



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL WEBSITE REDESIGN**  
**Questions and Answers #2**  
**April 5, 2024**

1. Are you open to Canadian Vendors?
  - Vendors outside of USA are not eligible to bid.
2. Have you set a budget?
  - The anticipated budget range is \$200,000-\$300,000.
3. What is the project budget?
  - The anticipated budget range is \$200,000-\$300,000.
4. What is the ideal project timeline?
  - Target completion date for the redesign of the State Bar's websites, [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) and [www.statebarcourt.ca.gov](http://www.statebarcourt.ca.gov), is Q4 2024. This includes evaluation of the current CMS platform to determine its ability to meet the desired requirements and recommendations for a CMS platform to meet the technical requirements and meet the strategic goals outlined in the RFP. This timeline does not include implementation of the sites or launch.
5. Will the hosting environment also be part of the evaluation?
  - Not part of the evaluation, but we welcome recommendations.
6. Are there existing branding guidelines?
  - Yes, the Brand Guidelines will be shared with the selected vendor. The Guidelines were last updated in 2023.
7. Is there a desire for the 2 sites to reflect a similar design, or is the preference to keep them as separate as they are currently?
  - The two sites currently share some design aspects (such as the menu structure), but are differentiated by color, logo, and other minor differences. While we would want our chosen partner to recommend a strategy for this, we expect there will be practical reasons to have consistent design patterns between the sites while maintaining some variations (e.g., logos, color) to differentiate the two sites.

8. Who supports the current sites?
  - Internal staff maintain the current sites.
  
9. There is mention of over 20 integrations, with seven listed. Are these integrations available via API? Specifically, these are listed in the RFP, and the other 13 not listed.
  - My State Bar Profile (.NET);
  - Agency Billing (.NET)
  - Attorney Search;
  - Power BI; and
  - Customer relationship management system (CRM);
  - Details of the integrations with our two public websites can be provided to the selected vendor during the discovery phase to support the design strategy.
  
10. Are there any details on what these integrations do on the website and what data is displayed from those integrations?
  - Details of the integrations with our two public websites will be provided to the selected vendor during the discovery phase to support the design strategy.
  
11. What type of future plans for the website does the State Bar have? AI integration, PDF conversion, etc?
  - We will expect the selected vendor to design for the content on the site as it exists currently, but as part of the discovery phase, we welcome recommendations and considerations for future state designs and implementation of new features and tools such as AI/ Chatbot Integration and Voice UI.
  
12. Is it the intention of the State Bar to issue a separate RFP for implementation on the new CMS or handle implementation in house?
  - The goal is to issue a separate RFP for the implementation of a new CMS platform.
  
13. Will there be a separate RFP issued for the redesign of the My State Bar Profile application? If so, do you anticipate this also being broken into separate design and implementation RFPs?
  - We are refining project plans and timelines for the redesign of My State Bar Profile. It is outside the scope of this project.
  
14. Creating a new Information Architecture is contingent on having a good understanding of the content currently available. Does the State Bar have an accurate catalog of the 2,700 pages and 2,200 documents that the vendor can work with, or should they plan on performing their own content audit?
  - Yes, we expect to have some elements of a content audit ready at engagement. This would include site analytics and a preliminary content inventory. We expect to work

with the vendor on any other elements considered critical. We expect the selected vendor to provide a perspective on the right type of information architecture based on the current content available.

15. The State Bar is looking for vendors with “demonstrated technical expertise and experience”. I think we speak for most vendors who would meet that description in saying we would have already made a determination about the CMS we prefer to work with. Any current, widely-supported CMS should be able to achieve the goals you have laid out. Would you consider reframing this RFP as “design + technical recommendation” allowing each vendor to explain how their preferred CMS meets the design and technical requirements you have enumerated?
  - The vendor may recommend a preferred CMS.
16. We do not believe creating a “CMS-agnostic” design is an efficient approach. Additional work will be required to either conform the CMS to the design, or the design to the CMS, with increased cost either way. Is the State Bar open to vendors responding to this RFP with design costs based on the assumption that they will be working with the CMS they recommend/are most proficient with?
  - Yes.
17. As a firm that works extensively with content management systems, receiving “front end coding” that has been created in a vacuum is of little value. Would the State Bar be willing to remove that deliverable from this RFP, and make it part of any implementation RFP?
  - Our rationale for front-end coding deliverable can be created with a preferred CMS in mind. If there is any work needed from the vendor during the future implementation phase, the State Bar would ask for an additional quote.
18. Where will the site be hosted? Meeting many of the Nonfunctional Requirements listed will be contingent on this. Would you like the vendor to make a hosting recommendation based on these requirements?
  - Yes, we welcome hosting recommendations with a preference of hosting on a public cloud environment.
19. What is the preferred timeline for delivery of the requested services?
  - Target completion date for the redesign of the State Bar’s websites, [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) and [www.statebarcourt.ca.gov](http://www.statebarcourt.ca.gov), is Q4 2024. This includes evaluation of the current CMS platform to determine its ability to meet the desired requirements and recommendations for a CMS platform to meet the technical requirements and meet the strategic goals outlined in the RFP. This timeline does not include implementation of the sites or launch.
20. Do you have brand guidelines? If so, when was the last time they were updated?
  - Yes, the Brand Guidelines will be shared with the selected vendor. The Guidelines were last updated in 2023.

