



NOTICE

ADDENDUM 1

FLORIDA VIRTUAL SCHOOL

12/18/2026

Adam Vierbickas
(407) 986-0275
avierbickas@flvs.net

RFP01-2604731B01-ITPMAT-XXXXXX; Information Technology Projects: Full-Service Software Development Firms is hereby amended by the following change(s):

1.

Section 3.3.3. References: Provide three (3) written letters of reference from the last thirty-six (36) months. Letters of reference should be on company letterhead from the referee and include signature and contact information.

a. Will FLVS accept a Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) from our federal clients in place of a traditional letter of reference? CPARs include detailed information such as Contract Number, Period of Performance, Contract Percentage Complete, Date Signed, Contracting Officer Name, Phone Number, Estimated Contract Completion Date, Contract Effort Description, evaluation based on meeting the schedule, budget, quality, and performance.

b. Will FLVS accept our parent company's CPARS to fulfill this requirement?

A. Yes, as long as it has all the requested details

B. The CPARS needs to be referenced for the submitting company.

2.

Is there an incumbent currently performing this work/similar work? If so, could you please provide the incumbent's name, current contract number, duration, historical level of effort, and contract value?

No

3.

Has a budget been established for this contract? If yes, could you kindly share the budgeted amount?

It will be set at the time of the project-specific RFQs.

4.

What is the place of performance for this work?

Remote/ Virtual

5.

Will remote work be permitted under this contract?



Yes

6.

Is offshore work allowed for any portion of the engagement?

Yes

7.

Could you please share the expected number of awardees under this contract?

Up to five.

8.

Could FLVS please clarify which core applications, platforms, or technology systems are currently in place that may be subject to enhancement under future Statements of Work?

Learning Management System and ancillary services, Student Information System (incl. Integration system and other ancillary services), Content Delivery System, Compliance System.

9.

To better understand future projects needs, can FLVS share any information about the types of new applications or technical capabilities that may be prioritized for development under this RFP?

Performance Management application + Professional Learning Application

10.

Can FLVS confirm whether any incumbent vendors are currently providing full-service software development under a similar contract, and if so, will those vendors be re-competing for this opportunity?

No Incumbent

11.

Section 1 indicates that FLVS is not seeking a supplier to supplement internal development efforts. To ensure our response aligns correctly, can FLVS elaborate on the expected delivery model—specifically whether FLVS anticipates vendor-led project execution with full end-to-end ownership of deliverables?

Yes – FLVS is seeking a vendor-led project with all work completed, then handed to FLVS as a finished project.

12.

Is FLVS able to provide an estimated annual or contract-wide budget range for the work anticipated under this multi-award MSA to assist vendors in aligning resource capacity and planning?

We do not have that at this time

13.

Regarding the required references, can these be from clients located outside the State of Florida, or does FLVS prefer references specifically from Florida-based organizations?

Select the references that best highlight your skills. Does not need to be a Florida-based organization.



14.

Does FLVS accept digital signatures (e.g., DocuSign), or do signatures need to be handwritten and scanned?

Digital is accepted

15.

Should the Cover Letter be on company letterhead, or is that optional?

A cover letter is required, but it is not required to be on letterhead.

16.

Is it mandatory for the Primary Contact and the Authorized Signer to be two separate individuals, or may the same person be designated for both roles?

It can be the same person.

17.

How many past performance examples does FLVS expect—are three sufficient? – Section 3.3.2

There is no established/required number, so as many as you feel are needed to showcase your abilities.

18.

Is it acceptable to include experience from subcontractors as part of the company's total experience, or should their experience be in a separate section? – Section 3.3.2

To avoid confusion, experience from subcontracting can be included and must be clearly labeled as such.

19.

For the roles listed in the RFP (Software Developer, Senior Software Developer, Software Architect, UX/UI Designer, Business Analyst, QA Engineer, Project Manager), are we required to submit actual resumes of the proposed personnel with the proposal, or can sample resumes be submitted initially and actual resumes provided after contract award?

