

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 Important Note 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 contract 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-though" items expected to be reimbursed by the state should appear in the cost proposal.
5	4.01 RFP SUBMITTAL FORMS	Page Orientation: For Submittal Forms with a five-page limit (e.g., Forms B and F), is it acceptable for one page to be formatted in landscape orientation, provided all other formatting requirements are met?	Orientation of the forms to "landscape" mode is acceptable to the procurement process and will be deemed "responsive" by the procurement officer.
6	SEC. 4.02 SPECIAL FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS	Margin Requirements: In addition to the minimum 12-point font size requirement, are there any specific margin settings (e.g., 1-inch margins) that must be followed?	The relative "framing" or borders of the submittal forms are intended to be the margins for the responses. Altering these borders may lead to a proposal to be deemed non-responsive. Thus in the case of submitting in "landscape mode", the borders should be the same size relative to the orientation.
7	SECTIONS EVALUATION CRITERIA AND CONTRACTOR SELECTION	Evaluation of Risks/Problems: Submittal Form D instructs offerors to "identify pertinent issues and potential problems related to this project," and the evaluation criteria for Section 5.06 include: "How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project?" Submittal Form F similarly instructs offerors to "identify any potential issues, risks, or problems they foresee with this project and how they will address them." However, the evaluation criteria for Section 5.08 do not appear to explicitly include scoring for identification of risks or problems. Can you confirm whether the discussion of risks/problems in Submittal Form F is evaluated as part of the scoring, or if it is included for completeness but not separately scored?	The Submittal Forms and the directions and questions for completing them are designed to give the PEC enough information to provide a score for the particular section. Each Section is scored in its totality. Individual evaluation questions are not scored but rather provide the PEC member a way determine if a proposal section provided a robust answer that shows viability to the ability to accomplish the tasks at hand. So a score will come from the completeness within the section, and not individual answers to them. In this particular case, the PEC is not asked to specifically consider if the discussion of risks/problems is included in the Offeror's answer, thus it is not likely to draw concern during the scoring process. Keep in mind that the PEC members will review all of the questions and answers in an RFP amendment and will see how the procurement officer answered your question.
8	GENERAL	May we review the other proposals submitted during the previous RFI process. Please let us know if these records are available for review.	Procurement rules and guidance from the Department of Law and the Alaska State Office of Procurement and Property Management (OPPM) designate the RFI responses as confidential until after a NOIA is issued for this procurement. I cannot provide them until after this procurement is over. I can disclose that I received eight (8) responses to the RFI.
9	SECTIONS EVALUATION CRITERIA AND CONTRACTOR SELECTION	Will you conduct in-person oral evaluation of any finalists?	There will be no interviews as part of the selection process for this RFP

10	3.03 DELIVERABLES	Will the CDPHP provide graphics support for communications material development, or will the vendor need to plan for supplying graphic design capabilities?	"Official" Logos for DOH/CDPHP programs (if they exist) will be made available to the selected contractor. The contractor should be prepared to support graphics production for the deliverables.
11	3.03 DELIVERABLES PART B: Meeting/Training Logistics and Facilitation	Will the vendor be required to conduct activities as a fiscal agent for CDPHP?	The vendor is expected to do all the work as indicated in the deliverables.
12	3.03 DELIVERABLES PART B: Meeting/Training Logistics and Facilitation	Will these duties include fiduciary responsibilities, and will it require the vendor to process payments without approval or oversight of the client? If yes, which transactions will the vendor be responsible for?	The vendor will perform all of the items as it relates to the deliverable. The state will not perform these tasks, and the state will audit to be sure its terms and conditions for travel are adhered to
13	3.03 DELIVERABLES PART B: Meeting/Training Logistics and Facilitation	Does CDPHP prohibit the use of a financial management services subcontractor to conduct the work?	The state permits subcontractors, including financial services. Any subcontractor must be US Based, and the work must be performed in the United States.
