



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ELEARNING SERVICES**

**Questions and Answers**

**October 16, 2024**

1. The State Bar issued a similar RFP in the Spring of 2023. Is this a rebid of that work? Is there an incumbent currently completing the prior work?
  - The RFP issued in the Spring of 2023 covered several different courses. This bid is for work on two courses, which has not yet been initiated by any incumbent.
2. The State Bar is requesting access to client environments for testing, which will be problematic (based on client access policies and proprietary information contained in client environments). Will the State Bar accept access to fully-functional courses in Review360 and/or ScormCloud for testing purposes?
  - Yes, for testing purposes, the State Bar will accept access to courses in Review360 and/or ScormCloud, if fully functional.
3. Regarding Format Requirements, the State Bar has indicated the product should be built using Design Lab software and SCORM 1.2 compliant. We use the Articulate360 suite of products to build SCORM-compliant courses. Is that acceptable?
  - Although the State Bar has indicated a preference for vendors who use Design Lab, the State Bar will consider a vendor who uses another product. The purpose of the preference for Design Lab is to enable future updates to all courses by a single vendor. The other courses that were recently completed, were built in Design Lab.
4. Will bidder's financial information be treated as confidential? If yes, how would you like bidders to indicate confidential information included in their response?
  - While the State Bar generally does not publish or otherwise publicize such information, the State Bar cannot guarantee the confidential treatment of information submitted in connection with a bid as such records are subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act as noted on RFP, Section III.A and III.M. Bidder may provide alternative documents in response to the requirements.
5. Is the State Bar willing to waive the Umbrella Liability Insurance coverage requirement (given the limited scope of this engagement)?
  - The State Bar may consider exceptions to the standard insurance requirements. Please indicate the desired modification in response section IV.F, agreement with contracting terms. Certain insurance requirements are only triggered if specific conditions are met (e.g., "Comprehensive Automobile Liability Insurance coverage if vehicle or mobile equipment are used to perform the Services under the final Agreement.")

6. What is the desired delivery timeline for the items scoped in Attachment A?
  - The desired delivery timeline for the items scoped in Attachment "A" is 6 months from the date the contract is executed.
  
7. Under "Key Requirements of Bidder," item 2 ("Format Requirements") includes this phrase: "The Product should be built using Design Lab software." It appears that the State Bar is referring to DesignLab software as developed by AllenComm, which is a proprietary software solution. If this is what is meant, can you clarify whether some or all of the State Bar's existing content was built with AllenComm's DesignLab software and, if so, whether the State Bar has purchased the necessary advanced licenses from AllenComm to allow for creating new modules/courses?
  - A portion of our eLearning courses were created using DesignLab. The State Bar has not purchased advanced licenses. The courses identified in this RFP will be new courses and will not require modifications in DesignLab. Articulate 360 is an acceptable alternative for the creation of the courses in this RFP.
  
8. Do you wish to receive Attachment 1 (Vendor History Questionnaire) and Attachment 2 (Cost Proposal) as separate files or embedded in the main body of proposals (as items 9 and 6, respectively, in the proposer's Table of Contents)?
  - Attachment 1 (Vendor History Questionnaire) and Attachment 2 (Cost Proposal) should be submitted as separate files.