21. Has any user research been done to inform this RFP and is the team open to engaging users to participate throughout the project? This can range from as early as the discovery phase to explore and validate needs, to later in the design process to verify the teams' findings & assumptions prior to build. Scope can range from as minimal as a standardized user survey, to larger-scale focus groups, usability testing, social media engagement, and public installations.

- A user survey is anticipated for this project. The State Bar will work with the selected vendor to frame the survey questions and identify participants.

22. Are there any of the following UX deliverables that you have already completed, or would like to exclude from the project scope?

Goals & KPIs

Personas

Brand Identity Positioning (both visual & verbal guidelines)

Site Map

Audit of Content Types

Wireframes

Desired Publishing Workflow

- We do not want to exclude any of these UX deliverables from this RFP.

23. Do you envision user research or any other deliverables occurring remotely or in person? What is your preference?

- A user survey is anticipated for this project. The State Bar will work with the selected vendor to frame the survey questions and identify participants. We anticipate the survey and all other deliverables to be handled remotely unless in person testing is considered necessary for validity.

24. Please list the integrations on the website, and categorize each integration appropriately: API integration, JavaScript snippet/embed, iFrame, or deep link to third-party site.

Details of the integrations with our two public websites can be provided to the selected vendor during the discovery phase to support the design strategy. Most are iFrame or embedded.

25. What is the budget for this project? Knowing your budget is critical to help us right-size the project plan.

- The anticipated budget range is \$200,000-\$300,000.

26. Is there an incumbent vendor responding to this opportunity?

- No.

27. What is the timeline to complete this project? What is driving the timeline?

- Target completion date for the redesign of the State Bar's websites, [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) and [www.statebarcourt.ca.gov](http://www.statebarcourt.ca.gov), is Q4 2024. This includes evaluation of the current CMS platform to determine its ability to meet the desired

requirements and recommendations for a CMS platform to meet the technical requirements and meet the strategic goals outlined in the RFP. This timeline does not include implementation of the sites or launch.

28. Regarding consulting the State Bar of California on a potential CMS that meets your needs — Which Content Management Systems does your team have experience with?
  - Staff familiarity with the CMS is not a part of the requirements.
29. Between <http://calbar.ca.gov> and <http://statebarcourt.ca.gov>, how much of the content is in both URLs? How much is unique to either?
  - There is almost no overlap in content.
30. The RFP mentions that the State Bar is also undergoing a parallel project redesigning My State Bar. Will the State Bar team assigned to this Project also be assigned to the My State Bar project? Do you foresee any risks with workflow or bandwidth impacting this project?
  - No.
31. We anticipate collaborating with the State Bar of California to codify designs that emulate the organization best through a series of interviews with leadership and stakeholders. How many internal **and** external stakeholders will be involved with this project?
  - The number of external and internal stakeholders is to be determined. Selected vendor should recommend a minimum number of stakeholder interviews internally.
32. In what way would the desired deliverables be applied to other web properties aside from <http://calbar.ca.gov> and <http://statebarcourt.ca.gov>? Are there specific items like header, footer, or global navigation that you are hoping to consolidate across various properties?
  - The two sites currently share some design aspects (such as the menu structure), but are differentiated by color, logo, and other minor differences. While we would want our chosen partner to recommend a strategy for this, we expect there will be practical reasons to have consistent design patterns between the sites while maintaining some variations (e.g., logos, color) to differentiate the two sites.
33. Have you participated in a messaging engagement previously that has informed how you communicate today?
  - We have ongoing engagement with our stakeholders. There have been no formal efforts with regard to our website since our previous redesign in 2016.
34. Are there any initiatives, entities, sub-organizations that will require (or as a nice-to-have) new sub-branding to fit in with the new visual identity?
  - No.
35. Do you anticipate that email templates will be in scope? If so, how many variations, initiatives, or entities will require a unique template?
  - No.

36. Within the Submission Requirements, item #8 is asking for company financial information to be provided in the Vendor History Questionnaire. We are a privately held company and do not disclose financial information, or information about past or present legal matters (if any). Will this automatically disqualify our proposal from being considered?

- Bidders may provide alternative documents in response to the requirements.

37. In our experience, completing design and front-end development before the decision of a CMS is made is not an efficient way to approach a redesign as there will likely be a need for substantial rework. Will the State Bar consider changing the RFP to complete a CMS evaluation/decision before going into the Strategy/UX/IA/Design of the new sites? If not, can you please explain your rationale for approaching the project in the way you are?

- Unfortunately, the State Bar cannot change the RFP. Deliverable “front-end coding” can be created with a preferred CMS in mind. If there is any work needed from the design vendor during the implementation phase, the State Bar would ask for an additional quote.

38. Would the State Bar be open to a proposal recommending WordPress as the only CMS option? Based on the outlined requirements, we think WordPress will be a suitable CMS.