14	3.03 DELIVERABLES PART B: Meeting/Training Logistics and Facilitation	In multiple sections, we're expected to purchase and organize travel for coalition members. Additionally on page 15 it states, "Allocate and distribute at least \$20,000 to selected coalition agencies providing professional development and annual workplan activity implementation in the field of faith-based health and wellness promotion and program development, as budget allows." Although we see a similar question has been asked and answered, we request an additional clarification please. We understand that these types of funds should be included in the cost proposal; however, will the state reimbursement come from the \$500K annual budget we've proposed or will the state be providing additional funds for the "pass through" items? For example, if our annual budget is for \$500K, for every time there is a listed \$20k "pass through" or to pay for 10 coalition members, or purchasing and organizing travel for coalition members etc., do we need to add that above our budgeted \$500k for those items? Or would these funds come out of a different state budget source?"	I reiterate that "any items, including "pass-through" items expected to be reimbursed by the state should appear in the cost proposal." The state wants to evaluate how much a proposer believes the contract could cost. As a reminder, The budget will not support the entire Scope-of-Work each budget year, and SEC 1.02 BUDGET states "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 proposal". Note that "only the Procurement Officer will see those amounts until the technical proposals have been scored and tallied by the PEC" and "Ultimately, only the total cost amount proposed in the SUBMITTAL FORM I -COST PROPOSAL will be used to determine the points for evaluation". Amendment 1 to the RFP, posted 1 MAY 26 detailed these items. If the offeror expects to be compensated for an expense, it MUST be included in the cost proposal.
15	3.03 DELIVERABLES PART B: Meeting/Training Logistics and Facilitation	Are there costs/spending guidelines or rules? For example, can we spend money on food for meetings? Is there a separate document on allowable/unallowable costs?	There are various guidelines and rules about what may be spent for some items. There are many documents that state those particular rules. Most specifically there exists specific rules on Travel: <i>State Approved Travel Guidelines:</i> <i>The State will cover costs associated with pre-approved travel per the criteria listed below.</i> <i>Expenses above these criteria must be approved in advance by the Program Manager.</i> · <i>Air Travel: copies of receipts and boarding passes for flights must be submitted with the invoice. The State will reimburse for coach travel only.</i> · <i>Hotel: copies of original hotel receipts at commercial facilities must be submitted with the invoice. Actual lodging expenses that exceed \$300 room rate per night, excluding taxes, must be approved in advance by the Program Manager.</i> · <i>Rental Car: copies of the rental car receipt and agreement must be submitted with the invoice. Rental should be for a mid-size or less car (unless approved in advance) and the rental period is to cover the business travel period only.</i> · <i>Ground Transportation: between the Contractor's home and the airport, and the destination airport and hotel; via airport shuttle, courtesy van, or taxi service.</i> · <i>Per Diem: the maximum amount for food and all other travel related incidentals in Alaska is \$60 per day, per person.</i> <i>Note: Costs of parking violations will not be reimbursed.</i> <i>This passage is found in almost all State Contracts, usually in Appendix D Payment for Services .</i> As for food for meetings, this requires a waiver the State Project Manager can submit. For the purpose of responding to this RFP, you can assume all cost waivers will be granted. We want to understand what you believe is needed for the project, and how much it will cost.
16	3.03 DELIVERABLES PART B: Meeting/Training Logistics and Facilitation	On page 12 of the RFP, it is stated, "Event management duties are not expected to be conducted by the vendor under this contract and will instead be managed by the State's existing Event Management Services contract. However, vendor may be expected to work in partnership with the Event Management Services contractor." Does the Event Management Services (EMS) contractor apply to any other sections? Or is this just for the ABC? Meaning, for other sections that require in-person training, do we expect to work with this EMS contractor? We see that for the Cancer Coalition we'd be expected to book the meeting location -- does this imply that the EMS contractor applies unless otherwise specifically stated like it is for the cancer coalition? Also, for ABC (and perhaps others), does the Event Management Services (EMS) contract include that vendor finding the meeting venue, signing contracts, procuring food etc. -- What will be their role versus ours? Is paying for the venue, associated food, or other venue related expenses paid by EMS? Or will those be our costs to be paid out of our proposed budget?	Most often, the Event Services Contractor is used for meeting with many participants inside and outside the state. Team meetings generally do not require the State's contractor. An event, as is expected to be the size and scope of the ABC meeting, will employ the use of the contract. The link to that contract is here: https://oppm.doa.alaska.gov/media/1358/11-event-management-services.pdf and the contract will be used to for the ABC event. Note that the State will pay for both the contractor's services described and the venue. All other needs for the meeting are the responsibility of the offeror. For the purpose of the cost proposal, you may expect that the Cancer Coalition meeting will employ the state's contractor as well.