We did not ask for resumes.

20.

Is it mandatory to submit the actual resumes of proposed project team members along with the proposal, or can they be provided after the contract award?

We did not ask for resumes.

21.

For strategic advantages, should we focus only on advantages related to the RFP scope, or can we include general company strengths? – Section 3.3.2

Both

22.

Can we include ongoing projects as part of our experience, or only completed projects? – Section 3.3.2

Completed projects so we can see the final results.

23.

Can references be from ongoing projects, or must they be fully completed projects within the last 36 months?

Completed projects so we can see the final results.

24.

Does FLVS require the references to include specific details, such as project scope, deliverables, and outcomes, or is a general letter of recommendation sufficient?

Project details are not required for the letters of reference.

25.

If one of the referees is no longer with the company, is it acceptable to provide another authorized person from the same company? – Section 3.3.3

Yes

26.

For the references required in Section 3.3.3, is it mandatory to submit the referees' signed letters of reference at the time of proposal submission, or is providing their contact information sufficient initially?

Letters are required at submission.

27.

Is it acceptable to include ongoing projects as case studies, or must they be fully completed? – Section 3.3.4

Completed projects so we can see the final results.

28.

Do we need to demonstrate every qualification listed in the table within each case study, or can different case studies focus on different skill areas? – Section 3.3.4

As long as all qualities of the table are shown, it can be spread across multiple projects case studies.

29.

For technical skills like specific frameworks, databases, or cloud platforms, is it acceptable to describe equivalent experience if exact technologies differ? – Section 3.3.4

Yes

30.

Should the case studies include team roles and responsibilities for each qualification area, or just describe company-level capabilities? – Section 3.3.4

The more detail, the better.

31.

Can subcontractor experience be included in the case studies, or should case studies focus only on the prime proposer's work? – Section 3.3.4

Subcontractor experience can be included, as long as working with that particular subcontractor is an option



moving forward for this agreement.

32.

Do we need to provide evidence of compliance for plugins, add-ons, and third-party tools, or is a disclosure sufficient? – Section 3.2.4

There is not enough context for us to properly answer this question.

33.

Can we reference existing cybersecurity frameworks or certifications (e.g., ISO 27001, NIST) instead of providing detailed internal policies? – Section 3.2.4

You can provide and attestation of compliance to an existing cybersecurity framework.

34.

For SOC2 reporting, is submission of the most recent SOC2 Type 2 report required with the proposal, or available upon request after award? – Section 3.2.4

SOC2 Type 2 report should be provided with the proposal, but FLVS can accept SOC2 Type 2 report after award if we have some type of attestation of compliance with SOC2 Type 2 before a selection is made.

35.

Should we propose our actual SLA numbers if they exceed FLVS minimum requirements, and how will these be evaluated? – Section 3.2.4

Yes, you should provide your SLA numbers if they exceed FLVS minimum requirements and they will be evaluated against FLVS minimum requirements.

36.

If our solution integrates with identity management tools other than Microsoft SSO, is it acceptable to provide justification and additional security controls? – Section 3.2.4

Yes

37.

Is it sufficient to describe audit and logging capabilities in general, or do we need to provide example logs and system screenshots? – Section 3.2.4

Describe audit and logging capabilities in general is acceptable, but must include type of data that is collected, any integrations if applicable, and retention periods.

38.

For contingency planning, is a high-level description sufficient, or should detailed disaster recovery procedures be included? – Section 3.2.4

High level description is acceptable

39.

Does FLVS require submission of a completed VPAT 2.5 report with the proposal, or is a statement of ability to provide it sufficient at this stage? – Section 3.2.6

Web:
www.flvs.net

Phone:
(407)409-8455

Email:
procurement@flvs.net

Procurement Services
5422 Carrier Drive, Suite 201 ·
Orlando, FL 32819



It is not necessary to submit it with proposal, only the commitment to adhering to the WCAG 2.1 AA guidelines. A VPAT would be required, after the requested work has completed development and prior to delivery of the product to FLVS. Only 1 VPAT would be necessary for the delivered product.