- The selected vendor is expected to evaluate and recommend a CMS as a part of the deliverables. The recommended CMS should meet the technical requirements and strategic goals and initiatives outlined in the RFP.

39. Were the current websites built in-house or with an outside vendor? And who is currently maintaining them?

- We partnered with a vendor for the website redesign in 2017, and we did the implementation internally. Our staff maintains the sites.

40. Will The State Bar's existing member login component (which seems to be hosted on a separate subdomain currently?) be kept the same in the new website? Or is there a need to redesign/update this as well?

- Yes, the existing member login component for My State Bar Profile site will remain as is. As mentioned in the RFP, My State Bar Profile design improvements are being handled as a separate project.

41. Regarding the Attorney Search feature - where is the data stored that is being accessed? Does The State Bar use a custom API for this integration?

- The Attorney Search feature is an application built within the public site and technical details can be provided to the selected vendor if needed.

42. Does The State Bar have a budget or range in mind right now for this project?

- The anticipated budget range is \$200,000-\$300,000.

43. Is there an incumbent? Will they be bidding?

- No.

44. Is there any preference for local vendors?

- No. The only requirement is that vendors must be in the United States.

45. What is the budget for this project?

- The anticipated budget range is \$200,000-\$300,000.

46. Who built the current websites - your internal team or a vendor?

- The current website was redesigned by a vendor in 2017 and implemented in-house.

47. If you used an outside vendor, how much did you spend on the implementation of your current sites?

- Implementation of the last redesign was done in-house.

48. Is there an organizational preference for open source vs. a proprietary CMS?

- No organization preference as long as it meets our requirements.

49. If open source is a consideration, is there a preference for a specific CMS (i.e., Drupal, WordPress)?

- There is no preference for a specific CMS, but we welcome recommendations as part of the CMS evaluation deliverable.

50. Are there multi-lingual requirements? Is Google Translate or similar sufficient?

- The current approach is to maintain use of Google Translate, but we are open to alternative approaches or recommendations.

51. What sets firm/org apart from the alternatives?

- We do not understand the question.

52. Who/what are the primary alternatives?

- We do not understand the question.

53. How many levels of users are needed?

- The design scope is for public sites that do not require log-in. This will be evaluated by the vendor during discovery phase when identifying the different types of web users.

54. Are survey/voting tools required?

- No.

55. Is there a need for a document library?

- We are open to recommendations.

56. Do you experience frequent surges of traffic that impact performance at critical times?

- Only during peak times and at certain times of the year, a couple applications which are outside the scope of this RFP but are accessible through our two public sites, may experience some performance degradation.
57. Have you dealt with any security issues or malicious traffic on your sites like DDoS attacks, SQL injections, etc? If so, what was the impact?
- Although we may experience cyber attacks to our two public sites, the redesign effort will not address cyber security issues and will be addressed in the implementation RFP.
58. Are you using anything for CDN or WAF currently?
- We are currently using a WAF, but not a CDN.
59. Do you expect copywriting or editing services as part of engagement?
- We are open to suggestions for main pages as well as a web content style guide.
60. Can you provide examples of sites that are good models for what you want?
- We expect the selected vendor to do a comparison of websites that might be good models to meet our strategic goals and requirements during discovery phase.
61. Please confirm that the awarded vendor will primarily work remotely, with regular web conference meetings as needed.
- Yes.
62. Please describe the internal team who will be responsible for the website post-launch (developers, non-tech users, etc)
- The website implementation and launch is not part of this RFP.
63. We are a US company with some remote team members working from outside of the US. Is there any restriction on their ability to contribute to the project?
- U.S. companies are eligible to send a proposal. There are no restrictions on remote teams working from outside of the U.S.
64. If it was a vendor, who was it?
- We do not understand this question.
65. Please confirm that one design theme will carry across the entire site. If we need sub-themes of any type please specify.
- We are open to design recommendations. The two sites currently share some design aspects (such as the menu structure), but are differentiated by color, logo, and other minor differences. While we would want our chosen partner to recommend a strategy for this, we expect there will be practical reasons to have consistent design patterns between the sites while maintaining some variations (e.g., logos, color) to differentiate the two sites.



66. What has been successful with the two existing websites? What's working well?

- This will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase.

67. Why is now the right time for this project?

- We have not had a redesign in seven years. Current sites are outdated and do not provide the expected user experience to meet our strategic goals and objectives.

68. What is the desired schedule to complete this scope of work?

- Target completion date for the redesign of the State Bar's websites, [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) and [www.statebarcourt.ca.gov](http://www.statebarcourt.ca.gov), is Q4 2024. This includes evaluation of the current CMS platform to determine its ability to meet the desired requirements and recommendations for a CMS platform to meet the technical requirements and meet the strategic goals outlined in the RFP. This timeline does not include implementation of the sites or launch.

69. When do you expect (or hope) the development and implementation phase will begin?

- Target completion date for the redesign of the State Bar's websites, [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) and [www.statebarcourt.ca.gov](http://www.statebarcourt.ca.gov), is Q4 2024. This includes evaluation of the current CMS platform to determine its ability to meet the desired requirements and recommendations for a CMS platform to meet the technical requirements and meet the strategic goals outlined in the RFP. This timeline does not include implementation of the sites or launch.