17	SEC. 3.02 SCOPE OF WORK	From page 9, "The budget will not support the entire Scope-of-Work each budget year. A planning meeting/conference for each contract year will be held to determine which units, and work will have emphasis and priority during the year. An annual work plan, deliverables, and budget will be co-developed and agreed upon by State of Alaska CDPHP program management team and the contractor during an annual planning meeting/conference, based on CDPHP section's budget and needs and contractor's capacity." As part of this annual planning process, is there flexibility to augment the individual line items that would increase support for prioritized units by reallocating one or more individual budget line items that support other non-prioritized units? For example, to attain a desired outcome the increased budget might cover a necessary increase in activities compared to those assumed in the original budget.	I believe your question has to do with how much financial support will be available for a particular year. This answer is in the RFP, and I have answered other questions that allude to the issues. You have quoted the specific RFP guidance in your question. As a summary, what specific deliverables will be expected and the funds available to pay them will be the focus for the planning meeting. This will be a jointly decided between the contractor and the State's Project Manager. The result is that the contractor will know what to plan for and what funds are available to pay for them. It is the contractor's job to accomplish the tasks. A contract year may have as little as \$15,000 available to accomplish the deliverables. This may mean that the contractor may not be able to accomplish all the elements within a particular element as proposed. When the funds available exceed that of the need of a particular deliverable, it is most likely that additional deliverables will be added, rather than financially augmenting a deliverable further. The expectation is that a proposer indicates how much a deliverable will cost each year, as if all the deliverables were being done each year.
18	3.09 LOCATION OF WORK	Section 3.09 of the RFP states that "The location(s) the work is to be performed, completed and managed is at the contractor's location...Travel will NOT be required for work on this contract. There are some deliverables that require IN PERSON MEETINGS. The state WILL NOT pay for or otherwise compensate the vendor for travel outside of the state of Alaska (to or from Alaska)." Is there an expectation that contractors attend in person meetings or attend any other in person events to complete a deliverable? If so, where should we assume the meetings are located?	For planning, please use Anchorage, Alaska as the designated meeting location
19	SEC. 4.02 SPECIAL FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS	Can the State clarify whether tables and graphics included within proposal responses may use a font size smaller than 12-point, provided the content remains readable?	For Tables and Graphics inserted into the proposal forms, Font sizes small than 12 point are acceptable.
20	SEC. 4.03 OFFEROR INFORMATION AND CERTIFICATIONS (SUBMITTAL FORM A)	Can the State clarify how "critical team members" should be defined for purposes of Form A, particularly for a contract structure where annual priorities, funded deliverables, and staffing needs may vary by contract year?	The State expects that there will be a "core mangement team" which will plan and direct the performance of the various deliverables of the contract. It is this team that should be identified on the submittal form.
21	SEC. 4.04 EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PERSONNEL	RFP Page 25 states "5. Finally, offerors must provide a description of the organization of the project team and the individual(s) responsible and accountable for the completion of each component and deliverable of the RFP." Are you looking to know who on our team brings subject matter expertise for each of the 6 units or are you looking for who has the skill set to be successful with deliverables (strategic planning, facilitating meetings)? Or both?	Ultimately, the State would like both.
22	SEC. 4.03 OFFEROR INFORMATION AND CERTIFICATIONS (SUBMITTAL FORM A)	When filling in the Forms A and the Standard Agreement attachment, sometimes the font is automatically less than size 12. Should we increase to 12 or leave it at the smaller preset font?	Font guidelines are only for the Technical Proposal Submittal Forms (B-F). You may leave they others for what they're preset for NOTE: Standard Agreement attachment, along wih the BAA are provided for information only, as the selected contractor is expected to agree to the terms and conditions (T&C's) on both forms. The State is not expecting those forms to be returned or to be a part of the proposal packet.
23	SEC. 4.10 SUBCONTRACTORS (SUBMITTAL FORM H)	Could a subcontractor who regularly works with specific consultants, utilize those consultants for part or all of a subcontracted deliverable?	Ultimately the awarded contractor is responsible for the work for all of the deliverables. The contract (as the RFP) will allow the contractor to "sub-out" some of the work. As long as the Subcontractor is acceptable to the State, how it handles its assigned work is up to the Contractor.
24	SEC. 3.02 SCOPE OF WORK	Could you clarify which coalitions go with which unit?	1. PAN a. ABC b. Faith Based Health & Wellness (Currently initiated/managed by PAN, but it is a broader initiative and will likely someday be supported section-wide, so all units participate.) 2. Health Systems a. Cancer Coalition b. Diabetes and Take Heart Coalition 3. Injury Prevention a. ASVIPP Coalition b. Shared Risk & Protective Factors CoP c. CoP Falls d. CoP Transportation & Injury e. CoP Suicide Prevention 4. Surveillance Systems includes The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System and Youth Risk Behavior Survey a. Working with: School Administrators, Parents, Youth, Youth Serving Organizations and Tribal Organizations 5. Tobacco Prevention and Control
25	SEC. 3.02 SCOPE OF WORK	Is there a specific youth group?	Other than surveillance systems BRFSS and YRBS, which are managed under separate contracts, no specific youth group has been identified
26	SEC. 3.02 SCOPE OF WORK	For Substance Misuse and Addiction, we are not seeing any specific deliverables or SOW. Is there something missing? Or maybe it's just undecided at this time?	The Office of Substance Misuse and Addiction Prevention (OSMAP) unit did not have any specific project needs related to the this projects scope of work when deloping the RFP . However, that may change in future contract years. We included all six units that are housed within the Section of Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (CDPHP) in the RFP to let offerors know that there is potential work associated with all six units throughout the life of the 10-year contract.
