

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Military and Veterans Affairs
Division of Administrative Services



ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE E-LEARNING MODULES DESIGN

RFP 260000004

Amendment #7

September 4, 2025

This amendment is being issued to answer questions from interested offerors.

Important Note to Offerors: This document does not need to be returned with 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: In the pricing section, it asks for the per hour cost for Subject Matter Experts. Is the selected vendor expected to provide and/or source Subject Matter Experts? Or will SMEs be provided by the client.

Answer: Please see Amendment 4 Question 2 for clarification.

Question 2: In response to the Amendment 5 Pricing Template, may we also supply a brief pricing narrative to explain our pricing approach in the spreadsheet?

Answer: Offerors may provide a brief pricing narrative for context. This narrative is optional, will not be scored, and will not influence the evaluation of technical or cost proposals. Proposal narratives are for explanatory purposes only. The information provided on these forms should be aligned with any narrative provided on Form G so that we can include it in our evaluation.

Question 3: The tiers use different units of measure (Per Module, Per Minute of Final Training Content, and Custom Price/Base Cost per Module), could you clarify how you would like us to align these for the “Total” and “Bid Total” calculations?

Answer: The 'Total' block should be the sum of Tiers 1, 2, and 3 for each year. The 'Bid Total (Sum of Years 1–5)' block should be the sum of all yearly totals from Year 1 to Year 5. To ensure comparability, all pricing for tiers 1 and 3 should be based on an estimated quantity of one single (1) module that is 20-minutes in length, whereas Tier 2 is per minute. If the vendor chooses to list all prices for one (1) 20-minute module (including Tier 2), that is acceptable too, but for evaluation purposes, all pricing in Tiers 1, 2, and 3 must be presented as a per-module cost, based on a 20-minute module. Offerors may calculate their per-minute costs internally, but the price submitted on Form G must reflect a 20-minute module equivalency across all tiers. This ensures comparability between offerors..

Question 4: We understand the budget for Year 1 is up to \$100,000, with an anticipated 6–8 modules. Could you clarify how you would like us to reflect this budget cap in the “Total” and “Bid Total” lines of the pricing table, particularly since the number and tier mix of modules for Years 2–5 has not been specified?

Answer: All pricing for all years should be based on an estimated quantity of one single (1) module that is 20-minutes in length for Tier 1 and 3 and per-minute cost for Tier 2. If the vendor chooses to consistently calculate pricing for one (1) 20-minute module across all 3 tiers

(including tier 2), that is acceptable too. For evaluation purposes, however, all pricing in Tiers 1, 2, and 3 must be presented as a per-module cost, based on a 20-minute module. Offerors may calculate their per-minute costs internally, but the price submitted on Form G must reflect a 20-minute module equivalency across all tiers. This ensures comparability between offerors..

Question 5: The table includes specific position titles (Instructional Design, Subject Matter Expert, Multimedia Specialist, Content Editor, Project Management, and Voiceover). Our team structure includes different roles and titles that do not align exactly with those listed. Could you clarify how you would like us to represent our positions in the pricing table?

Answer: The vendor may provide their own specific position titles if they deviate from the positions listed. Labor rates provided are for evaluation of cost reasonableness only. They will not form the basis for invoicing or payment under the resulting contract.

Question 6: The table lists “Voiceover – Per Hour” as a position description. Could you clarify whether “Per Hour” refers to (a) the hourly labor rate for voiceover talent (time spent preparing, recording, editing, etc.), or (b) the rate for one finished hour of narration (which typically requires several hours of labor to produce)?

Answer: ‘Per hour’ refers to labor rate for each listed position description, including voiceover. If the vendor’s position titles differ from the ones listed in this table, they may provide their own titles. Labor rates provided are for evaluation of cost reasonableness only. They will not form the basis for invoicing or payment under the resulting contract.

Question 7: Please clarify the format for proposal submissions. In regards to proposal format, would it be acceptable for the proposal to be formatted into a single PDF, including all submittal sections, with pricing at the end of the document. Due to the length of each submittal section (5 pages), it is easier to format this onto standard word doc as opposed to filling in the boxes provided in the RFP. Is this format acceptable as well?

Answer: Per Sec 1.07 of the RFP, if submitting via email, the technical proposal and cost proposal must be saved as two separate PDF attachments and emailed to MvaDasProcurement@alaska.gov. Offerors may reformat submittal forms, provided all requested information is included. Submittal Form G must be submitted without alteration except for required cost data.

Per Amendment 3, Question 17, you are allowed to submit your own format for submittal forms with the exception of Submittal Form G which is addressed in Amendment 5 Change 2.

Question 8: As the Financial proposal template now asks for pricing for years 2-5, should offerors propose their own escalation rate or use the current Consumer Price Index (CPI-U) for All Urban Consumers, All Items, Urban Alaska which stood at 1.6 percent for the year between June 2024 and June 2025?

