



Alaska Legal Services Corporation

RFP Questions and Answers - Intake Assessment and Improvement Project

Alaska Legal Services Corporation has consolidated questions received from respondents submitted by the 10/19/26 deadline. These responses are intended to clarify the RFP and should be considered alongside the original solicitation.

Q1. Are there particular intake pathways, operational issues, or service outcomes ALSC considers highest priority? Within the available budget, does ALSC prefer broad coverage of all pathways or deeper analysis of selected areas?

A1. ALSC has not established priority intake pathways or a preferred balance between broad coverage and deeper analysis. Respondents should propose an approach appropriate to the statewide Scope of Work, project objectives, and available budget.

Q2. Our reading is that the engagement covers assessment, recommendations, high-level requirements and an implementation roadmap. Please confirm whether system configuration, integration development, data migration or implementation of recommendations is outside this contract's scope.

A2. Direct implementation activities are outside the scope of this RFP. This project has a two-phase structure:

- Phase 1: Assessment and Roadmap (this RFP).
- Phase 2: Implementation and Improvement.

Phase 2 funding is contingent on LSC approval of an acceptable implementation plan developed through Phase 1. Regardless of Phase 2 funding availability, ALSC may consider continuing to work with the selected consultant on implementation activities or issuing a separate RFP, including where required by the funder.

Q3. The RFP emphasizes rural and remote communities — what are the primary barriers those communities face in reaching ALSC today (connectivity, language, awareness, staffing coverage), and are there priority regions for the assessment?

A3. Alaska's geography and infrastructure present challenges related to broadband and telephone connectivity, transportation, and access to services. ALSC is seeking a

statewide assessment that considers differences in access and service delivery across communities, including [rural and remote](#) areas.

Q4. What will the findings, recommendations, and phased roadmap be used to decide — for example, technology procurement, staffing changes, or process redesign? Should the roadmap be constrained to improvements ALSC can implement with current resources, or may it recommend multi-year investments?

A4. The findings, recommendations and phased roadmap will inform ALSC's future planning and decision making. Successful completion will include a comprehensive assessment of current intake operations, practical recommendations, and an actionable phased roadmap that identifies priorities, resource considerations, and future implementation steps consistent with the deliverables outlined in the RFP.

Q5. If the full scope cannot be completed within the budget, is ALSC open to a phased scope, or to a base proposal with separately priced optional items?

A5. This is a grant-funded project, which is reflected in the available budget. Respondents may propose additional or alternative approaches, including separately priced options, which will be considered based on organizational feasibility and the project's grant requirements.

Q6. Approximately how many staff, volunteers, Community Justice Workers, and community partners does ALSC anticipate participating? May respondents propose a representative sampling approach across locations, roles, and intake pathways?

A6. ALSC has not established an expected number or range of participants. Respondents may propose a representative sampling approach that captures relevant differences across locations, roles, and intake pathways.

Q7. Does ALSC expect direct engagement with current or former applicants, or may the consultant evaluate applicant experience through staff interviews, available feedback, intake data, and observation? If direct engagement is proposed, what support can ALSC provide with participant recruitment, scheduling, and accommodations?

A7. ALSC has not established a required methodology for evaluating applicant experience, and direct applicant interviews or surveys are not required. Respondents should propose an appropriate approach and identify any anticipated support needed from ALSC, including recruitment, scheduling, or accommodations.

Q8. What existing materials and data will be available at the start of the project? Will ALSC provide previous assessments, current intake procedures, process documentation, and

available historical and de-identified intake data? Will ALSC designate a coordinator to arrange participants, support necessary data exports, and consolidate feedback?

A8. ALSC anticipates providing relevant existing documentation, which may include assessments, current intake procedures and process maps, and de-identified data. ALSC does not currently have standardized telephone reporting for metrics (such as wait times or abandoned call rate). Specific data needs and any necessary staff support will be coordinated with the selected consultant.

Q9. Roughly how many applications does ALSC receive annually, and how many staff, volunteers, and Community Justice Workers participate in intake?

A9. In the last 12 months, ALSC received 5,951 applications. Of those, 44% were handled by ALSC's Statewide Intake Coordinator (1 FTE), and the remainder were handled by 38 staff members across offices and programs.

