Request for Information No. VIII RFP No. 25/26-01 Artificial Intelligence Platforms

September 16, 2025

Please see the website at https://edtechjpa.org/rfp-no-2526-01-artificial-intelligence-platforms for previous RFIs.

Response to Proposers' Questions

8.1 **Question**: Is the pricing similar to GSA schedule with rates for roles?

Answer: Vendors should respond with existing solutions that meet the required criteria (green with double asterisks). Ed Tech JPA understands that Vendors may offer services that are not covered in standard licensing costs (for example: customization, consulting, service, labor, etc). Hourly rates for services and labor may be included on the Pricing Form. The Pricing Form includes sections for Implementation costs, Training Costs, Other costs, and Optional Services/Solutions, in an effort to allow Vendors to include all costs. All costs must be included in the proposal, and pricing should be transparent and easy for members to understand.

Ed Tech JPA is open to different options for pricing structure. The pricing form is designed to allow Vendors to capture a variety of pricing approaches including per-student and per-FTE models. Vendors may incorporate tiers in their pricing model (e.g. a lower per-student price for districts with more than 20,000 students). Additionally, time and materials pricing (such as a standard rate for custom development or training) are common on our RFPs. Vendors may differentiate these hourly rates by role (e.g., senior developer, project manager, business analyst). Some vendors may also approach pricing as a standard discount off of list pricing. This approach (discount of list) is acceptable if Vendors' list pricing is included in the RFP response, and/or publicly available.

8.2 **Question**: Will the JPA consider a 2 week extension for the due date?

Answer: Unfortunately, Ed Tech JPA has members who are dependent on the timeline for this RFP, and has staff allocated to scoring during the timeline, and is unable to extend this RFP. This RFP has been open since July 28th. Ed Tech JPA scheduled the 9 week open period in hopes that it is enough time for vendors to draft responses.

8.3 **Question**: Regarding the general requirement (3.1) is there a threshold (how much AI) to qualify as a "core...integral component"?

Answer: Section 3.1 includes the following statement "Reminder: The proposed solution must feature artificial intelligence (AI) as a core, integral component of its primary functionality. Solutions in which AI is limited to minor features, add-ons, or enhancements (e.g., AI-powered search or reporting within an otherwise traditional software product) will not be considered responsive to this solicitation".

Ed Tech JPA does not have a specific percentage based threshold regarding how much AI a solution must have to qualify for this procurement. This RFP is for products where AI is the primary focus (core engine of the product). Many products with AI as the core focus will include content creation, and personalization to support instruction and/or operational efficiencies. Please see specific RFP criteria for details.

If the proposed product is a student information system (SIS), learning management system (LMS,) or website tool, etc. with AI enhancements, that product may be better suited for another RFP specific to the core nature of the product. Solutions that are not primarily a core AI solution will not be awarded for this RFP, however our team may notify proposers that their product may be better suited to a future RFP and relay the anticipated timeline for those RFPs.

8.4 **Question**: Is the first prebid proposal call recording and/or transcription available?

Answer: There is not a transcription or recording available however, all questions asked during the first vendor conference are available in RFI No. I. All questions received, including in this call and submitted in writing are available as RFIs on the Ed Tech JPA website at https://edtechipa.org/rfp-no-2526-01-artificial-intelligence-platforms.

8.5 **Question**: 1.2.1 states that subcontractors Azure and Amazon Web Services are considered sub-contractors. If a vendor is reselling Google or Oracle they should be considered subcontractors?

Answer: Criteria 1.2.1 states that "Any subcontractors performing services against this agreement must be fully listed and detailed in the proposal submitted by Vendor. State any work proposed to be provided by a subcontractor, and provide evidence of each subcontractor's capability and willingness to carry out the work. Please keep in mind that hosting providers, such as AWS and Azure, are considered subcontractors".

Yes, for the purposes of this criteria Google and Oracle would count as subprocessors. Educational agencies are subject to stringent privacy laws and must ensure that student data is stored in a legal, privacy compliant manner. Hosting solutions may house confidential data and their performance affects the availability of the proposed Solution. Please rest assured that Ed Tech JPA does not require Google, Oracle, or other third party hosting agencies to sign an agreement.

8.6 **Question**: Would the cloud vendor accounts be owned by the school district, or would that be owned by us (vendor)?

Answer: Ownership of cloud accounts may be dependent on the nature of the proposed Solution. The Vendor would likely own the cloud accounts if they are proposing a SaaS Solution or a custom AI that is configured and maintained by the Vendor. If the Vendor is proposing a Solution that would be hosted and maintained by the Member (customer), the Member would likely own the cloud accounts.

