

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Public Safety
Division of Administrative Services



PERMITS AND LICENSING REPOSITORY

RFP 2025-1200-0168

Amendment Two

ISSUED December 22, 2024

This amendment is being issued to answer vendor submitted questions, including questions from the Pre-Proposal Conference

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.

Kelly Pahlau
Procurement Specialist 5
Phone: (907) 269-8493
Email: kelly.pahlau@alaska.gov

COMPANY SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DATE

Questions submitted by potential offerors and answers from the state:

Question 1: What is your number of anticipated users for the program? Of your users, how many are field inspection?

Answer: No more than 12 users, and they will all need the field inspection capability.

Question 2: Will every applicant coming into the system have an APSIN ID already assigned?

Answer: No – the Department of Public Safety (DPS) will create that identifier for them using another state system.

Question 3: Are you requiring GovCloud hosting?

Answer: No, however there may be components to this project which require compliance with the Criminal Justice Information System Security Policy. This will be determined during the discovery based upon the data points of the business processes and capabilities of the selected vendor.

Question 4: Application types and number of them – six are counted with a renewal program for each. Can you verify that?

Answer: There is the initial, renewal, change, and replacement application for each license type.

Question 5: Assuming there is some sort of pass/fail process to these licenses – do we know (or need to know) what those reasons for pass/fail are? Is this just a “holder for the record” or is the offeror/system having to check Triple I, etc.?

Answer: DPS does review the records of all applicants. The threshold is set by state and federal statute, and our team applies those rules, and it is pass/fail. DPS approves/denies initial applications, but DPS will also suspend or revoke applications that have already been issued if disqualifying information is identified subsequent to the initial approval of the permit. There is a continuous review process. Searches of III will be performed through an external system.

Question 6: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...migrate all permits and licensing data into a unified platform which allows for consistent business processes across multiple permit and licensing programs...” For importing legacy records from APSIN and Access databases, what specific field-level normalization rules (such as mapping legacy permit status codes to standardized enums, reconciling inconsistent renewal intervals, or aligning instructor ID formats) should the solution apply to achieve a uniform data structure that supports cross-program reporting and streamlined workflows?

Answer: Due to multiple data sources involved, standards may differ between the applications. During the discovery process, we will address and standardize the data structures in coordination with the selected vendor.

Question 7: RFP Reference: Section 2.01 (Background Information): “ACHP permits are valid for five years and expire on the applicant’s birthday...” For ACHP permits, should the solution apply configurable expiration logic that accommodates situations where the initial expiration date falls short of a full five-year term due to the applicant’s birthdate, and should it dynamically adjust related fee calculations, automated renewal notifications, and subsequent renewal intervals to accurately reflect these abbreviated initial terms?

Answer: The proposed solution must address the expirations less than 5-years for initial applications. Fees must remain the same.

Question 8: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...receipt and financial reporting capabilities to include report generation necessary to manage the permit and licensing programs...” For daily financial reconciliation, should the system generate a line-item breakdown of fees by permit type (ACHP, SGL, SGAL, CPS) and payment method (credit card, cash, check, money order), apply granular controls (such as highlighting NICS exemption surcharges or reissuance fees), and automatically flag transactions requiring follow-up in cases of payment gateway declines or partial settlements?

Answer: Daily Financial Reports: Any proposed solution must include a daily system generated report breaking down the fees by permit type and amount.

Question 9: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...real time reports available in a variety of file formats (.csv, .xml, .xmlx)...” Should the reporting module enable administrators to define and store custom field-level filters, such as isolating ACHP permit holders with NICS exemption flags or segmenting SGL licensees by armed/unarmed status, and should it support reusable filter sets that authorized staff can apply on-demand or schedule for periodic exports without technical intervention?

Answer: Any proposed solution must support both on-demand and scheduled reporting exports without technical intervention.

Question 10: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...compliance with FBI CJIS Security Policy and Alaska Personal Information Protection Act...” Under FBI CJIS compliance, should the solution maintain tamper-proof audit logs that record every instance of user access to personal data, tagging each event with a user’s assigned CJIS clearance level (e.g., CHRI Analyst vs. Permit Administrator) and preserving a forensically sound history of actions (such as viewing NICS-exempt permit details or updating criminal history notes) to support external audits or investigations?

