

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Military and Veterans Affairs
Division of Administrative Services



ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE E-LEARNING MODULES DESIGN

RFP 260000004

Amendment #3

August 22, 2025

This amendment is being issued to answer questions from interested offerors and make changes to the RFP.

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.

Jannah Cayetano

Jannah Cayetano

Procurement Specialist 3

Phone: (907) 428-7222

Email: MvaDasProcurement@alaska.gov

COMPANY SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DATE

Questions submitted by potential offerors and answers from the state:

Question 1: What date should we apply for an Alaska business license, if awarded the contract?

Answer: The selected vendor may apply for an Alaska Business License after receiving the Notice of Intent to Award; however, the license must be obtained before a contract can be awarded.

Question 2: Attachment 1 Submittal Form A – Offeror Information. Please clarify what information is required in Federal Requirements section. We are unclear as to what type of information or statement will satisfy this section of Attachment 1.

Answer: Main requirements are ADA compliance and WCAG 2 standards as well as regulations on privacy, cyber security and information management. This relates to 'SEC. 3.17 NONDISCLOSURE AND CONFIDENTIALITY' of the RFP. DoD specific requirements may include DoD Instruction 5200.48 on using controlled unclassified information (CUI), AR 25-2 (information assurance), AR 25-4, and AR 380-67 as well as 32 CFR Part 327. Throughout the project, specific DoD requirements may arise if CUI is handled by the vendor. As part of the requirement, the contractor will need to complete mandatory training on the proper handling and safeguarding of this information. This could likely be coordinated with our OPSEC or AKARNG security specialist if the contractor doesn't already have this certification.

Question 3: Attachment 3 – Master Agreement Form for Professional Services. Will a clean form be provided, or are we to fill in and sign the one marked “SAMPLE ONLY” within the RFP?

Answer: The selected vendor will be provided with a cleaner copy of this document. This document is for informational use only.

Question 4: Please clarify the response to question 9 in Amendment 1 (copied below). For out-of-state vendors, is an Alaska business license required for this contract prior to notification of award?

Answer: The Alaska Business License is required after the Notice of Intent to Award is issued. The selected vendor must have this license prior to the contract award is issued.

Question 5: The RFP states under Proposed payments subheading, a one-time payment (Sec. 3.05). However, earlier on page 22, it states: “Progress payments will be tied to milestones and invoices will be processed as deliverables are completed. Deliverables, such as individual

modules or other content items, will be released individually as they are completed.” Is the state intending payments made on a rolling basis when modules are completed and finalized based on an agreed upon schedule determined at the kickoff?

Answer: Please see change 1 below. It is recommended that the payment schedule is aligned with project phases listed in the milestones section of the RFP (p. 19-20) for each module. The final payment will be made once the post-implementation phase has been successfully completed.

Question 6: The contract mentions on page 4 that that DMVA and AKARNG are seeking to establish a multi-year contract. Can AK confirm it is seeking 10 modules in its first 12-month period. Also, for additional years is the intent for a similar scope of work and budget ceiling??

Answer: A multi-year contract was established with the intent of having flexibility regarding the specific number of modules requested over the contract length. The budget ceiling is expected to remain the same over the contract length with an estimated budget of between \$80,000.00 to \$100,000.00 dollars per contract year. We likely do not seek the delivery of 10 modules in the first 12-month period. Modules #3-8 are of higher priority and are expected to be requested first. Additional modules would be incrementally requested over the remaining lifetime of the contract. However, these decisions will be subject to the availability of funds.

Question 7: Seeking a fast response to the business license requirement please. It seems this is something we need to purchase, is this accurate?

Answer: The selected vendor shall be required to obtain a valid Alaska Business License prior to execution of the contract.

Question 8: Regarding the additional modules, just for clarification—would that be treated as a subsequent change order to the original scope, or should we build in the possibility of additional modules within the existing scope of work?

Answer: The vendor must include the possibility of additional modules within the existing scope of work. We set this up as a multiyear contract to allow flexibility to add modules, continue working with the same vendor, and account for potential regulatory changes without needing to create a new contract.

Question 9: Is there a certain number of case studies that you're looking for? And as far as you would be looking at environmental compliance focus case studies and/or state of Alaska focused case studies or can those be private as well with other companies that are looking at environmental compliance?

Answer: We are open for suggestions. Some of the case studies are universally applicable, whereas others will need to be AKARNG-specific. This will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. As an example, the Hazardous Waste management modules for SQGs and VSQGs are fairly universal and there are great case studies from other industries. Nonetheless, we prefer examples from our AKARNG facilities. Other modules, such as spill response, will be location-specific. These need to be developed in close collaboration with our team.

Question 10: We primarily have designed to this point medical and that type of training, would it be responsive to bid if we don't have prior environmental experience? Would we be expected to also have our own subject matter experts or would we be using your subject matter experts?

Answer: This experience is not required but is highly desired. Having an environmental compliance subject matter expert on your team would be an advantage; however, our work is highly unique and specific to large-scale compliance matters involving the National Guard, which differs from other fields and industries. Therefore, the lack of this experience will not exclude you from consideration

Question 11: Regarding Artificial Intelligence (AI), are you against it being used at all, or is it just as it has to be reviewed, edited, and touched by humans?

Answer: The use of AI is strongly discouraged. Reasons to avoid AI include DoD security standards, our goal to create location-specific training with applicable, non-generic examples, as well as the intricate and complex nature of regulatory compliance of our organization and the importance of accuracy of regulatory details and requirements – some of which differ from other industries and must be in line with our internal plans. The use of AI will only be permitted only on a case-by-case basis. Approval may also require coordination with our legal office to ensure compliance..