If the Vendor is hosting the Solution, or leveraging a cloud service to host the Solution, any hosting provider must be listed as a subprocessor. Vendors are responsible for ensuring that subprocessors comply with the expectations laid out in the RFP, including the NDPA (privacy agreement).

If Vendors are proposing an on-premise, or a Solution where the Member would select and implement their own hosted environment, Vendor does not need to list the cloud services provider. However, Vendor's response and pricing form should include adequate information for Participants to estimate their costs and select an appropriate hosting provider option.

Vendors must be clear about what is included in the Solution. If cloud services are not included as part of the proposed Solution, and are required for the Solution to function as described in the RFP, Vendor must explicitly state the requirements for Members to provide their own cloud accounts, as well as the details the Solution requires.

8.7 **Question**: and is the cloud resource costs as part of the proposal?

Answer: Any and all infrastructure costs must be included in proposals.

Vendors should respond with existing solutions that meet the required criteria (green with double asterisks). Vendors who are proposing a custom SaaS solution to be developed on an existing platform, with infrastructure provided by the district, must be clear about this in their proposals. For custom solutions Vendors must be clear about what functionality already exists in the Solution, and what may be custom designed. All awarded Vendors must have strong histories of providing relevant products and services.

It is not typical for Ed Tech JPA to award to Vendors who offer services to build a solution from scratch. Typically public agencies don't require a purchasing vehicle for professional services, which may include custom development. Ed Tech JPA is more focused on providing a procurement avenue for existing solutions.

8.8 **Question**: Will the system go through a 3rd party security audit and do we need to include the costs for that?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA does not currently require 3rd party audits with proposals. Vendors with established solutions are expected to have internal security audits which could be provided to the purchasing member in a redacted form for the confirmation of adequate security practices.

Vendors who are proposing a custom SaaS solution to be developed on an existing platform should include ALL costs to get the custom Solution production ready. This includes, but is not limited to development, audits, privacy compliance, etc. If vendors are unsure if a service is required they may include it as an optional add-on (Ex: when building a house, including the city permit as an optional cost, with pricing listed).

For custom Solutions, all additional installation and configuration services offered by Vendors should also be included in the proposals, so members can estimate what those costs are when evaluating proposals.

8.9 **Question**: Do you accept offshore resources? Is any mandatory registration or certification needed?

Answer: Pursuant to section 4.1 of the RFP "Vendors submitting Proposals for Solutions that house student data must be located in either the United States or in a country where the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) governs and must perform the proposed Solution in either the United States or in a country where the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) governs. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Vendors not in the US and not subject to GDPR may be considered, but must fully demonstrate their compliance with US and California State privacy laws (as covered in the CA-NDPA provided in the RFP). Vendors outside of the United States that house student data must agree to the Standard Student Data Privacy Agreement CA-NDPA with no redlines/amendments. Vendors should note that some Members may have board policies and procedures that limit their ability to contract with agencies outside the United States".

Pursuant to criteria 1.3 "Vendors who are not located in the United States, but who are located in a country where the GDPR governs and/or who do not perform their proposed Solutions in the United States, but whose performance is in a country where the GDPR governs (Foreign Vendors), must include at least three (3) references located within the United States that use the Solution".

Please be advised that many educational agencies are unable to contract with or issue Purchase Orders to Vendors who do not have an address in the United States.

8.10 **Question**: The RFP speaks to the provider providing support for up to 5 years after the agreement is finalized, can this be provided remotely?

Answer: Typically school districts and public agencies prefer that the Vendor who provides the Solution also supports it for an ongoing basis. For most AI Solutions this support would not be expected to be on-site support. The criteria in sections 1.6 & 2 allows Vendors to describe their support hours and additional details about how they support the proposed Solutions.

8.11 **Question**: Can you offer more context and guidance for the "Disclosure of Proposal", i.e. full proposal vs redacted proposal? Which parts of the proposal can be redacted?

Answer: The Disclosure of Proposal Form is specifically related to the posting of Vendor proposals on password protected members-only webpages. Unless Vendors prefer to redact their proposals, members get access to full proposals so they can determine what Solution best meets their needs. These proposals are <u>not</u> publicly available.

Additionally, Ed Tech JPA is a public entity and is subject to the California Public Records Act (Government Code, sections 6250 et seq). Please see section 3.11 of the RFP for additional information.