Answer: The vendors must propose their own escalation rate for years 2-5. Escalation for Years 2–5 may not exceed 3% annually. Offerors may propose any rate up to this ceiling, but all proposals will be evaluated at the ceiling rate for cost comparability.

Question 9: Should we distribute the costs of Tasks 1-3 (pp 20-21) in the original RFP across the Tiered module in submittal Form G? For example, by including a portion of the price of the initial kickoff meeting/needs assessment, instructional design document, and proof of concept in the per-module cost for Tier 1, and per-minute cost of Tier 2?

Answer: The costs listed on Submittal Form G should be a comprehensive cost projection (per module) including all project-related costs. Once the vendor is awarded the contract, DMVA will request modules based on the prices listed on form G. DMVA will request modules across the three tiers via delivery order (DO) depending on project needs throughout the lifespan of the contract. To ensure that listed pricing encompasses all costs incurred by the vendor, these prices should include all costs throughout the project phases and various components of the project.

Question 10: Should the "Total" line in Submittal Form G represent simply adding up the quantity and units of measure for Tier 1, 2, and 3 modules listed above?

For example, if we determine a per module price is \$50 for Tier 1, a Tier 2 per-minute price is \$1, and a Tier 3 module is \$75, should our total price entered into the spreadsheet be \$126? See an illustrative example below. Or, should we estimate the actual cost of Year 1 deliverables (assuming 6 modules, 20-minutes each, two at Tier 1, three at Tier 2, and one at Tier 3?)

Answer: The "Total" line in Submittal Form G should be the total of the proposed cost for a single, 20-minute module in Tier 1, and 3 and per-minute pricing for Tier 2 (the vendor may choose to list tier 2 pricing for a 20-minute module to keep it consistent across all three tiers, but should indicate this to ensure comparability during proposal evaluation).

Question 11: Can we assume the Tier 3 per module price includes our recommended and estimated quantities of content such as simulations, videos, and animations?

Answer: No, tier 3 will not include the added features listed in the add-on menu. The reason for this is that tier 3 is intended to be highly customizable. Each vendor may offer different additional services for these added features, therefore tier 3 should merely be a “base” rate per 20-minute module, with the option for custom, elective, features, and elements which are listed on the à la carte table. In comparison, tier 2 offers a comprehensive price for modules with standard, intermediate interactive features such as simulations and animations.

Question 12: May additional rows be added that include additional project labor categories and rates?

Answer: Yes, the rows can be adjusted, and rows can be added. Labor rates provided are for evaluation of cost reasonableness only. They will not form the basis for invoicing or payment under the resulting contract.

Question 13: Are you still wanting to see a breakdown of a per person percentage on the project based on the tier level?

Answer: No, a per person percentage is not needed per tier level. Labor rates provided are for evaluation of cost reasonableness only. They will not form the basis for invoicing or payment under the resulting contract

Question 14: Can you define the bounds of custom video. Is that original captured video for us to be onsite/travel, write storyboards, capture video, edit, etc.). Or is custom video using video captured by AK’s team and doing editing and voiceover.

Answer: Custom video on Form G refers to original captured video developed by the contractor (or subcontractor). Any work associated with video captured by AK’s team that falls within the vendor’s proposed scope of work should be outlined in the methodology and need to be factored into the fixed pricing.

Question 15: Can you define the level of interactive graphics for the per interactive graphic costing.

Answer: The level of interactive features depends on the level defined for tier 1, 2, and 3 as described in previous amendments. Basic interactive graphics we would seek to include across all tiers would include simulations such flip cards, image hotspots with tooltips, and

basic labeled diagrams. Tier 2 is identified as intermediate level interactive content, so this is likely most relevant for Tier 2.

Examples for a basic graphic would be:

- Hotspot image: A labeled diagram of a spill response kit where users hover over icons to see tool names and descriptions.
- Flip cards: Flashcard-style interactions or a list where clicking each item reveals a short explanation for definitions, quantity limits and timelines for different hazardous waste generator statuses.

For tier 3 and advanced interactive graphics listed in the “a la carte add-ons table”, we aim at customized graphics with multiple states or user driven navigation, such as drag and drop matching exercises, animated process flows, or interactive timelines or dashboards.

Examples for Tier 3/advanced interactive graphics would include the following:

- Drag and drop: Match types of waste to their correct label and disposal containers.
- Simulation: A branching decision-making activity where users choose how to respond to an oil or chemical spill, with feedback based on their choices.
- Interactive dashboard: A clickable map of a facility where users explore different zones to learn about environmental risks and controls.

Vendors are expected to provide a thorough methodology and describe their understanding of the project in their proposal. We are specifically looking for highly creative ideas and approaches vendors can come up with for this project. Vendors should clearly illustrate possible components for each tier and describe their expertise and capabilities to provide different interactive features and elements. Vendors must also indicate which of the items on the “a la carte add on” menu can be provided and, if applicable, propose examples how these items would be implemented.

END OF AMENDMENT 7