

Request for Information

RFI 02-103-27



State of Alaska
Department of Administration
Division of Motor Vehicles

Date Issued: September 4, 2026

MODERNIZATION OF DRIVER RECORDS AND CREDENTIALING SYSTEMS

Introduction:

The State of Alaska, Department of Administration (DOA), Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is seeking information from qualified vendors regarding services to support the modernization of the division's driver records and credentialing systems. This request includes two distinct scopes of work:

- 1) State-to-State (S2S) Driver History Record (DHR) Implementation; and
- 2) Representational State Transfer (REST) Upgrade for the SPEXS Application.

Interested parties may respond to one or both scopes of work (SOW); however, each SOW must be addressed independently, with a separate and complete response provided for each scope.

This request for information (RFI) does not guarantee future work. The information gathered will aid DMV in conducting market research to ascertain the availability and applicability of resources in the marketplace.

Background Information:

Alaska currently operates legacy UNI based and batch style interfaces for multiple American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) programs.

The S2S DHR scope of work is not an extension of the REST upgrade. It is a business process transformation that leverages the existing S2S messaging infrastructure to enhance the administration of driver history records.

The implementation of DHR centers on the electronic exchange and management of convictions and withdrawals, which ensures that each driver maintains a single, comprehensive history record. To achieve this, operational changes would be required, including the creation and management of Driver History Type (DH-Type) pointers, strict adherence to retention requirements, and the resolution of potential duplicates.

DHR is governed by specific regulatory and procedural requirements that are distinct from those associated with REST; these include the mandatory recording of Table 11 AAMVA Code Dictionary (ACD) codes and the handling of no-credential pointers, both of which are essential for compliance and accurate driver history administration.

AAMVA has transitioned to RESTful Web Services for all message types, and Alaska is accessing the potential needs to upgrade systems accordingly.

Alaska DMV exchanges data with numerous AAMVA programs to support identity verification, driver licensing, vehicle titling, and compliance functions. These include:

- SPEXS (State Pointer Exchange Services)
- DHR (Driver History Record) – SPEXS upgrade
- NMVTIS (National Motor Vehicle Title Information System)
- PDPS (Problem Driver Pointer System)
- SSOLV (Social Security Online Verification)
- HAVV (Help America Vote Verification)
- USPVS (U.S. Passport Verification Service)
- CDLIS (Commercial Driver's License Information System)

Alaska's current environment relies on legacy Windows UNI messaging and AMIE formats. To maintain compliance with AAMVA requirements and support long-term operational stability, Alaska is considering migration of its interfaces to RESTful Web Services.

Alaska DMV's current system of record, the Alaska License and Vehicle Information Network (ALVIN), is an internal .NET web application with a Microsoft SQL Server backend. ALVIN integrates with internal and external systems through numerous service interfaces and APIs.

Currently, AAMVA messages are routed from ALVIN to an internally developed AAMVA interface service. This service transforms ALVIN messages into AMIE/UNI format and routes them through the UNI server for transmission to AAMVA. Incoming AAMVA messages received through UNI are similarly processed and forwarded to ALVIN for the appropriate business action.

The State is seeking information regarding the potential migration to AAMVA's REST interface, which may primarily involve modifying or replacing the existing AAMVA interface service to translate ALVIN transactions into the required REST-based format, transmit requests to AAMVA, and receive and process both solicited and unsolicited REST messages from AAMVA. Vendors should consider this architecture in their responses and identify any additional components or modifications they believe are necessary to support a successful migration.

The architectural description above reflects the State's current understanding of the migration effort. Respondents are encouraged to identify any additional architectural changes, risks, or dependencies that should be considered.

Respondents may provide information on approaches they have used in similar projects, including the replacement of system components or the use of middleware, where applicable. ALVIN is expected to remain the system of records.

AAMVA's documentation for moving from UNI to REST is provided on their website at: <https://www.aamva.org/unitorest/>

Response Information:

Please provide detailed responses. Respondents may provide relevant documentation, brochures, or specification sheets as attachments to their response. Clearly indicate which SOW your response addresses.

If you are responding to both SOWs included in this request, submit two separate emails, each clearly identified with the corresponding SOW and including all relevant attachments.

Response must include the following information:

- 1) Organization name, contact name, mailing address, phone number, and email of designated point of contact;
- 2) Description of potential technical approaches and existing capabilities related to the services identified above;
- 3) Company overview and relevant experience;
- 4) Examples of similar state DMV or AAMVA integration projects;
- 5) Description of experience with RESTful migration from UNI to AMIE environments; and
- 6) Responses provided in both Word and PDF formats.