40.

Should the VPAT cover only the specific deliverables proposed for FLVS, or can it reference existing company products and platforms? – Section 3.2.6

The VPAT would cover only what was delivered from the awarded project(s).

41.

Is there a preferred format for presenting accessibility compliance in the proposal, or is referencing WCAG 2.1 and Section 508 standards sufficient? – Section 3.2.6

Reference to WCAG 2.1 and Section 508 would be sufficient.

42.

If a product meets WCAG 2.1 at Level AA but not AAA, is that acceptable, or must Level AAA compliance be demonstrated? – Section 3.2.6

AA is acceptable.

43.

Can FLVS provide guidance on which accessibility features are most critical for evaluation (e.g., screen reader support, keyboard navigation, color contrast)? – Section 3.2.6

We have a diverse group of students and customers, so all features are equally important. Adhering to the AA guidelines from all features would be expected.

44.

Is it mandatory to submit a completed VPAT 2.5 Accessibility Conformance Report with the proposal, or can it be provided after contract award? – Section 3.2.6

It is not necessary to submit it with proposal, only the commitment to adhering to the WCAG 2.1 AA guidelines. A VPAT would be required, after the requested work has completed development and prior to delivery of the product to FLVS. Only 1 VPAT would be necessary for the delivered product.

45.

Do you require supporting documents such as past cybersecurity audit reports, penetration test results, or SOC reports, or is a detailed written description of our cybersecurity practices sufficient? - Section 3.2.4

No – please provide SOC 2 Type 2 reports and executive summary/attestation of vulnerability remediation for recent audit or penetration tests.

46.

Is there a requirement to submit a formal cybersecurity certification (e.g., ISO 27001, SOC2), or will a narrative explanation of our policies meet the requirement? - Section 3.2.4

Submit a formal attestation of compliance such as SOC 2 Type 2 and any relevant policies you would wish to share.

Web:
www.flvs.net

Phone:
(407)409-8455

Email:
procurement@flvs.net

Procurement Services
5422 Carrier Drive, Suite 201 ·
Orlando, FL 32819

47.

Are cybersecurity reports mandatory for evaluation, or only required if we are selected for the award? - Section 3.2.4

SOC2 Type 2 report (or other reports) should be provided with the proposal, but FLVS can accept SOC2 Type 2 report (or other reports) after award if we have some type of attestation of compliance with SOC2 Type 2 (or other reports) before a selection is made

48.

Is the VPAT 2.5 WCAG report required at the time of proposal submission, or can it be submitted after the award or during the project delivery stage? – Section 3.2.6

It is not necessary to submit it with proposal, only the commitment to adhering to the WCAG 2.1 AA guidelines. A VPAT would be required, after the requested work has completed development and prior to delivery of the product to FLVS. Only 1 VPAT would be necessary for the delivered product.

49.

Do you require a VPAT specifically for the proposed solution/product we will build, or is a company-level VPAT demonstrating capability acceptable at this stage? – Section 3.2.6

It is not necessary to submit it with proposal, only the commitment to adhering to the WCAG 2.1 AA guidelines. A VPAT would be required, after the requested work has completed development and prior to delivery of the product to FLVS. Only 1 VPAT would be necessary for the delivered product.

50.

For the proposal evaluation, is it sufficient to state our adherence to ADA, WCAG 2.1, and Section 508 standards, or do you require sample documentation demonstrating past accessibility compliance? – Section 3.2.6

Yes, it is sufficient to state your adherence – no sample documentation is required.

51.

Could you please clarify, From Section 3.3.3 - reference letters be on 'company letterhead,' do the letters need to be provided on the referee's official company letterhead, or on FLVS letterhead, or on our own company letterhead? - Section 3.3.3

Letterhead is preferred, but as long as there is a way to tie it to the company, such as their official email, that would be sufficient.

52.

If a referee's company does not issue formal letterheads, will a signed PDF with contact details be acceptable? - Section 3.3.3

Yes

53.