Q10. What systems and LegalServer features currently support intake, including the statewide intake telephone system? What reporting is available on call volume, wait times, and abandoned calls? Will consultants have access to system demonstrations, a training or test environment, or read-only LegalServer access, subject to applicable privacy and security requirements?

A10. ALSC uses an on-premises Avaya VoIP platform for its statewide intake line. Other office locations use a combination of Avaya VoIP, PBX landlines, Google Voice, and cell phones for telephone services. ALSC does not currently have a call-logging or call-center reporting system that provides standardized queue metrics such as wait times and abandoned calls.

ALSC uses LegalServer as its case management system, including [LegalServer's Online Intake](#) for online applications, but does not currently use the additional options.

The selected consultant will have access to relevant process documentation and opportunities to review existing workflows with ALSC staff. ALSC has a demo site where fictional information can be entered, and may also be able to provide limited contractor access. Specific data access and security requirements will be reviewed with the selected consultant before any access is provided.

Q11. Does ALSC anticipate retaining LegalServer as its core case-management platform, with recommendations focused on configuration, integrations, and complementary tools, or should the assessment also consider replacement options?

A11. ALSC currently uses LegalServer as its case management system and LegalServer online intake for online applications. ALSC has not predetermined specific technology recommendations or replacement decisions.

Q12. Does ALSC anticipate hands-on technical testing or detailed system configuration and security assessments, or would an operational and functional evaluation supported by available documentation, stakeholder input, and system demonstrations meet the intended scope? For recommended technology investments, would planning-level cost estimates be sufficient, or would formal vendor quotations and direct vendor engagement be expected?

A12. ALSC is seeking an assessment of its existing technology environment and practical, vendor-neutral recommendations to inform future improvements. Detailed system configuration, implementation, and formal security testing are not required. Recommendations should be sufficiently detailed to identify technology needs, integration opportunities, implementation priorities, estimated costs, resource requirements, and dependencies. Planning-level cost estimates are acceptable; formal vendor quotations are not required. Security considerations should be addressed as part of the assessment.

Q13. Is there an anticipated level of detail or number of individual process maps expected in the final report? Is there an expected cadence for project meetings, interim reviews, and feedback or revision cycles during the engagement?

A13. ALSC has not established a required number of process maps or a specific meeting and review cadence. Respondents should propose an approach appropriate to the Scope of Work and deliverables, including how they will document variations in statewide intake processes and coordinate review and feedback with ALSC staff.

Q14. Who will approve the deliverables, and can coverage, acceptance criteria and consolidated review rounds be agreed in the project plan?

A14. ALSC's Administrative Director and Technology Director will serve as project leads and approve deliverables. Specific deliverable review processes, acceptance criteria and timelines may be established during project planning.

Q15. Would ALSC accept a fully remote assessment using staff-guided live process observation, system walkthroughs and virtual stakeholder sessions? If an onsite visit is proposed, does ALSC have preferred locations or a preferred duration?

A15. An onsite visit is preferred but not required. ALSC will consider proposals for fully remote assessments, provided the proposed approach adequately addresses the Scope of Work and deliverables.

ALSC has not established a required location, duration, or timing for an onsite visit, although ALSC anticipates a visit would include the Anchorage headquarters. ALSC will coordinate with the selected consultant to book travel directly or reimburse reasonable travel expenses, subject to prior approval.

Q16. If multiple team members travel, may approved arrangements cover more than one consultant?

A16. Proposed travel arrangements, including the number of travelers, will be reviewed with the selected consultant and are subject to prior approval by ALSC's CFO.

Q17. Would two references for relevant workflow automation or business process improvement projects outside legal-aid organizations satisfy the reference requirement?

A17. Yes, references are not required to be from legal aid organizations. Respondents should provide two references familiar with relevant work demonstrating the respondent's qualifications and ability to complete the project.

Q18. May a newly formed firm demonstrate relevant experience through its proposed principals' prior employment and provide professional references who directly supervised or worked with them on those engagements?

A18. Yes.

Q19. Would ALSC accept two individually contactable professionals from the same client organization, where each supervised a different operational software/workflow project, or must the references represent two distinct organizations?