70. Do you expect to streamline the existing websites through consolidating or removing some existing content pages, and documents? If so, who will lead this process?

- Yes, it will be done internally. We will perform a content audit and welcome recommendations from the selected vendor to inform the overall design and content strategy.

71. Can you detail any existing user or market research that will be provided by the State Bar to inform this work?

- A user survey is anticipated for this project. The State Bar will work with the selected vendor to frame the survey questions and identify participants.

72. Do you have any general expectations for the types and amount of user or market research that should be included in this project scope?

- A user survey is anticipated for this project. The State Bar will work with the selected vendor to frame the survey questions and identify participants.

73. Can you provide a list of the internal roles that support the website or will be involved in this project?

- This will be provided to the selected vendor.

74. Can you provide a budget range or maximum budget for this contract?

- The anticipated budget range is \$200,000-\$300,000.
75. What do you consider the biggest potential challenges to the successful completion of this project?
- Combining ease of use with a modern, contemporary-branded website to improve the overall user experience.
76. Which external company currently provides design and development support for the websites?
- The staff maintains the website.
77. Where are the websites hosted?
- This will be discussed with the selected vendor during the discovery phase.
78. How much does the State Bar spend annually on website hosting?
- This is not relevant to this RFP.
79. How much does the State Bar spend annually on website maintenance, enhancements, and technical support?
- This is not relevant to this RFP.
80. What is the approved budget or range allocated to this project by the State Bar?
- The anticipated budget range is \$200,000-\$300,000.
81. Please confirm if we can we utilize a **hybrid resource model** (on-site/remote/offshore) to accomplish the tasks outlined in this RFP? Or does the State Bar require all the vendor resources to reside within Continental U.S.?
- Yes, a hybrid resource model may be utilized.
82. We assume there is no requirement for the key staff to be onsite for this project. Please confirm?
- Key staff do not need to be on-site.
83. We request State Bar to consider extending the proposal submission deadline by **at least one week**. This extension would provide us ample time to respond appropriately after receiving the clarifications on our questions.
- Unfortunately, we cannot extend the deadline of this RFP.
84. If the vendor fails to provide the financial information, will it result in our disqualification?
- Bidders may provide alternative documents in response to the requirements.
85. **As per RFP page 11 subsection 'submission requirements' under section 'General information' pointer 8-** "The most recent year's annual reports, or comparable document, including detailed current profit and loss, assets and liabilities, and other relevant financial

data. Bidders must submit Attachment 1: Vendor History Questionnaire electronically in native .xls format per instructions below". **We would like to request an exemption from submitting audited financial information due to its confidentiality at the proposal submission stage. Instead, can we provide alternative documents to showcase our financial strength. Upon contract award, we are willing to share financial information with you. See**

- Bidders may provide alternative documents in response to the requirements.

86. Could you confirm whether submission of the D&B rating is mandatory for this opportunity? If yes, we kindly request consideration for relaxation of this requirement and make D&B rating optional.

- The State Bar may consider exceptions to the requirements. Please indicate the desired modification in response to the requirements.

87. Could you please provide us with an email address where we can securely share financial information/ the Vendor History questionnaire Excel file? Since financial details are considered confidential, we request you to provide a secure method of transmission?

- You may email the information to [Sunly.Yap@calbar.ca.gov](mailto:Sunly.Yap@calbar.ca.gov). Please note that all submission materials may be subject to public records act requests as noted in section IV.M of the RFP.

88. Does the vendor need to include any licenses cost in the proposal? Please confirm?

- The vendor does not need to include license costs in the proposal.

89. As per the RFP page 12 section – D “Evaluation Process and Highest Scored Bidder” Pointer 3, Could you please provide individual scoring for References, Vendor Qualifications, and Approach? This will aid in clearly understanding the significance of each section.

- Unfortunately, we cannot provide any more information that is not already stated in the RFP.

90. Can you confirm whether sections containing information such as reference contact details, financial information, etc., can be marked as confidential (with Red) when provided?

- All submission materials may be subject to public records act requests as noted in section IV.M of the RFP.

91. As per the RFP section III “General Information” Page 16- **“All materials submitted in response to an RFP will become the property of the State Bar and will be returned only at the State Bar's option and at the expense of the bidder. One copy of each proposal will be retained for the State Bar's official files and become a public record pursuant to the California Public Records Act. By submitting a proposal, a bidder agrees to these terms and waives any right to pursue a cause of action for damages incurred as a result of the release of any information contained in a proposal”**. We request the State Bar to consider “Confidential” the Sections of the Proposal containing details such as references, cost, and financial information and ensure that it will not be disclosed as public record. Please confirm.