Please rest assured that Ed Tech JPA reaches out to Vendors when we receive public record requests, to allow for a redaction of trade secrets and/or confidential information. Typically screenshots and descriptions of the product do not meet the threshold of "trade secret"; and pricing is considered a public record.

If a Vendor allows for the posting of the full proposal on the members-only webpage they will still be notified if there is a public records request that includes the proposal.

8.12 **Question**: What is your preferred approach to training on the Chatbot system? Do you expect in-depth technical training, or would high-level operational training suffice?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different desires related to training.

Vendors should include their available options in proposals and allow members to select the option they prefer. For a standard Solution typically standard training would be sufficient, but please include all options in your proposal.

8.13 **Question**: If a manufacturer does not allow a reseller or system integrator to list the manufacturer as a subcontractor, would that disqualify the responding firm?

Answer: If the manufacturer does not allow Vendor to list it as a subcontractor, it may not necessarily disqualify a Vendor. If the Vendor will carry the warranties and liabilities, can provide documentation showing its legal ability to sell the product, and confirm that adequate privacy and security standards will be upheld then Ed Tech JPA may be able to work with them.

8.14 **Question**: 2.3.3 says Vendors need to have DOJ clearance. Exactly what do we need for that?

Answer: Section 2.3.3 states "2.3.3 DOJ Clearance All Vendor personnel working on any Participant site shall have attained the proper Department of Justice (DOJ) clearance as required by applicable laws and the Participant policy. Vendor must comply with this requirement and, upon request from Participant, must demonstrate this clearance for all personnel prior to being allowed onsite. Those who are not cleared may not be allowed on the project".

DOJ clearance is required for all Vendors who work onsite or have contact with students pursuant to Education Code Section 45125.1.

8.15 **Question**: Are there Amendments to this RFP as of today? I have not seen anyone yet. Did I miss anything?

Answer: There are no amendments to the RFP at this time, however we advise you to check the Ed Tech JPA website and read all the RFIs for this RFP. Ed Tech JPA's deadline to post Amendments and RFIs is September 23, 2025.

8.16 **Question**: Is it too late for us to get involved in this process or do you think a collaboration is worthwhile?

Answer: Proposals will be accepted through September 30, 2025 at 12:00pm. Ed Tech JPA does not collaborate or have communications with Vendors during an open RFP. All questions are answered through the RFI process.

8.17 **Question**: Are you looking for a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) solution, or a fully custom-built service?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.7.

8.18 **Question**: Who is the current incumbent vendor?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Members will have different levels of implementation of AI platforms and incumbent vendors.

8.19 **Question**: Is the incumbent vendor eligible and expected to participate in this RFP process?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.18 regarding incumbent vendors.

8.20 **Question**: Are there any existing platforms / systems that chatbots must integrate with?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different existing platforms and systems for chatbot integration. Vendors should provide a list of all platforms and systems that they have existing integrations with.

8.21 **Question**: Is there a requirement for the chatbots to support languages other than English?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to languages. Vendors should include the different languages supported by their Solutions.

8.22 **Question**: Do you have any specific concerns regarding Chatbot tone, language style, or cultural sensitivity that we should incorporate into the development process?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different concerns related to Chatbot tone, language style, and cultural sensitivity. Vendors should include the capabilities of the Solution.

8.23 **Question**: How much data will be anticipated annually in MBs, GBs or TBs?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different levels of data. Vendors must be clear about any usage limits and any pricing constraints related to data.

8.24 **Question**: How many users will be concurrently accessing the system? Also, please specify the total number of users?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different numbers of users and concurrent users. Vendors should include any limitations of the Solution and pricing in their proposals.

8.25 **Question**: Are there any existing benchmarks or case studies from that you would like us to consider when designing the chatbot?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA does not have any existing benchmarks or case studies it would like Vendors to consider when developing chatbots.

Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different desires related to chatbots.

8.26 **Question**: Would you be open to conducting a pilot phase to measure early outcomes before full implementation?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to implementation timelines and the levels of evaluation. Some members may be open to a pilot phase and others may prefer to select a Vendor and fully implement the selected system without a pilot phase.

8.27 **Question**: What is your preferred approach to training on the Chatbot system? Do you expect in-depth technical training, or would high-level operational training suffice?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.12.

8.28 **Question**: What is the overall implementation timeline and go-live for the system?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to implementation timelines and desired go-live dates.

8.29 **Question**: Do you expect the vendor to perform any tasks on-site, or can all work be performed remotely?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.10.

8.30 **Question**: Do you accept offshore resources?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.9.

