad-hoc reporting capabilities is needed, but it does not have to be SSRS.

---

85. Does the data need to be stored in a relational database in the cloud or can no-sql databases be used?

Answer: Data should be kept in a relational database.

---

86. Is data migration from existing on-premise system to the cloud required as part of this effort?

Answer: Yes

---

87. Is there a requirement to create IaC and CI/CD pipelines for the deployment of DAIS in the cloud?

Answer: This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

88. Is Penetration Testing and Static Code analysis required before the system is put in production?

Answer: The vendor is required to comply with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) guidelines for penetration testing and static code analysis, and to document that in the System Security Plan.

---

89. What are the RTO and RPO for DAIS during migration and later during normal operations?

Answer: For cost estimation purposes, the RTO is 2 hours or less and RPO is 15 minutes or less. This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

90. Can the State provide technical documentation for both the existing on-prem DAIS solution and all the required interfaced platforms or apps?

Answer: Yes, this can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

91. Which company was awarded the contract under RFP 2019-0400-4235 for the DAIS modernization effort?

Answer: Resource Data, Inc. was awarded the resulting contract from RFP 2019-0400-4235.

---

92. What was the period of performance for the contract?

Answer: June 1, 2019 through October 15, 2023.

---

93. Is the company that performed the work considered the incumbent for this project?

Answer: No.

---

94. Will any artifacts, source code, or other deliverables from the previous contract be made available to the new winning bidder?

Answer: Yes. This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

95. What were the outcomes of the previous effort to modernize DAIS?

Answer: The previous effort to modernize the DAIS system did not meet the expectations of the State.

---

96. Could you share any lessons learned or key takeaways from this prior effort that could help prospective bidders set themselves up for success?

Answer: Please review the RFP's scope and deliverables.

97. Section 3.10 of the RFP states that subcontractors must have a valid business license by the close of the RFP. However, on page 22, it mentions that this requirement only applies if the subcontractor operates in Alaska. Could you please clarify this requirement?

Answer: All contractors/vendors are required to have an Alaska Business license if they will physically perform work within the State of Alaska. If the contractor/vendor will not be performing work within the State of Alaska, they are not required to have a business license.

---

98. In Attachment 3, under the section titled 'Innovation in IT Transformation Projects,' the RFP requests experience with blockchain technology. Could you please clarify the specific expectations for the use of blockchain technology in this RFP?

Answer: AI, blockchain, and zero-trust are provided as examples of innovative technologies used in IT transformation projects. We are looking for you to describe your experience as a vendor with implementing innovative technologies that are relevant to your proposal.

---

99. Are the 22 DAIS Support Applications included in the project scope to be incorporated into the new cloud-native solution? If so, are these requirements included in Attachment 2- PFDD\_Attachment 1 - DAIS RFP Requirements? If not, could we please get a list of the 22 applications along with their requirements?

Answer: The 22 DAIS Support Applications outlined in Attachment 2- PFDD\_Attachment 1 - DAIS RFP Requirements consist of core DAIS functionality that was created as ancillary modules over many years. Examples include screens for recordation and/or reconciliation that were not originally incorporated into the core DIAS system due to technology or resource limitations. It would be expected that the functionality of these modules will be incorporated into the core feature set of the DAIS rewrite.

---

100. Are all of the requirements for the Support Services included in Attachment 2- PFDD\_Attachment 1 - DAIS RFP Requirements? If not, can you please provide them?

Answer: All requirements are provided in the RFP document as well as the associated attachments.

---

101. Do you have a list of the various business reports that are in scope for the project? The RFP simply identifies “Various Business Reports” and the Attachment 2- PFDD\_Attachment 1 - DAIS RFP Requirements doesn’t appear to list them.

Answer: This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

102. The 6th and 9th bullet in the Scope of Work on page 15 of the RFP mention “... other administrative enhanced functionalities” and “... additional administrative functionalities”, respectively. Would you provide a list of these administrative functionalities?