- All submission materials may be subject to public records act requests as noted in section IV.M of the RFP.
92. The RFP mentions limitations with the DNN CMS. Can you provide more details to understand the specific needs, like usability issues or missing features? This information will help us focus the new CMS on their priorities.
- This will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase.
93. Kindly share the detailed content inventory. Understanding the types and volume of content (text, images, videos, downloadable documents) will help us in estimating the resources required for migration and ensuring successful content migration.
- Content inventory will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase. Implementation and migration are not within the scope of this RFP.
94. Are there any specific CMS vendors or platforms you would like the proposals to focus on – opensource or proprietary, or are you open to receiving recommendations from bidders?
- The selected vendor is expected to evaluate and recommend a CMS as a part of the deliverables. The CMS should meet the technical requirements and strategic goals and initiatives outlined in the RFP.
95. Are there any specific features or functionalities that are critical for the new CMS beyond those listed in the RFP?
- The RFP comprehensively lists what the State Bar believes are critical features and functionalities. If a vendor recommends other new features or functionalities beyond what is listed in the RFP, please include those suggestions as part of the proposal. Added features and functionalities can be discussed with the selected vendor during the discovery phase.
96. How do you anticipate the website's content and traffic volume to grow in the next few years?
- Please base design on the website's current content. Web analytics will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase to identify higher volume pages.
97. Has keyword research been conducted? Are there any SEO reports available that provide insights into current keyword rankings and organic traffic sources?
- This should be done as a part of the discovery phase of the project.
98. Has any keyword research been conducted to identify relevant keywords and search terms for the target audiences?
- This should be done as a part of the discovery phase of the project.
99. How does the State Bar currently manage data backups and disaster recovery?
- Both are required. We will share our current architecture with the selected vendor.

100. What are the expectations for regular security audits and penetration testing?
  - Both system and networking audits are required.
  
101. How does the State Bar envision managing user access and permissions across different integrated systems (e.g., single sign-on)?
  - This would be determined during the implementation process and is not relevant to this project. SSO/MFA should be considered from a design perspective in this RFP for the administrative users (internal staff) who will be logging into the public sites to manage content, etc.
  
102. Could you provide more details on your multi-factor authentication (MFA) requirements for different user groups (internal vs external)?
  - This would be determined during the implementation process and is not relevant to this project. SSO/MFA should be considered from a design perspective in this RFP for the administrative users (internal staff) who will be logging into the public sites to manage content, etc.
  
103. Does the State Bar have any specific performance benchmarks beyond those listed in the RFP (e.g., page load times, concurrency)?
  - This would be determined during the implementation process and is not relevant to this project. Web analytics will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase to inform the overall design approach.
  
104. What are the scalability requirements for the new website? How many users does the State Bar anticipate at peak times?
  - The scalability requirements can be detailed during the discovery phase, but generally, the design must be responsive to support to mobile, tablet, and desktop devices. Web analytics will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase to inform the overall design approach.
  
105. Does the State Bar have a documented content strategy for the website redesign? Are there plans for ongoing content creation and updates?
  - We would expect selected vendor to make recommendations on a content strategy and style guide. As they do now, internal staff will handle content creation and updating.
  
106. Should photography (and videography, if applicable) be provided by the client, or is it expected to be included in our proposal?
  - For designs that includes stock photography, we would expect the vendor to recommend specific photography and other assets.
  
107. For Interaction Support during the UXD process (such as surveys, persona creation, User Journey Mapping), is there a specific process users need to follow, potentially causing

delays, or can we directly engage them through communication channels without additional waiting periods?

- We expect the chosen vendor to work with us to define the UXD process.

108. Does the client possess an existing style-guide for reference, or will the application necessitate the development of a completely new Style-Guide?

- Development of the new web style guide is part of the deliverables.

109. Are different themes required for any subsites/sections, or will they adhere to the main theme exclusively?

- The two sites currently share some design aspects (such as the menu structure), but are differentiated by color, logo, and other minor differences. While we would want our chosen partner to recommend a strategy for this, we expect there will be practical reasons to have consistent design patterns between the sites while maintaining some variations (e.g., logos, color) to differentiate the two sites.

110. Is there a need for us to offer ADA training or support to the client's web team?

- No.

111. Are there present application's functional documents like site architecture documents/information architecture/playbooks/handbooks/feature list.

- We can provide these documents to the selected vendor as needed.

112. We can see that this application login's using the State Bar and MJP number, are there other authentication methods.

- The My State Bar Profile application is outside the scope of this RFP. SSO/MFA for the two public sites should be considered from a design perspective in this RFP for the administrative users (internal staff) who will be logging into the public sites to manage content, etc.

113. We Can see that EVOQ being used, please share present stats from analytics dashboard.

- We will provide stats to the selected vendor during the discovery phase.

114. Is there a concept of Gated/Ungated content and is it required to implement SEO for gated content?

- No, the content is public.

115. Are there any learning platforms integrated with present web applications?

- Integrations are outside the scope of this RFP.

116. Is the State Bar looking to have design consistency between calbar.ca.gov and statebarcourt.ca.gov, or is the preference to have 2 very distinctive designs?