Are electronic signatures (e-sign or digital signature) acceptable for the reference letters, or do they require handwritten signatures? - Section 3.3.3

Digital signatures are acceptable.

54.

Apart from the referee's contact information and signature, are there any additional required details that must appear on the referee's company letterhead (e.g., address, project details, or dates)? - Section 3.3.3

The reference document in the forms packet must be completed with the authorization for us to check those references completed as part of the packet.

55.

Contract Pricing: Could you please confirm where the official Proposal Price Sheet is located within the RFP package or attachments? We are unable to identify the specific file. – Section 1.3.5

It is section 6 of the RFP and needs to be submitted as part of your full proposal and as a separate document under the price sheet section.

56.

For Sections 6.0 through 6.6 (Cost Proposal Forms), could you please clarify the required submission format? Should we complete these cost tables directly within the RFP document, submit them as a separate Excel file, or upload them as a standalone PDF? Additionally, is there an official cost proposal template or spreadsheet provided by FLVS that we must use?

Please submit it as shown in the RFP as part of your full response and as a standalone document. You may submit additional price sheets for roles; however, only the ones included in the price sheet will be considered for price evaluation. All needed documents/templates are in the RFP document on Bonfire.

57.

What is the expected annual budget for this project?

Not identified yet.

58.

Are there any mandatory stipulations for out-of-state businesses?

No

59.

If Florida (SunBiz) registration is preferred, or if business registration in another state is sufficient to submit a proposal?

It is preferred that out-of-state companies register with Sunbiz before contracting; however, Sunbiz.org registration is not required to submit a proposal.

60.

Are there any incumbents currently? If yes, may we know the size of the team by each role and associated revenue/spend? Are they allowed to compete again?

No incumbents

61.

Since it's mentioned as a multi-award. Is there a chance to award to more than 5 vendors?



No five is the cap for this award.

62.

Are these all basically onsite roles? Or US-based remote roles? Are you going to consider any roles to be outside of the US? Like nearshore or offshore (south east Asia etc.)

Remote roles only. Offshore permitted.

63.

Is it possible that the award could be given to a small business with less than \$1 billion in revenue?

Yes

64.

Do we need to be a FL based business to submit?

No

65.

Is Subcontracting allowed? If yes, can we use references and case studies from the combination of Prime/Subcontractor to submit?

To avoid confusion, experience from subcontracting can be included and must be clearly labeled as such.

66.

Is there any Small Business set aside or goals?

No

67.

If any portion of work or meetings must occur in Florida, or can the project be completed remotely?

Work will be completed remotely

68.

Who is the incumbent vendor currently providing similar services? Is the incumbent vendor allowed to participate in this RFP?

There is no incumbent

69.

What are the current limitations and challenges that you are facing?

Due to the number of ongoing active projects, FLVS is in need of a supplier who can handle full delivery of the project from start to finish.

70.

Do you expect the vendor to perform any tasks on-site, or can all work be performed remotely? Do you accept offshore resources?

Remote roles only. Offshore permitted.

Web:
www.flvs.net

Phone:
(407)409-8455

Email:
procurement@flvs.net

Procurement Services
5422 Carrier Drive, Suite 201 ·
Orlando, FL 32819



71.

Is this project funded? What is the approved budget or range allocated for this project?

The budget will be determined on the RFQ level.

72.

Can FLVS provide a high-level inventory of the current application portfolio, including the primary technology stack, database versions, and the status of existing documentation, to support enhancements to existing applications?

- Proprietary LMS (Learning Management System). Main technologies used are Angular, Node.js, MongoDB, RHEL8, with older parts of the application using Perl and flat files. Documentation available in Azure DevOps wikis.
- Proprietary SIS (Student Information System) and registration systems. Currently using .NET technologies, IIS, SQL Server, but rewriting to React, Node.js, MongoDB, RHEL8.
- Proprietary Compliance Management System: React, Node.js, MongoDB
- Proprietary Content Delivery System: PHP, RedHat, MySQL

73.