Answer: Any criminal history information must meet the CJIS Security Policy requirements.

Question 11: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...a financial tracking system that can support multiple forms of payment...from multiple sources...” For over-the-counter transactions at DPS offices, should the solution enforce cashier-level process controls—such as requiring supervisory approval for fee adjustments, refunds, or voided receipts—and should it record these events in an audit trail keyed by cashier ID and role, providing a clear trace of financial exceptions for later financial reconciliation or compliance reviews?

Answer: Functionality allowing over-the counter transitions at DPS offices is required.

Question 12: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...configurable workflows for application review and approval to include renewal and reissuance workflows...” should the solution’s workflow engine allow DPS staff to define conditional rules such as requiring an extra round of fingerprint-based background checks when an SGL armed renewal request is detected, or prompting for additional employer sponsorship verification when converting an SGAL license from unarmed to armed and should these logic updates (e.g., changing minimum training hour thresholds or inserting a mandatory firearms competency validation step) be achievable through a configuration interface without vendor code changes?

Answer: A configuration interface without vendor code changes would be preferrable.

Question 13: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...support multiple forms of payment...the AKDPS currently uses Wells Fargo for online payment...Clover devices for in-person payment processing.” should the online payment interface accommodate structured partial payments or installment plans for specific high-fee permit categories (e.g., multi-year armed security guard licenses), and if so, should the system enforce configurable installment schedules (such as automated reminders for outstanding balances), ensure that no final permit issuance occurs until all installments are cleared, and log each partial payment event with a timestamp and payment method indicator for auditability?

Answer: Full payment is required at the time of application submission.

Question 14: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...allow printing of the application forms so that they may be submitted to AKDPS by an applicant in person...” When generating printed application forms, should the solution dynamically incorporate applicant-specific data (e.g., cross-referencing ACHP instructors’ certification numbers or embedding SGL employer sponsorship fields) along with conditional sections that only appear when certain eligibility criteria are met, and should it maintain version-controlled templates so that staff can roll back to previous approved formats or update required legal disclaimers without introducing inconsistencies in older submitted applications?

Answer: Incorporating applicant specific data would be preferred.

Question 15: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...includes a public webpage that lists contact information for AKDPS authorized fingerprint examiners and certified handgun instructors...” Should the public directory page automatically reflect newly approved examiners or instructors immediately after their status is updated in the system (e.g., no manual synchronization required) and should it maintain a historical archive of previously listed individuals—such as those with expired or revoked credentials—so that AKDPS staff can review past listings or restore an instructor’s profile once recertified?

Answer: The public directory page should automatically reflect newly approved instructors. Any historical archive of previously listed individuals should only be viewable by Permits and Licensing program staff.

Question 16: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...research records may contain criminal justice information and therefore FBI CJIS Security Policy compliance will be required.” Should the solution enforce elevated security measures, such as a mandatory dual-authentication prompt (e.g., requiring a secondary passcode or hardware token) before granting staff access to sealed or restricted CJIS research records, and should it log all such accesses (including user ID, timestamp, and a justification reason code) in a tamper-proof audit trail to support periodic CJIS compliance audits?

Answer: DPS has a preference towards leveraging the existing State of Alaska Microsoft Entra ID. Any criminal history storage must comply with the CJIS Security policy.

Question 17: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...online proctored examination option...” If implementing online proctored exams, should the solution enforce multifactor identity checks at exam initiation (e.g., capturing a webcam image and verifying it against stored applicant records), apply browser lockdown measures (such as disabling navigation to external sites or copying/pasting), and record proctoring metadata (e.g., time-stamped exam violations or connectivity interruptions), rather than relying solely on a basic score capture mechanism?

Answer: This is preferred functionality.

Question 18: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...renewal and reissuance workflows...” When processing a reissuance for a lost or stolen ACHP or CPS license, should the system prompt staff to select a defined reason code (such as “lost card” or “theft reported”), maintain a historical counter of how many times a particular license has been reissued, and automatically apply specific regulatory fee structures (e.g., reduced rates for the first replacement, escalating charges for subsequent replacements) to align with statutory fee rules?