Answer: Administrative enhanced functionalities as well as any additional administrative functionalities will be discussed during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

103. Does the State of Alaska or the PFDD have published UI/UX standards that you expect the solution to comply with?

Answer: UI/UX standards include Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/> and State of Alaska Look and feel website standards <https://alaska.gov/LookAndFeel/>.

---

104. You mention a mobile application in the RFP, but Attachment 2- PFDD\_Attachment 1 - DAIS RFP Requirements discusses responsive web design usable across multiple mobile devices (F.P.002). Is a responsive web design an acceptable mobile solution given the long-term total cost of ownership implications for PFDD?

Answer: The current solution uses a browser based mobile format. Mobile friendly web browsing will work for the purposes of this RFP. A separate iOS and Android application project may be a future enhancement, subject to future budget appropriations.

---

105. Requirement F.D.001 mentions the need for a process to receive, convert, and load new application data into the system. Can you provide details on the data formats, sources, and expected volumes?



Answer: This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

106. Regarding requirement F.D.006, which mentions integration with the current third-party document scanning system (ILINX), could you provide more details on the integration points and any specific APIs or protocols that are preferred for this integration? Additionally, are there other third-party systems that the DAIS system needs to integrate with?

Answer: ILINX does not contain an API. Integration is provided via a Department created "plugin" which submits data into the DAIS database. This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

107. Requirement TECH.D.030, which states the system must comply with all necessary security requirements, could you elaborate on the specific state, federal, and banking standards that are applicable? Are there any particular encryption methods or authentication protocols required?

Answer: NACHA (National Automated Clearing House Association) Operating Rules and Guidelines, Alaska Personal Information Protection Act are required. This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

108. Could you provide insight into the review process for the system security plan to help plan the timeline?

Answer: System Security Plan progress will be iterative throughout the project, involving the Chief Technology Officer, Chief Risk Officer, and State Security Office, to minimize both costs and the timeframe for final review. The final review timeframe will be 2 weeks.

---

109. The RFP states the respondent should complete a "Summary analysis report on necessary steps to complete the New DAIS update project, including timeline to complete remaining items." Can you provide details on this existing project that needs to be completed?

Answer: This statement refers to iterative development and regular cadence-based updates on "remaining items" in the project schedule.

---

110. Would DOR be responsive to a multistage approach in which the current system is migrated to modern technology and then iterated on to enhance workflows?

Answer: No.

---

111. You request that the vendor ensures that IT staff are certified in system and cloud technologies involved. Will the State of Alaska identify the staff and pay for the system and cloud certifications required, or do you expect the vendor to pay for the certification courses and testing? How many IT staff do you anticipate training as part of the initial training?

Answer: The vendor would be required to ensure that 9 DOR IT staff receive appropriate training and certification to support the new solution and products.

---

112. How many business users do you anticipate training?

Answer: Internal State business users are approximately 80.

---

113. Will the respondent be responsible for costs associated with the cloud-native services? If so, would you provide the state license rates for Azure?

Answer: During the time of the project, the vendor will be responsible for costs associated with cloud native services. To determine state license rates for Azure, use the Azure cost calculator for Azure Commercial Cloud with less than a 9% markup.

---

114. Would the state consider extending the due date by one week?

Answer: No.

---

115. For the following sentence in the first paragraph of Section 5.02, "Evaluation Criteria," on p. 32 of the RFP, is it stating that vendors need to provide a separate copy of their proposal with their name and brand removed so PEC will not be affected by bias? If that is the case, it seems that a word might be missing ... that it should read "one copy of their proposal that does NOT include the company name ... ." Please clarify.

Answer: Second 5.02 states: "Offerors/Contractors will be required to provide one copy of their

proposal that includes the company name, project lead names, and anything other company identifiers that does not hinder the PEC's ability to evaluate the proposal." The state requests two copies of Offerors/Contractors proposals. 1 copy that includes company and employee information, project sensitive information, etc., for PEC to evaluate. The other copy that will be a Public Document Proposal is a redacted version that omits all confidential information to protect the company's interests. This sanitized proposal is suitable for public disclosure, providing only essential project information without compromising sensitive data, while the other version includes all information needed for PEC to evaluate proposals.