For mobile application development, does FLVS prefer a specific cross-platform framework (such as React Native or Flutter) to reduce long-term maintenance costs, or should planning assume separate native iOS and Android development efforts?

We don't currently have mobile applications, however cross-platform framework would be preferred.

74.

Would the government consider extending the deadline for this RFP to accommodate for holiday schedules?

We are not extending the deadline

75.

How frequently do you expect RFQs/SOWs to be issued in a typical year, and what is the average project size and duration?

This has not been determined.

76.

How does FLVS define "success" for the first 6–12 months of an awarded vendor on this contract?

Award of an RFQ; Complete a project successfully.

77.

Are there preferred delivery methodologies (Agile, SAFe, hybrid) that align best with FLVS's internal teams?

Delivery following an iterative approach is preferred.

78.

Web:
www.flvs.net

Phone:
(407)409-8455

Email:
procurement@flvs.net

Procurement Services
5422 Carrier Drive, Suite 201 ·
Orlando, FL 32819



How closely will vendors be expected to collaborate with FLVS internal engineering and product teams versus operating independently?

Close collaboration is preferred to ensure regular project updates (e.g. via FLVS and vendor liaisons appointed to the project)

79.

Are there existing reference architectures, shared platforms, or preferred cloud services that vendors should align with when designing new applications?

Architecture of new applications will be created in-house in most cases. Azure cloud preferred solution.

80.

Does FLVS anticipate standardizing on specific front-end frameworks, API patterns, or container platforms across projects?

Yes (React, Node.js, Express, OpenShift)

81.

How much flexibility will vendors have to introduce new tools or frameworks if they demonstrably improve security, performance, or maintainability?

New tools, frameworks, etc. would need to be vetted by FLVS Cybersecurity.

82.

Are there specific security frameworks or internal controls beyond those listed in the RFP that vendors must align with during delivery?

No, however subject to change as requirements may be adjusted at the RFQ level.

83.

How does FLVS currently handle security reviews, penetration testing, and ATO-like approvals for new or enhanced applications?

Due to security concerns, we do not answer this in public-facing documents

84.

What is FLVS's tolerance for managed cloud services versus custom-built security controls?

FLVS will evaluate managed cloud services and custom-built security controls based off compliance with standard Cybersecurity frameworks such as NIST CSF, ISO/IEC 27001, OWASP, CIS Controls, SOC 2 Type 2, Secure SDLC Frameworks and industry best practices.

85.

How does FLVS validate WCAG 2.1 and 508 compliance today—manual review, automated tools, or third-party audits?

A combination of all three (tools: JAWS, NVDA, Axe, WAVE)

86.

Are there common accessibility challenges FLVS has faced in prior applications that vendors should proactively

Web:
www.flvs.net

Phone:
(407)409-8455

Email:
procurement@flvs.net

Procurement Services
5422 Carrier Drive, Suite 201 ·
Orlando, FL 32819



address?

Aria labels and screen reader support have been the most common pain points.

87.

What level of post-launch support does FLVS typically expect before transitioning applications fully to internal teams?

If critical issues are discovered post-release, the expectation is that the vendor will ensure their triage and resolution within an agreed-upon timeframe.

88.

Are there SLAs or support expectations that vary by application criticality beyond availability metrics?

Any additional SLAs will be provided at the RFQ level.

89.

How does FLVS prefer knowledge transfer to be structured at the end of a project?

FLVS development team to conduct an iterative review of vendor code throughout the project life cycle, + Final project documentation from the vendor to be created in markdown format.

90.

Is FLVS open to pilots or proofs of concept for emerging capabilities such as AI-assisted tooling, analytics, or personalization?

Yes, if relevant to the awarded project. Note: new technologies/tools need to be vetted by FLVS Cybersecurity.

91.

Who is the incumbent of this contract, if any?

There is no Incumbent.

92.

Is there an upper limit to the project budget? Or acceptable range?

This has not been decided and will be set at the time of contact/Board award.