27	3.03 DELIVERABLES	Section 3.03 describes deliverables in detail across about nine pages, while Submittal Form E is capped at five pages. To help offerors calibrate, what level of methodological detail does the state expect: methodology at the Part level (A through E), or methodology at the individual deliverable level?	The offeror may provide this at either the part level or the deliverable level, so either would be acceptable.
28	SUBMITTAL FORM H SUBCONTRACTORS	For subcontractors named in Submittal Form H, should individual subcontractor staff be listed as critical team members in Submittal Form A and described in Submittal Form B, or is firm-level identification sufficient?	Please See question 20 above, which addresses the intent of critical team members in Submittal Form A. If a subcontractor is not going to be used the management and administration of the contract as a whole. Then the subcontractor should not be considered a "Critical Team Member"

29	3.03 DELIVERABLES	For in-person meetings in Alaska, does the offeror need to cover the cost of travel, and not include any of that cost in the budget (assume they are traveling from out of state)?	The State will not pay for offeror travel from out of state.
30	3.03 DELIVERABLES	For the annual planning conference in Part E, what format (virtual, in-person) and duration should offerors assume for cost-proposal purposes, and which contractor staff are expected to attend?	The annual planning conference may be done virtually or in person.
31	3.03 DELIVERABLES	For digital and PDF communications deliverables (C1–C3), can the State confirm whether compliance with WCAG 2.1 A/AA must be validated with specific tools or checklists, and whether it will provide any preferred templates or brand standards the contractor and subcontractors must use?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please review RFP guidance (SEC 3.03 DELIVERABLES, C 2 1) a): <i>"All materials that will be published online must be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) web-accessible communication materials. During the term of this contract, the contractor's work must be compliant with the most current Web Content Accessibility Guidelines required by the State of Alaska Accessibility Policy. In 2026, all of the department's content (pages, documents, videos, etc.) that's available online must meet the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 A/AA requirements. Failure or inability of the contractor to produce online materials that are compliant with these standards may result in the contract being terminated for non-compliance."</i> • The State would like to know what an offeror's accessibility capabilities are and what kind of accessibility workflow they will use to make sure materials pass our accessibility requirements. • Few very basic templates may be provided. They are Microsoft Office. Design files would mostly be done in Adobe or other design software. • All materials will be checked with built-in accessibility checkers (e.g. Adobe Acrobat accessibility checker for pdfs) and with manual checks to make sure tagging structure is complete and accurate. • Offerors may review DOH accessibility statement here: https://health.alaska.gov/en/education/our-commitment-to-accessibility/.
32	3.03 DELIVERABLES	For the 'simple online resource webpage' under C1, will the State host the page on an existing State platform, or should the contractor propose a hosted solution? If State hosted, will State IT handle platform security and maintenance while the contractor/subcontractor manages content? Is the contractor expected to do the actual website coding/direct edits?	This will not be a state hosted webpage. The vendor should propose a platform for this deliverable.
33	3.03 DELIVERABLES	Regarding C3 (ABC website content maintenance and updates), can the State clarify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) which CMS/platform the site currently uses; b) whether the contractor will receive direct editor access; and c) whether there are any constraints on using remote staff to perform content updates? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The State uses Wix.com Website Builder b) The State will provide the contractor direct access to edit c) The only constraint on using remote staff to perform content updates is that the updates MUST be made in the United States.
34	3.03 DELIVERABLES	For D5, does the State anticipate technical assistance to awarded community partners to be primarily document/template development and periodic consults, or does it expect embedded/ongoing implementation support? Approximately how many hours per partner per year should offerors assume for budgeting?	The exact level of technical assistance will vary and depends on (a) the awarded organizations' capacity and understanding of the award and (b) the specific award and its level of compliance complexity. The state anticipates working with the contractor to establish a limited deliverable D5 TA bank of hours reserved for this activity, not to be exceeded annually unless mutually agreed upon by SOA and contractor. For proposal budgeting purposes, assume approximately 10-15 hours of TA support per award. The state anticipates learning more about what specific TA needs and the number of hours of support needed—on average—during year 1 of the contract. Subsequent years may need to be adjusted based on lessons learned in contract year 1.
35			
36			
37			