- The two sites currently share some design aspects (such as the menu structure), but are differentiated by color, logo, and other minor differences. While we would want our chosen partner to recommend a strategy for this, we expect there will be practical reasons to have consistent design patterns between the sites while maintaining some variations (e.g., logos, color) to differentiate the two sites.
117. Is the State Bar open to user research surveys being used in the discovery phase?
- A user survey is anticipated for this project. The State Bar will work with the selected vendor to frame the survey questions and identify participants.
118. Do you currently engage with a web design/development vendor?
- No.
119. Is there an incumbent vendor?
- No.
120. What is the budget or budget range that has been set aside for this project?
- The anticipated budget range is \$200,000-\$300,000.
121. What internal team resources are being devoted to this project? What will they be responsible for as a part of this engagement?
- This information will be provided to the selected vendor.
122. Do you have an anticipated timeline for project completion? Are there any internal drivers that may impact that date?
- Target completion date for the redesign of the State Bar's websites, [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) and [www.statebarcourt.ca.gov](http://www.statebarcourt.ca.gov), is Q4 2024. This includes evaluation of the current CMS platform to determine its ability to meet the desired requirements and recommendations for a CMS platform to meet the technical requirements and meet the strategic goals outlined in the RFP. This timeline does not include implementation of the sites or launch.
123. How do you currently measure the success of your website in attracting and informing your audience? What types of success metrics are important to you?
- This will be shared with the chosen vendor during the discovery phase.
124. What are the conversions that should be supported by the new user paths and design work? (e.g. form fill, click to another website, content engagement, etc)
- We expect the vendor to make these recommendations.
125. There is mention that the My State Bar profile will be redesigned at the same time as the design work conducted by the vendor. Should we prioritize using the same component library that the MyStateBar profile is using, and will this component library be developed before the vendor's design system is created?

- No.
126. Are there brand guidelines or an existing design system that the selected vendor needs to work within? Are there any constraints to the level of brand and design recommendations that should be made? If brand guidelines exist, could they be made available for assessment during the response period?
- The State Bar does have existing Brand Guidelines, and they will be shared with the selected vendor.
127. Could you provide examples of websites that you aim to emulate in terms of design or functionality?
- We expect the selected vendor to do a comparison of websites that might be good models to meet our strategic goals and requirements during discovery phase.
128. How do you envision your content strategy changing (if at all) with the new website? Are there any target audiences you feel you are currently not reaching or would like to expand?
- The goal is to make the sites more user-friendly and accessible to all audiences.
129. What are the main limitations/weaknesses of your existing CMS?
- This will be shared with the chosen vendor during the discovery phase.
130. Should the CMS recommendations also include a hosting partner recommendation and any other integrations that could help improve workflows?
- Yes.
131. What technical skills does your internal development team possess for creating the final product? For instance, are they proficient in open-source PHP frameworks, or do they lean towards .NET development?
- Implementation is outside the scope of this project.
132. Will the vendor be supporting your teams through the development process?
- If additional support is required during the implementation phase, we will ask for a quote from the vendor for additional work.
133. Regarding the CMS recommendation, what implementation options are you considering? For example, are you expecting options such as a monolithic platform design, progressive web app, or microservices model? Should the vendor make recommendations for implementation options?
- Yes, we expect the selected vendor to make recommendations as a part of the CMS evaluation to better support the overall redesign effort. Implementation is outside the scope of this project.
134. What do you like/dislike about the current CMS.



- This will be shared with the chosen vendor during the discovery phase.
135. In order to help us better estimate cost, can you please clarify what kind of front-end coding is expected to be delivered in Section G, Design Phase: “Front-end coding (HTML/CSS) for responsive designs, accessible from a wide variety of devices.” Since redesign implementation is stated as outside the scope of this RFP, we would like to clarify the distinction.
- The deliverable should help us understand the front-end coding requirements to support the new designs for the websites.
136. How will you measure the success of the new website? What are some KPIs?
- This will be shared with the selected vendor during discovery.
137. How many internal developers & resources do you have to support this project, and what is their anticipated role in the initial development of the solution, ongoing maintenance, and feature enhancements to the website?
- Implementation is outside the scope of this RFP.
138. Will you need the vendor to help develop content?
- No.
139. Do you need documentation for governance of the website?
- No.
140. Is a compliance audit required?
- No.
141. What level?
- No ADA compliance audit is required, but the expectation is that the new designs meets our accessibility goals as stated in the RFP.
142. Are there existing brand guidelines that should be followed?
- The State Bar does have existing Brand Guidelines, and they will be shared with the selected vendor.
143. Do you anticipate data visualization
- We are open to receiving design suggestions for website data visualizations.
144. Are you open to additional templates?
- Yes.
145. Can you share the URL of websites that you feel are successful?
- We expect the selected vendor to do a comparison of websites that might be good models to meet our strategic goals and requirements during discovery phase.