8.31 **Question**: Are there any specific budget constraints or expectations that we should be aware of in terms of both upfront implementation costs and ongoing operational expenses?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different budget constraints. Vendors should propose their pricing, including different options and tiers to allow members to evaluate solutions with all relevant information.

8.32 **Question**: Will you provide your own datasets for model training/tuning, or should the vendor supply models out-of-the-box?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different desires related to providing datasets for model training/tuning.

8.33 **Question**: Which **modules** are mandatory vs. optional? (General AI, Staff AI, Student AI, Intelligent Tutoring, Multimedia, Meeting Assistant, Research AI, Custom AI)

Answer: Section 3.1 General is required for Vendors to be considered for award. Sections 3.2 - 3.8 (Staff AI Platform, Student AI Platform, Intelligent Tutoring System (ITS), Multimedia Creation AI, AI Meeting Assistant, AI Research Too/Deep Research, Custom AI Instance) will be awarded separately and are not required for award.

Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants may have different needs related to the modules. Vendors should propose the functionality of their Solutions so members can evaluate according to their unique needs.

8.34 **Question**: Do modules need to be purchased separately or bundled?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA understands that Vendors have different needs related to how pricing is structured. The Pricing Form is provided so Vendor pricing is transparent and Members can base evaluations on accurate information, however Ed Tech JPA does not intend to control how Vendors price Solutions.

Vendors should include module pricing either separately, bundled, or with both options, depending on how they prefer to structure pricing. Often Vendors will offer both options, with bundled pricing offered at a discounted price.

8.35 **Question**: What is your expected timeline from award to go-live?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.28.

8.36 **Question**: Do you require onsite training, or is remote sufficient?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.10.

8.37 **Question**: What level of technical support is expected (24/7, school hours, ticket turnaround times)?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to technical support. The criteria in sections 1.6 & 2 allows Vendors to describe their support hours and additional details about how they support the proposed Solutions. Vendors should respond with levels of support available.

8.38 **Question**: Do you require data migration assistance from legacy systems?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to possible data migration from legacy systems.

8.39 **Question**: Should pricing be per user, per school, or enterprise-wide?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA understands that Vendors have different needs related to how pricing is structured. The Pricing Form is provided so Vendor pricing is transparent and Members can base evaluations on accurate information, however Ed Tech JPA does not intend to control how Vendors price Solutions. Vendors may provide pricing in their desired format (per user, per school, enterprise-wide, or another option). If offering per school please be clear if District Office and administrative staff is included at no additional cost, considered one school site, or another format.

8.40 **Question**: Do you want multi-year pricing commitments or annual renewals?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA typically enters into a five (5) year Master Agreement with awarded vendors to govern the terms of the award and relationship between Ed Tech JPA and awarded Vendors. Proposed pricing must remain valid for the length of the Master Agreement, as this is a formal procurement. If pricing is expected to escalate annually Vendors must include details in the Pricing Form.

Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to agreement term length. The Purchase Agreement does not allow for automatic renewals, but allows for mutually agreed renewals/extensions.

If there is a discount for entering into a specific Purchase Agreement term length please include that information in the Pricing Form and Section 4: Price.

8.41 **Question**: How should we price optional services/features — flat, tiered, or usage-based?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA understands that Vendors have different needs related to how pricing is structured. Optional features may be offered as flat, tiered, usage-based, hourly, or other pricing, depending on the Vendor's preference and the optional service/feature offered. The Pricing Form is provided so Vendor pricing is transparent and Members can base evaluations on accurate information, however Ed Tech JPA does not intend to control how Vendors price Solutions. Vendors should include all pricing options in the Pricing Form, so members can leverage the Purchase Agreement to make purchases.

8.42 **Question**: What are your SLA expectations (uptime %, response times, disaster recovery RTO/RPO)?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to service level agreement expectations. Vendors should include their SLA information in the relevant criteria and members can consider them when evaluating Solutions.

Question: We respectfully request a two-week extension of the proposal due date to October 14, 2025. As a Value-Added Reseller (VAR), we are required to obtain approvals from the CSP/OEM in order to bid their offering, as well as provide technical content specific to their solution. This approval process typically spans several weeks. While we have taken steps to expedite these requirements, additional time would ensure that we can provide a complete and thorough response commensurate with the scope and importance of this opportunity. Thank you for your consideration of this request. We appreciate your understanding and look forward to submitting a comprehensive proposal.

Answer: Please see RFI 8.2.