---

116. There appears to be a sentence fragment on p. 2 of the "Scope Level of Expertise Plan Form," in the section "Cybersecurity of the Project and System": "Describe your experience with meeting common cybersecurity standards, such as the NIST Cybersecurity Framework, in previous projects. Describe your experience with generating and maintaining a system security plan (e.g., "Could you please let us know what the end of the sentence should be?"

Answer: The complete sentence should be, "Describe your experience with meeting common cybersecurity standards, such as the NIST Cybersecurity Framework, in previous projects.

Describe your experience with generating and maintaining a system security plan."

---

117. Previous attempts?

- What information regarding the previous attempt's (RFP 2019-0400-4235) progress can be shared? What artifacts exist? What information can be shared regarding why this RFP procurement no longer applies?

Answer: The previous effort to modernize the DAIS system did not meet the expectations of the State including budgetary requirements.

---

118. State involvement?

- Will the State dedicate any personnel resources within the execution of RFP 2025-0400-0038?

Answer: Yes.

---

119. Dependencies on State resources?

- Will the State provide an escalation path for performance challenges or conflicts with state resources?

Answer: See section 3.03 of the RFP.

---

120. Guidance/examples on docs?

- Can the State provide guidance or examples of documentation artifacts such as to minimize reformatting or refinement loops with critical stakeholders?

Answer: Yes, where available. This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

121. Preference for COTS/custom/low-code?

- Does the State have any explicit preference on solutions based solely on one type of solution (COTS/custom/low-code), or should a mixture of solution types be assumed?

Answer: We have no preference, all of those are viable options. PFD needs to be able to support, maintain, and update the system as needed internally by the PFD-IT staff. While the Department does not have a prescribed architecture for this project, we would expect to see consistent architectural paradigms employed in an effort to minimize technical fragmentation and training effort for Department staff.

---

122. Existing comms/organizational for external parties/dependencies?

- Does the State have an established steering committee or governance body through which communications and organizational management should flow?

Answer: Communications will be routed through the Office of the Commissioner.

---

123. Areas for improvements? Existing challenges?

- Does the State have known areas of improvement or known existing challenges that extend beyond a "lift-and-shift" migration of the DAIS that would need to be assessed for scoping?

Answer: Yes, those have been identified and will be shared with the selected offeror.

---

124. Mitigation/backup plan in event that the January 1st go-live is not attainable?

- Does the State have a plan in place in case it is found that the intended go-live date is not attainable under the assumed scope, schedule, and budget?

Answer: The Department plans to thoroughly review proposals. Per the RFP section 3.01 and 3.03, the awarded contract will have a go-live date of January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026.

---

125. Previous efforts towards business process re-engineering?

- Does the State, or did the previous effort (RFP 2019-0400-4235) have intent to re-engineer any existing business processes that would require additional estimation and analysis?

Answer: This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

126. Entire PFD db to be converted?

- Is it assumed that all historical PFD database records will need to be converted and migrated or will there be applicable subsets of critical data for conversion?

Answer: All data will need to be converted and imported into the new system.

---

127. Are any components identified in Section 2.03, besides the DAIS PowerBuilder application, included in scope for replacement or rewrite?

Answer: All components are in scope for replacement or rewrite.

---

128. How many SSRS reports?

- How many SSRS reports exist that would be included within the migration, and what is the relative nature of their distributed data sources?

Answer: Roughly 200 SSRS reports exist and should be included within the migration. This can be discussed further during the requirements analysis phase with the successful offeror.

---

**Changes to attachments:**

**Change 1:**

**Cost Proposal has been updated.**

**Change 2:**

**Confidentiality Agreement has been updated.**