Respondents should describe their capabilities related to:

- Executing DHR readiness and testing.
- Operationalizing data visibility policies for driver history (DH) (visible in-state, visible to other states, visible to all states) and aligning business rules accordingly.
- Using updated SPEXS/AAMVA reporting for DHR (Out-of-State Transaction Report; Disqualifying Convictions Received/Rejected; Pointer Suspense/Suspense Resolved; Duplicate Resolution Summary; Quarterly Potential Duplicate Report).
- Migration from UNI-based messaging to RESTful Web Services.
- Replacement of AMIE message formats with AAMVA-compliant RESTful specifications.
- Integration with existing DMV applications, databases, and workflows.
- Logging, monitoring, diagnostics, auditing, and error-handling improvements.
- Security, encryption, and certificate-based authentication.
- High availability, redundancy, and failover strategies.
- Scalability to accommodate future AAMVA program changes.

Respondents should outline their experience with:

- SPEXS implementation
- NMVTIS RESTful integration
- PDPS RESTful integration
- SSOLV RESTful integration
- HAVV RESTful integration
- USPVS RESTful integration
- CDLIS modernization to RESTful Web Services

Respondents should provide:

- Information on relevant architecture or technology stacks used in similar projects
- General approach or considerations for UNI-to-RESTful migrations
- Experience with AAMVA testing and certification
- Typical timelines observed in similar projects
- General risks or challenges seen in similar projects
- Benchmark cost for similar projects
- Describe your licensing or subscription model
- Information on available maintenance and support services

This RFI does not extend any rights to prospective vendors or obligate the State to conduct a solicitation or purchase of any goods or services. DOA will not award a contract from this RFI, nor will DOA be

financially responsible for the preparation, or administration costs incurred to respond to this RFI. All costs associated with responding will be solely at the interested party's expense.

Procurement Officer contact information:

Interested parties must submit a written response by **September 18, 2026, at 2:00:00 PM AK Time**. Responses must be emailed to doa.oppm.procurement@alaska.gov.

All questions must be directed to the person listed below and in writing via email.

Department of Administration

Attention: Lisa Trombi, Department Procurement Manager

Email: doa.oppm.procurement@alaska.gov

Notice to Vendors:

Pursuant to [Administrative Order 352](#), (a) any person or business determined to support or participate in a boycott of the State of Israel will be disqualified from any procurement related to this Request for Information; and (b) the support of or participation in a boycott of the State of Israel by a person or business contracting with the State of Alaska under AS 36.30 constitutes grounds for termination of the contract.

[Administrative Order 352](#) does not apply to a contract if the person or business has fewer than 10 employees; or the amount to be paid under the contract, excluding renewals and options available under the contract, is less than \$100,000.

Disclosure of Submission Contents:

This section governs the ownership, return, and disclosure of any response or other record a Respondent submits in response to this request for information. (Herein, any reference to "Record" includes all such records and the submission response; any reference to "Law" includes any federal or State of Alaska (State) law, including any court or administrative order or rule.)

1. All Records belong to the State.
2. The State has sole discretion regarding whether to return any Record. In exercising this discretion, the State will comply with all Laws.
3. Unless a notice of intent to award is issued pursuant to a subsequent and related solicitation, the State will, to the extent permitted by Law, consider all Records confidential and not subject to the Alaska Public Records Act (APRA).
4. If and when a notice of intent to award is issued, the State will consider nonconfidential any Record unless, at the time of submission, the Respondent undertook the following protective measures:
 - a. marked information confidential;
 - b. for any information marked confidential, identified the authority that makes that specific information confidential; and
 - c. committed, in writing, to explain in detail, including with affidavits and briefs, why each authority applies in any court or administrative proceeding in which any nondisclosure is challenged.
5. If the Respondent did not undertake each protective measure, the State will not consider any information in a Record confidential: the State will disclose the entire Record without any redaction in response to an APRA or other request or, if it chooses, in the absence of a request and the State will disclose the entire Record without notifying the Respondent.
6. If the Respondent undertook each protective measure, the State will withhold the information marked confidential to the following extent:

- a. The State agrees that the Law protects the information; and
- a. If the nondisclosure is challenged, the Respondent fulfills its commitment to explain, including with affidavits and briefs, how each authority applies to the information marked confidential.

The State will only notify a Respondent of a request for the Record and of a planned release if the Respondent undertook each protective measure, but the State disagrees that the marked information is protected. If there is such a disagreement, then before releasing the Record, the State will, to the extent permitted by Law and practicable, notify the Respondent that it will disclose the information unless the Respondent convinces the State not to or obtains an order prohibiting disclosure.