8.44 **Question**: Can you clarify whether the proposed AI platform must include built-in compliance with the CA-NDPA Standard Student Data Privacy Agreement, or is it sufficient to demonstrate the ability to integrate with such standard post-award?

Answer: Vendors must agree to sign the Standard Student Data Privacy Agreement prior to award, however the agreement does not need to be finalized until after award.

Vendors should describe existing privacy protections within the Solution.

8.45 **Question**: Should the AI platform include adaptive learning features or personalized learning pathways?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to adaptive learning features and personalized learning pathways. Vendors should include the adaptive features and personalized learning pathways available in their Solutions and members will evaluate Solutions based on their needs.

8.46 **Question**: Does the AI platform need to support multimodal AI (e,g., text voice, image) or is text-based interaction sufficient?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to multimodal AI. Vendors should include the multimodal AI features in their Solutions and members will evaluate Solutions based on their needs.

8.47 **Question**: Is integration with existing SIS or LMS platforms required?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to integrations with existing platforms. Vendors should include existing integrations and members will evaluate Solutions based on their unique needs.

8.48 **Question**: Will Ed Tech JPA require a third-party audit or security assessment prior to deployment?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.8.

8.49 **Question**: Is there a budget ceiling or range that the proposers should be aware of?

Answer: Please see RFI 8.31.

8.50 **Question**: Are references from other California school districts required or preferred?

Answer: Criteria 1.3.1 requires references from three (3) educational or government organizations currently serviced by the Vendor. References do not need to be located in California.

8.51 **Question**: Will accessibility WCAG 2.1 compliance be required?

Answer: WCAG 2.1 compliance is not required for award. Vendors who are not WCAG compliant should be transparent in their proposals. Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to WCAG compliance, especially depending on the use of the AI Solution being considered.

8.52 **Question**: Appendix D of the price form appears somewhat limited in capturing the complexity of pricing cloud solutions. Would it be acceptable for respondents to include an additional attachment with detailed pricing notes and descriptions to supplement the form?

Answer: The Pricing Form has been created in an effort to create transparency related to pricing. Ed Tech JPA is aware that AI solutions may have complex pricing. Vendors may submit additional pricing forms as long as pricing is transparent. Ed Tech JPA may ask for additional clarity related to Vendors' pricing forms through clarifying questions.

8.53 **Question**: Would the Customer reconsider the requirement that hosting providers be considered subcontractors under the RFP? The way Oracle structures its distribution agreements with its partners prohibits any partners from entering into any end user contractual relationships under which Oracle is considered a subcontractor. Instead, Oracle partners stand in front of Oracle and are the party with privity of contract with the end user. Oracle partners pass through all Oracle authorized warranties and liabilities, and would be the party the Customer looks to for warranty/liability of the offering.

Answer: Please see RFIs 8.5 and 8.13.

8.54 **Question**: We are a system integrator and AI solution provider. For our RFP response, we intend to submit multiple AI solutions designed for educational or government organizations. Regarding the References section, are we required to provide three unique confirmations of operational use, actively supported by Vendor (references) for each individual solution/ product, or do we need to submit only three references for the entire RFP submission as a whole?

Answer: For vendors submitting proposals including multiple solutions different references should be submitted for each solution. Please be clear in your proposal regarding which solution meets each criteria by either including separate sections for each product, or differentiating in responses. Each product must be listed separately in the Pricing Form. Please see RFI 1.1 for additional information.

8.55 **Question**: What organization is the primary beneficiary of the Vendor solution in this RFP? Is it Irvine Unified School District?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a 211 varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Awards will be available to all Ed Tech JPA members.

Irvine Unified School District is the initiating district and currently has an AI steering committee that is starting pilots of some products this year. Irvine USD has a high interest in each of these tools that meet criteria for Functionality and Usability sections: 3.1 (General), 3.2 (Staff AI Platform), and 3.3 (Student AI Platform). Irvine USD does not currently have immediate interest in section 3.4 (intelligent Tutoring System - ITS).

8.56 **Question**: What workloads is the end user organization looking to run on this Vendor solution?

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different needs related to workloads. Vendors should include any limitations and all pricing so members can evaluate Solutions based on their needs.

8.57 **Question**: Can you quantify the frequency (number of users, number of locations, frequency of calling on the cloud or on prem hosted solution each week/month/year)

Answer: Ed Tech JPA represents a large and varied number of local educational agencies. Ed Tech JPA members vary in size from 1,500 ADA to 600,000 ADA. Participants will have different frequencies. Vendors should include any limitations and all pricing so members can evaluate Solutions based on their needs.