146. Is there any existing user research or user feedback available?
- A user survey is anticipated for this project. The State Bar will work with the selected vendor to frame the survey questions and identify participants.
147. Are you interested in having user research and usability testing to ensure a user-friendly website?
- A user survey is anticipated for this project. The State Bar will work with the selected vendor to frame the survey questions and identify participants.
148. Are you able to provide participant recruitment if user research is desired?
- Yes.
149. Can you specify which vendor groups you are seeking input from?
- We do not understand the question.
150. Is there an incumbent vendor? If so, is that vendor bidding on this contract?
- No.
151. Is there preference for an in-state vendor
- The only requirement is for vendors to be located in the United States.
152. What is the budget/range for the project?
- The anticipated budget range for the project is \$200,000 - \$300,000.
153. What was your budget on the current site?
- The anticipated budget range for the project is \$200,000 - \$300,000.
154. What is the deadline for completion of the work?
- Target completion date for the redesign of the State Bar's websites, [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) and [www.statebarcourt.ca.gov](http://www.statebarcourt.ca.gov), is Q4 2024. This includes evaluation of the current CMS platform to determine its ability to meet the desired requirements and recommendations for a CMS platform to meet the technical requirements and meet the strategic goals outlined in the RFP. This timeline does not include implementation of the sites or launch.
155. Is a content inventory and audit included in the scope?
- We expect to have some elements of a content audit ready at engagement. This would include site analytics and a preliminary content inventory. We expect to work with the vendor on any other elements considered critical. We expect the selected vendor to provide a perspective on the right type of information architecture based on the current content available.
156. Will there be access to analytics for an audit and analysis?

- Yes, this will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase.
157. Is SEO part of the scope of work?
- Yes, this should be done as a part of the discovery phase of the project.
158. Most California agencies have adopted open source technologies at their core, and principally Drupal or WordPress for their websites. Is there a shortlist of CMS solutions that, if not on the list recommended at the end of this process, might feel like an omission?
- No.
159. What is the context for BigPipe being listed as a very specific technical requirement?
- We want to ensure that the site has quick load times and a better user experience.
160. As you may know, this technology is part of Drupal core. Are you signaling a CMS preference?
- BigPipe is a web framework for sending large amounts of data. We are not preferable to Drupal. We are also open for other similar types of modern frameworks.
161. Do you have an established internal styleguide or a perspective/mandate regarding the use of <https://designsystem.webstandards.ca.gov/>?
- We are open to suggestions for a web style guide.
162. Is there an incumbent applying for this opportunity?
- No.
163. Who are the key people and roles that will influence this project's direction?
- We will provide this to the selected vendor.
164. What aspects of the internal culture or external environment could put this redesign at risk to fail?
- This will be discussed during the discovery phase.
165. Can you please describe the scoring criteria for proposals? How much does price factor into the decision?
- The scoring rubric is detailed in the RFP on page 13. As noted there, total cost is 30 percent of the score. Please read the details in the scoring section.
166. Do you have an opinion about or preference for digital agencies over large consulting firms like Deloitte or Accenture?
- No.
167. The success of projects of this nature is greatly improved by strong relationships founded in clear communication and partnership. Presentations help us both better assess

our collaborative potential, and to begin to create a strong foundation that eases contracting. At this time, are you forecasting scheduling interviews with finalists?

- Yes.

168. Are there any intranet-type features or specific logged in functionality in scope in this project?

- Not at this time.

169. Please provide more detail on the process of updating the My State Bar Profile application.

- This application integration is outside the scope of this project.

170. Is this run and managed in-house, or with an external digital agency? Is the technology platform for the revised version known?

- The website is managed by staff internally.

171. Your RFP calls for the creation of website personas. While marketing personas still provide value, we have found that traditional personas risk introducing bias in the UX design process and shifted away from them a number of years ago. More recently, we have adopted a framework of user types and goals, designed to be more inclusive. Are you open to reformulation of the discovery program artifacts in order to better serve your stated goals?

- Yes.

172. Are you open to a provisional evaluation of CMS options earlier in the program, to be later validated through the design process? While our design process is CMS agnostic, understanding the general CMS direction can provide opportunities to leverage core capabilities of the target platform to streamline design, and optimize budget impact.

- Yes. We are open to discussing more details during the discovery phase.

173. Neither of the sites currently exhibit robust multilingual or translation capabilities. While the RFP does not seek these features, other state bodies we have worked with do require them. Could you expand a bit on your rationale for including or excluding multilingual capabilities on your websites?

- We welcome recommendations from the selected vendor for improving the multilingual capabilities on the websites for future consideration.

174. Could you please expand on the types of forms you would like to embed in the website?

- We will discuss with the selected vendor during discovery.

175. Do these leverage third party technologies and if so, which ones? Could you provide example URLs where these forms currently exist?

- We will discuss with the selected vendor during discovery.

176. Could you please expand on your definition of “advanced search”? Is this AI-enabled search, faceted search, or other paradigms?

- We want a site that provides comprehensive and relevant search results. We are looking to the vendor on best practices to improve the user experience when using the search feature.

177. Could you please expand on the 20+ integrations? What is the depth of these integrations?

- We will discuss with the selected vendor during discovery.

178. Which are just external links, and which are deeper API integrations? Are any 3rd party tools being phased out or new ones being brought on that would impact this program?

- Details of the integrations with our two public websites can be provided to the selected vendor during the discovery phase to support the design strategy.

179. Please expand on the rationale for requesting financial statements. As a privately held entity, we typically do not disclose cash on hand or financial details short of assuring our financial stability. What are you looking to determine from these numbers, how do they weigh into the decision making process, and what metrics might disqualify a participant? Understanding, for example, that you have a minimum top line revenue requirement would save many agencies countless hours mounting proposals.