Question 12: Beyond knowledge checks, tests, or quizzes, should vendors address how the training modules impact actual behavior in the field? Should proposals include guidance on measuring learning outcomes beyond knowledge acquisition, or is there an existing system for tracking this?

Answer: We have our own internal way of checking whether or not training is effective through site assessments. We use a program through the National Guard called Environmental Performance Assessment System (EPAS) which allows us to conduct internal inspections of the facility to identify and track any issues. The training is designed, in part, to address the most common findings, such as hazardous waste management and spill prevention/response. These areas are the focus of our training, and any reduction in findings would be directly measurable. While the training is designed with these priorities in mind, we already have a system in place to collect data and assess its effectiveness. An evaluation of desired behavior changes will be an important component in the training design process. As the vendor designs each module, a review of existing compliance findings as well as SME interviews are important to evaluate what learnable behavior changes can feasibly be addressed through training and how the training is designed. This will be a key component in the needs analysis (identified in the Planning Phase of the project, RFP p.19).

Question 13: Are you requesting the source files in an editable format, such as Articulate project files, or are you only looking for the final packaged modules? For example, are the editable files needed to support future updates and maintenance?

Answer: If this is an option, then yes, we would like the files to be provided in an editable format. Editable files would be highly advantageous to ensure efficient collaboration of vendor and DMVA PM. Access to chosen authoring tools (Articulate or similar) would need to be facilitated either through the vendor or will be pending DMVA approval and availability of funds.

Question 14: Could you provide some guidance on the budget? Considering the scope of work includes 12 modules with highly technical content and likely human narration, and noting that this is a multiyear contract, could you clarify your expectations? Should vendors make assumptions or model a certain amount of work to be completed in year one, assuming additional funding may be available in subsequent years?

Answer: The exact number of work requested throughout the lifetime of this multi-year contract will be subject to the availability of funds. There are a few modules that we expect to request immediately in the first project term. Those are identified in the SOW as modules #3 to #8 which comes to a total of 5 modules. The yearly budget is capped to \$100,000.00 but that doesn't necessarily mean that we would be requesting all 12 modules all at once or that there is a fixed number of modules requested during subsequent contract years to reach the annual limit. We'll need some flexibility on the training content requested. In addition to the 12 core modules, the SOW highlights that there may be additional modules that may be requested depending on future program needs.

There will be several ways a vendor may choose to structure their pricing. Our suggestion would be that the vendor pricing is not be merely structured around 12 modules, but rather identifies fixed pricing per module according to proposed tiers (this pricing structure will ensure transparency and reflect complexity of the instructional design approach and features and offer DMVA a high level of flexibility). The vendor will need to identify which specific instructional features are included at a given tier. DMVA will then need to determine which tier is appropriate for each module.

This solicitation is intended to result in an as-needed contract, and the state doesn't guarantee a minimum or maximum amount of orders under this contract.

Question 15: Should we base our proposals on the \$100,000 per year scope and indicate the amount of work that can be completed within that budget? This would allow you to see how the work over the next few years aligns with your goal of producing 12 modules totaling three to five hours of complex content

Answer: With a project like this, there can be multiple levels of complexity in the work delivered, which can make budgeting challenging. In response to a similar question, I proposed a tiered model as one approach—identifying two or three levels of work and shaping pricing based on the complexity of the work delivered. There will also be some variability in how many modules will be requested per contract year. With that in mind, it is a good idea to outline in the proposal what amount of work the vendor would agree to complete within the \$100,000 budget per contract year. Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention.

Question 16: Are the courses required to be accredited for continuing education (CE) or any similar certification?

Answer: No.

Question 17: Are vendors allowed to use their own format for submittal forms, provided that the page limit requirements are met?

Answer: Yes.

Question 18: Our company is currently registered in New Jersey. Once the proposal is awarded, will we be required to register in the State of Alaska to comply with the contract?

Answer: You will be required to obtain an Alaska Business License prior to contract execution.

Question 19: Does an out-of-state business that is registered as a foreign entity in Alaska qualify to "receive the Alaska Bidder Preference"?

Answer: To qualify for the Alaska Bidder Preference, all questions in the Alaska Bidder Preference Questionnaire (see Certification Form, page 56 of the RFP) must be answered "Yes." Additionally, in order for any Alaska bidder or offeror preferences to be applied during the evaluation of proposals, the offeror must hold a current Alaska business license.

Question 20: We are located and headquartered in Pennsylvania and employ staff both in and out of the United States. If our staff are working together on this project, will we be required to obtain a waiver?

Answer: Yes, a waiver is needed. Per AAM [81.015](#), the vendor must provide justification showing why it would be in the State's best interest to allow work outside the U.S., and why restricting to U.S. providers could be detrimental to our mission.

Question 21: Are we allowed to present our proposal through a video call? A lot of our examples are not accessible through shared links but we can screen share them if possible.

Answer: All proposal materials must be submitted in writing by the RFP's deadline. This approach ensures fairness and transparency for all vendors. If a vendor cannot provide samples through shared links or as attachments, it is their responsibility to find a compliant way to include them in their written submission.

Question 22: It seems that attaining a business registration license requires an entity registration (for out of state business). The application is \$350 for the entity license and \$50 for the business registration. Is this purchase of \$400 required in order to submit an RFP? If so, can a consideration be made to forgo these requirements until receiving an award? This process is extremely confusing and lacks clarity.

Answer: An Alaskan business license is not required to submit a proposal. However, in order to be awarded the contract—which occurs 10 days after the Notice of Intent to Award is issued, the selected vendor must obtain one prior to contract execution.

Changes to the RFP:

Change 1: SEC 3.05 Proposed Payment Procedures will be changed to the following language:
The state will make payments based on a negotiated payment schedule. Each billing must consist of an invoice and progress report. No payment will be made until the progress report and invoice has been approved by the project director.

-END OF AMENDMENT 3-