Answer: This is preferred functionality.

Question 19: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...document upload, retention, and management for processing approximately 20,000 various permit/license applications annually.” Should the document repository enforce distinct retention schedules per permit type (e.g., automatically purging ACHP application files after five years post-expiration, retaining CPS-related documents for two years, or archiving historical SGL renewals), issue configurable alerts (such as a 60-day pre-expiration warning to administrators), and maintain a tamper-proof audit log of all retention-based deletions or archive actions to ensure full compliance with statutory records management mandates?

Answer: DPS requires different retention schedules per permit type.

Question 20: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...support multiple forms of payment (cash, check, money order, credit card) from multiple sources (public portal, AKDPS staff, etc.)...” Should the payment engine automatically impose supplemental administrative fees for certain non-electronic methods (e.g., adding a handling surcharge when a permit renewal fee is paid by check rather than online), and should it allow authorized supervisory roles to override or waive these surcharges under-documented conditions (such as granting fee exceptions for applicants presenting official hardship justifications) while preserving an audit record of such overrides?

Answer: No. Any proposed solution should not have any processing or surcharge passed onto the applicant.

The proposed solution may automate the application of late fees based on business rules provided by DPS. The proposed solution may have functionality allowing authorized staff to override this fee and it should be logged with a reason why.

Question 21: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...reports available in a variety of file formats (.csv, .xml, .xlsx)...” Should the reporting module include a standard “Daily Permit Status” report that categorizes active permits by type (ACHP, SGL, SGAL, CPS), annotates each record with attributes like NICS exemption flags or imminent expiration alerts (e.g., within 30 days), and should it empower staff to reorder columns, rename field headers (such as changing “Expiration Date” to “Renew By”), or add filtering criteria before exporting the final dataset for daily operational reviews?

Answer: Report specifications will be determined during discovery.

Question 22: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...automated fee calculation based on application type and applicant details...” Should the fee calculation module dynamically apply specialized pricing rules (e.g., reduced ACHP renewal fees for retired peace officers, incremental charges for expedited CPS re-issuance requests, or conditional waivers if a SGL applicant meets certain employer criteria), and should authorized AKDPS personnel be able to adjust these parameters, such as updating a discount percentage or adding a new waiver

category directly in an administrative configuration panel without vendor support or code changes?

Answer: Fees should be based on business requirements and permit type.

Question 23: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...integration with payment gateways for online fee collection; the AKDPS currently uses Wells Fargo...” Should the solution handle asynchronous financial events—such as receiving a chargeback notification post-permit issuance or a partial refund confirmation—by automatically adjusting the associated permit’s financial status (e.g., setting it to “payment under dispute” or “partial settlement”), triggering a queue for financial officer review, and logging these updates with a detailed transaction history (including reason codes provided by the payment gateway)?

Answer: Handling asynchronous financial events is a preference.

Question 24: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...email notifications and printable letters...” Should the solution maintain a version-controlled library of notification templates (e.g., acceptance letters, denial notices, missing-document requests) that can dynamically merge applicant-specific data fields, insert conditional paragraphs (such as adding specialized fingerprinting instructions only for SGL armed applicants or detailing re-training requirements for ACHP renewals), and allow authorized staff to roll back to previous template versions if regulatory language changes occur?

Answer: Version-controlled library of notification templates would be a preference.

Question 25: RFP Reference: Section 3.01 (Scope of Work): “...preference for proposed solution to provide a public webpage...with the ability within the proposed solution to maintain the contact information...” Should the public directory automatically remove an instructor’s listing as soon as their certification expires or is revoked, maintain a historical log of all previously listed instructors with timestamps and reason codes for removal (e.g., certification lapse, disciplinary action), and support swift reinstatement if their credentials are subsequently restored, ensuring that AKDPS staff can rapidly respond to changes without losing historical context?

Answer: Automatic updates to the webpage would be preference.

Question 26: Other than an integration to the Wells Fargo payment processing solution for online payment transactions, are there other payment or financial systems that may require integration to the selected solution?

Answer: Not at this time.

Question 27: Will the agency need to integrate to the system for NICS or any other repository for verification of criminal background status?