- The financial statements are required for several reasons including assessment of financial stability and viability of bidders, risk evaluation, capacity of bidders to meet obligations, transparency and accountability. Bidders may provide desired documents in response to the requirements.

180. We would like to request that detailed financial information be removed as a requirement for submission. Are you willing to meet for a debrief regardless of the outcomes of the award?

- Bidders may provide alternative documents in response to the requirements.

181. Do you have a budget in mind for this project you’re able to share? (Or a ‘not to exceed’ limit?)

- The anticipated budget range for this project is \$200,000 - \$300,000.

182. Are you partial to California-local agencies?

- No. The only requirement is for the vendors to be located in the U.S.

183. You’ve requested personas, however we often find personas to be problematic because the focus is on demographics rather than behavior. We recommend doing user journeys instead- a document that outlines the key touchpoints and calls to action for priority users. Would you find user journeys to be an acceptable replacement for personas or do you need personas for a particular reason?

- We are open to suggestions.

184. Are there particular problems with the sites that you'd like to be resolved in these redesigns?
- This will be shared with the chosen vendor during the discovery phase.
185. Are there any particular new features that you'd like the sites to have?
- Any new features or functionalities outside of what is listed in the RFP can be discussed during the discovery phase.
186. Have you done any user research on either of the sites?
- A user survey is anticipated for this project. The State Bar will work with the selected vendor to frame the survey questions and identify participants.
187. Who are the stakeholders of this project?
- This will be shared with the selected vendor.
188. You mention Front-end coding (HTML/CSS) for responsive designs, accessible from a wide variety as a design phase deliverable. What are you envisioning with this deliverable? An interactive prototype? We use a Figma to prototype and show intended interactions and link up page types...we have found our devs can glean the info needed from Figma to get into the build. But if you're hoping for actual FE code for reusable components to take to your chosen CMS, we'll scope accordingly.
- As outlined in the RFP, expected deliverables include design mockups, wireframes, and prototypes. Figma is acceptable to show prototypes. Deliverable "front-end coding" can be created with a preferred CMS in mind. If there is any work needed from the design vendor during the implementation phase, the State Bar would ask for an additional quote for this work.
189. Do you have brand guidelines for the State Bar of California we would be working with?
- Yes, the State Bar has existing Brand Guidelines.
190. When is the kickoff for the redesign of the My State Bar Profile Application tool?
- The My State Bar Profile application is outside the scope of this RFP.
191. Beyond the existing DNN CMS, are there any specific CMS platforms that you would like included in the CMS Evaluation?
- We do not have any specific CMS platforms in mind.
192. Is there an expectation around how many CMS platforms should be included in the CMS Evaluation?
- No.
193. What do you mean by feature throttling? Does this refer to reducing features on the mobile version or something?

- We included Lazy Loading and Feature Throttling as examples of helping a web page load faster and preserving API performance.
194. Wanted to confirm you are not married to continuing with DNN as your CMS, correct?
- Correct.
195. Do you have published brand standards and a style guide? Going forward do you envision more UX unity between the two sites or should they remain somewhat separate?
- Yes, the State Bar has existing Brand Guidelines. We are open to design suggestions.
196. Please detail what members are able to do once they log into the site.
- The applications are outside the scope of this RFP. For the two public sites in this RFP, only internal staff can have log in access to manage content and components.
197. How would you describe the purpose of the 'Attorney Search' feature and the profiles that search turns up? Do you think your members view it the same way and find that they get value from it?
- The Attorney Search function is a fundamental public service that is key to the State Bar's public protection mission. It allows consumers to search for attorneys and verify that an attorney is licensed to practice law in California.
198. What are some of the specific pain points with the current CMS and how are those affecting staff's efficiency and use of time?
- This will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase.
199. Are you happy with the language translation features on the current sites? Where could those be improved?
- This will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase.
200. How many editors do you have on the current sites?
- This is outside the scope of this RFP.
201. Can you topline the method of integration for each of the 20 or so third party systems you use now? iframe, API, other, if SSO is needed, etc.
- Details of the integrations with our two public websites can be provided to the selected vendor during the discovery phase to support the design strategy. Most are iFrame or embedded.
202. How will you define (and measure) success once the redesign is completed?
- This will be shared with the selected vendor during the discovery phase.
203. Do you have a budget or budget range in mind for this project?
- The anticipated budget range is \$200,000 - \$300,000.

204. How much do you spend annually on hosting and maintenance for the current sites.
- This is not relevant to this RFP.
205. Will you be considering partner agencies outside of California?
- Yes. The only requirement is that the vendor must be located in the U.S.
206. Will you be considering partner agencies who have not worked for California's state government? (Again, we have worked at the Federal Government level.)
- Yes. Proposers should detail their experience designing government websites.
207. Are you open to WordPress for your CMS? This is our preferred CMS and we are a gold partner of WordPress VIP.
- The selected vendor is expected to evaluate and recommend a CMS as a part of the deliverables. The CMS should meet the technical requirements and strategic goals and initiatives outlined in the RFP.
208. What is your budget for the project? Our engagements begin at \$250K. Is this in your ballpark?
- The anticipated budget range is \$200,000 - \$300,000.