A19. Yes, ALSC will accept two references from the same organization, provided that they are separate individuals familiar with the respondent's relevant work.

Q20. Would ALSC accept detailed work samples, a project-specific assessment sample using fictional data, and a technical interview in place of two references?

A20. Respondents are encouraged to submit relevant work samples or other supporting documentation. These materials may supplement, but do not replace, the two required references.

Q21. Would ALSC consider a joint consultant team where one party leads operational/technical intake assessment and another provides Alaska legal-aid or access-to-justice expertise? If so, may the required two project references be supplied across that team?

A21. Yes, ALSC would consider a joint proposal. The two required references may be provided across the proposed team, provided they are familiar with relevant work and demonstrate the team's qualifications and ability to complete the project. Respondents should clearly identify each team member's role and responsibilities.

Q22. May an international company and its team participate directly? Can foreign tax documentation meet the Federal Tax Identification Number requirement, and would any U.S. registration or U.S. bank account be required? What foreign-vendor documentation and payment methods would apply?

A22. Yes, consultants and firms based outside the U.S. may submit proposals. Respondents may provide their country of registration, applicable foreign tax identification number, and legal status. Executing a contract with the selected consultant would be subject to applicable tax documentation requirements, including the appropriate IRS form, and confirmation that mutually acceptable payment arrangements can be established.

Q23. May the required Federal Tax Identification Number be provided separately through a secure channel as part of the submission, rather than included in the main proposal?

A23. Yes.

Q24. Which privacy and records retention standards and laws govern the intake process?

A24. ALSC follows applicable Legal Services Corporation requirements, the Alaska Rules of Professional Conduct, and state and federal laws governing confidentiality, privacy, and records retention. Relevant internal policies and specific data security requirements will be reviewed with the selected consultant during project planning.

Q25. Are there in-house accessibility standards or should we focus on current WCAG or 508? Please let us know if this question is out of scope for this project.

A25. Accessibility is within the scope of work. ALSC has not established specific internal accessibility standards. Respondents should propose an appropriate approach to evaluating accessibility and identifying improvements, including consideration of relevant accessibility standards and the needs of applicants across Alaska.

Q26. Could ALSC share the confidentiality and data-security requirements that would apply to the assessment, including restrictions on recording, transcription, storage, international access, third-party research tools, and AI? Where direct system access is restricted, would ALSC-led demonstrations and redacted or de-identified materials provide an acceptable basis for the assessment?

A26. Specific confidentiality and data-security requirements will be addressed during contract development and will be subject to applicable state and federal laws and regulations. Respondents should describe their proposed data-handling practices, disclose any anticipated use of AI tools, and identify any requirements or assumptions relevant to their proposed approach.

Q27. Are there any known mandatory contractual or LSC grant requirements that would affect eligibility or costing, such as insurance, guarantees, liability, ownership of deliverables, record retention, or audit access? May a proposal identify contractual assumptions or requested exceptions for later negotiation while meeting the 60-day firm-offer requirement?

A27. This project will be subject to the LSC Special Grants Terms and Conditions, available [here](#). Any required grant-related provisions will be addressed during contract development with the selected consultant. Respondents may identify any proposed contractual assumptions or exceptions in their submissions for consideration.

Q28. For cash-flow planning, what invoice-to-payment period should bidders anticipate? Are there any known grant restrictions on advances, milestone payments or retainage, or any requirement that ALSC receive grant reimbursement before paying the consultant?

A28. Respondents may propose payment schedules and invoice terms for consideration. Final arrangements will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

Q29. Are there any anticipated third-party service or technology costs that should be included within the proposed project budget?

A29. No. Respondents should identify any anticipated third-party services, technology costs, or other resources needed to complete their proposed approach and include associated costs in their budget.

Q30. Are the five evaluation criteria weighted equally, or does any carry more weight? Which qualifications are most important to the selection panel, and is there a minimum number or type of comparable projects required?

A30. There are no numerical weights assigned to the evaluation criteria. Proposals will be evaluated against the criteria identified in Section 8. ALSC has not established a minimum number or type of comparable projects beyond the qualifications and reference requirements identified in the RFP.

Q31. Is a single PDF attached to the submission email acceptable?

A31. Yes