Answer: This is not required functionality, but DPS would be interested in options to do so at a future date.

Question 28: For education and exam requirements, will the solution need to integrate to any of those solutions to protect the integrity of testing results of applicants?

Answer: This is unknown at this time.

Question 29: Does the Dept. currently use a document management solution or is a solution for that also required?

Answer: A document management solution is a requirement.

Question 30: Is any GIS or mapping functionality required?

Answer: No.

Question 31: Are any inspections for any of the license/permit types required?

Answer: Yes, there is an audit component to these programs.

Question 32: How many years of data will be migrated from the legacy mainframe solution and the Access database?

Answer: All permits and licenses that are currently active, and all inactive or expired permits not more than 5-years old on the date of migration. There are approximately 14,000 active licensees/permit holders; we estimate 25,000 number of historic records will need to be migrated

Question 33: Does the Department process and issue any other license/permit types for which a solution may be needed?

Answer: This is unknown at this time.

Question 34: Per the RFP stating: "Department of Public Safety, Division of Statewide Services, estimates a budget of no more than \$1,000,000 for completion of this project. Proposals priced at more than \$1,000,000.00 will be considered non-responsive." Can the State verify the contract

valuation? Does the \$1 million cap only apply to the implementation cost? Does the \$1 million cap apply to Renewal Terms 1 -5 as well?

Answer: Yes--The not-to-exceed applies to the implementation cost and the renewal terms. The maximum allowable cost of \$1,000,000.00 encompasses all hardware, software, services, and maintenance required for the initial installation, as well as ongoing maintenance for an additional five years.

Question 35: Can the State/Agency describe the Background Check process? Does Computer Projects of Illinois (CPI) serve at a one-stop interface solution for all background check interfaces? Does the State anticipate replacing CPI?

Answer: For the vendor, the background check involves a fingerprint based criminal history record search of state and national databases. The State has a long-term contract with CPI and does not anticipate replacing CPI. For applicant background checks, additional checks through NICS would be done as required and authorized.

Question 36: Does DPS require a need for certain third-party data-exchange interfaces. Also, please note if each interface will be one-way or two-way.

Answer: This is not a requirement of the project, but the DPS has a preference for two-way interface between the proposed solution and the APSIN replacement solution, the details of which will be fleshed out during the discovery process.

Question 37: How many data tables and size of tables does the State anticipate migrating?

Answer: Less than 10 tables and less than 1GB of data.

Question 38: APSIN is identified as an existing system. It is understood that ASPIN interfaces with the FBI's NICS. Does DPS anticipate the new system to interface with ASPIN or replace it?

Answer: No, this is a standalone application. The DPS is interested in future functionality to interface with the NICS.

Question 39: For each of the 4 identified licensing programs, can the State list all the types of licenses, registrations, permits, etc. that the agency supports, the approximate number of entities applying for and holding each type, and specify which license type(s) will require which types of online functionality (e.g. online applications, renewals, verifications, disciplinary processes, reciprocity, reinstatement, etc.)?

Answer: Please see the following sections in the RFP:
Section 2. Background (all)

Section 3. Scope of Work & Contract Information (all)

Any additional information not listed in the RFP, or subsequent amendments, concerning online functionality will be discussed during the discovery process.

Question 40: Please provide the names of all system outputs required, including reports, queries, and correspondences. Also provide the audience and the location from which each will be run (back-office, public website, specific login-secured area of public website, etc.). If such details are not available at this time, please provide at least the total numbers of each type of output required.

Answer: This will be addressed and discussed in detail during the discovery process.

Question 41: Can you elaborate on the agency's preferences regarding hosting with the vendor? Specifically does the State prefer Azure or AWS, e.g.?

Answer: The state currently leverages Azure. Azure is not the requirement.

Question 42: Can you elaborate on any need for mobile inspection/field investigation capabilities? If there is any need, please respond to the following: (a) How many mobile devices would the agency need set up to use on the new system? (b) In order that we may determine the number of forms that would be integrated into the new mobile system, how many different forms are currently in use in the field? (c) How should pricing for these items be proposed?

Answer: There is no mobile requirement at this time.
