

**RFP 2026-1600-0117 - Offeror Questions and Answers from the State**

Number	RFP Section	Question	Answer
1	3.04 CONTRACT TERM AND WORK SCHEDULE	Two-year contract total. The initial contract term in Section 3.04 is two years (7/14/2026 through 7/13/2028), with optional renewals. For the initial two-year term, should offerors view the available budget as a strict \$500,000 per year, or as a combined \$1,000,000 across the two years that may be allocated unevenly between Year 1 and Year 2 based on deliverable priorities?	Ultimately, only the total cost amount proposed in the SUBMITTAL FORM I -COST PROPOSAL will be used to determine the points for evaluation (Proposed Total Evaluated Project Cost at the bottom of the form). How a offeror determines that number is part of the process. Note that only the Procurement Officer will see those amounts until the technical proposals have been scored and tallied by the PEC.
2	1.02 BUDGET 3.02 SCOPE OF WORK	For Year 1 priority deliverables reference an annual planning meeting/conference where the contractor and CDPHP will co-develop the work plan, deliverables, and budget for each contract year. To support a realistic Year 1 cost proposal, are there any deliverables in Section 3.03 (Parts A through E) that CDPHP has already identified as priorities for Year 1? Conversely, are there deliverables that CDPHP anticipates will not be active in Year 1 and are intended for later contract years?	The priority deliverables and funding are yet to be determined. The offeror is expected to propose so the PEC has understanding of the proposer's capacity and ability in all the deliverables presented, as each will be of importance when the funding supports it. The selected offeror <i>may</i> have influence on the priorities of the first two years of the contract.
3	SUBMITTAL FORM I COST PROPOSAL	Submittal Form I requires offerors to provide costs as if all deliverables are expected each contract year. We are concerned about the apparent conflicting requirement to show coverage of all tasks each year, but within a \$500,000 budget that will be decided as time moves forward. Given that the actual annual scope will be co-developed and is not expected to fund the full Scope of Work in any single year (per Section 3.02), would CDPHP find a modular cost proposal helpful — one that prices each deliverable individually so that annual work plans can be assembled from the menu within the available funding? If so, are there any formatting preferences for how that breakdown should be presented within Submittal Form I? How would you like us to show that we can complete the totality of the scope but also stay within the annual budget constraints?	<p>The <b>Important Note</b> in SEC 1.02 BUDGET is meant to frame the intent and reasonably complete needs of the state. Pricing out each deliverable for each year will provide data to assist in the discussion at the planning conferences. The state expects the selected offeror will eventually contract for one, or perhaps two of the deliverables for each contract year. Each offeror can determine what the work will be "worth" to them each year as they price the deliverables. A contact year's funding <i>may</i> be as much as \$150,000 for the first year and as little as \$15,000 for subsequent years. As funding dedicated to this contract will be allocated by the legislature each fiscal year, the determination of what will be done will be a joint decision of the Contractor and the Project Manager as a part of the planning meeting discussed in SEC 3.02 SCOPE OF WORK. Note that this same passage states "<i>The budget will not support the entire Scope-of-Work each budget year</i>". As a final note, the second paragraph in SEC 1.02 BUDGET states "<i>While proposals in excess of this budget will not be considered non-responsive, offerors are expected to be competitive and take the budget into consideration when developing their cost proposals</i>". This phrase is meant to inform the offerors that the state acknowledges that there may be reasons why the proposal cannot stay within the proposed budget and variations will not put the offeror at risk for non-compliance.</p> <p>Please refer back to the answer provided to Question 1 "<i>Note that only the Procurement Officer will see those amounts until the technical proposals have been scored and tallied by the PEC</i>" and "<i>Ultimately, only the total cost amount proposed in the SUBMITTAL FORM I -COST PROPOSAL will be used to determine the points for evaluation</i>".</p> <p>Note here that the state hopes to contract with the most qualified offeror, and price is secondary to the most competent technical offeror. To provide the PEC with more strength in selecting the most competent proposer, Alaska's Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) has waived the statutory requirement that 40% of cost be used for scoring to 20% percent cost.</p>
4	3.03.3 DELIVERABLES	Deliverables involving sub-awards or pass-through funding. Deliverable B8 references allocation and distribution of at least \$20,000 to selected coalition agencies, and several deliverables (B3, B5, B6) reference travel sponsorships for coalition members. Should these pass-through and travel-support amounts be included within the contractor's annual cost proposal, or are they funded through a separate mechanism? If they are to be included in the contractor's budget proposal, it would help to know how many people will be attending and approximate costs of funding travel to meetings. Another question is whether other meeting costs (e.g., food, printing, venue fees, hotel fees) need to be included in our budget.	Any items, including "pass-through" items expected to be reimbursed by the state should appear in the cost proposal.