

D2L Answers to Questions – RFP ID: D2L-2026-SLM

The following responses are provided for clarification purposes only. They do not introduce new requirements, modify evaluation criteria, or supersede the terms of the RFP. In the event of any inconsistency, the RFP remains the governing document.

Section 1 — Strategic Intent and Partnership Model

1.1 The RFP references D2L's intent to "resell" or "jointly position" the marketplace alongside Brightspace. Could you clarify the primary commercial model you are seeking — for example:

- **D2L white-labels the marketplace within Brightspace,**
- **D2L resells the marketplace as a standalone but co-branded product, or**
- **a co-sell arrangement where both organizations independently market to their respective customer bases?**

D2L Response:

The RFP does not prescribe a single commercial or go-to-market model. As stated in **Section 2 (RFP Objective)**, D2L is seeking a marketplace solution whose capabilities can be **resold or jointly positioned alongside Brightspace**, depending on customer segment and use case.

Vendors may describe the commercial and partnership model associated with their proposed solution, provided it aligns with the scope and objectives outlined in the RFP.

Section 2 — Marketplace Composition and Content Network (Section 5.2)

2.1 In relation to Section 5.2, is D2L open to a blended marketplace model that includes:

- **Canadian post-secondary institutions and training providers,**
- **global online platforms (LinkedIn Learning, Udemy, Coursera),**
- **private training vendors and industry certifications,**
- **wraparound services (career coaching, mental health supports, business start-up resources, financial literacy),**
where these services are integral to workforce development and employment outcomes?

D2L Response:

Yes. As reflected in Section 5.2, the RFP allows for a marketplace that includes a range of learning providers and offerings, provided the overall solution aligns with the RFP's focus on skills-based learning, upskilling, workforce development, and employment related pathways. As indicated by 5.2.2 specifically, we have an interest in offerings from Canadian institutions and content providers.

The RFP does not prescribe a specific marketplace composition model.

2.2 The RFP asks for a curated catalogue of post-secondary institutions and training providers. Does D2L expect the marketplace partner to have all catalogue relationships fully contracted at time of proposal, or is a committed roadmap to acquire additional Canadian content partnerships acceptable? What is the minimum acceptable percentage of Canadian content at launch versus at 12 months?

D2L Response:

The RFP does not require that all catalogue relationships be fully contracted at the time of proposal submission, nor does it prescribe a minimum percentage of Canadian content.

As described in Section 5.7.4, the RFP provides vendors the opportunity to describe upcoming releases and planned capabilities as part of their roadmap. For evaluation purposes, D2L will assess the catalogue providers and offerings available at the time of proposal submission separately from future-looking or roadmap items. This distinction supports D2L's ability to evaluate the solution as it exists today while also considering planned capabilities where provided.

2.3 Does D2L have a preference for course catalogue depth (many courses within a few domains) versus breadth (a wide range of topics and certifications across sectors)?

D2L Response:

The RFP does not prescribe a preference for catalogue depth or breadth. Vendors may describe their catalogue strategy and how it supports the use cases and customer needs identified in the RFP.

Section 3 — Government Funding Models and Program Workflows (Sections 5.3–5.4)

3.1 In Sections 5.3 and 5.4, the RFP asks about tuition workflows and learning assistance. Should vendors assume support only for traditional employer tuition reimbursement and corporate learning workflows, or do you also anticipate use cases involving government-specific funding and program models — such as:

- **Training vouchers or learner accounts (where governments pre-fund learner access),**
- **Grant-funded cohort programs (where a government entity pre-funds training for a population),**
- **Outcome-based payments (where vendors are paid based on completion or employment outcomes),**
- **Caseworker-approved interventions (where employment services staff approve training as part of case plans)?**

D2L Response:

Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the RFP request information on tuition and learning assistance workflows. The RFP does not limit responses to a single funding or program model. Vendors may describe how their solution supports applicable funding and workflow scenarios within the scope of the RFP.

3.2 For government customers, how important is the ability to segment learner populations and configure differentiated approval, budget control, and payment workflows per program type? For example, should the marketplace support distinct workflows for: unemployed job seekers, incumbent workers seeking upskilling, displaced workers, and individuals with barriers to employment?

D2L Response:

The RFP does not prescribe specific segmentation or workflow requirements. Vendors may describe relevant capabilities that support multiple learner populations or program structures, where applicable, in response to requirements.

3.3 Does D2L anticipate the marketplace needing to integrate with external government systems — such as employment services case management platforms, social assistance systems, or public employment service (PES) infrastructure — where training is a funded intervention?

D2L Response:

The scope of this RFP is focused on a reseller or jointly positioned marketplace arrangement. Integration needs, if any, would be assessed on a case-by-case basis for specific customer opportunities once a reseller arrangement is in place and according to the needs of specific opportunities. Vendors may describe prior experience with integrations and their general approach to interoperability for informational purposes.

3.4 For government customers, are there standard reporting requirements — such as program performance dashboards per government specification, equity and inclusion breakdowns, or provincial/territorial compliance reporting — that the marketplace should be capable of supporting?

D2L Response

The RFP does not prescribe standardized government reporting requirements. As outlined in **Section 5.5**, vendors may describe configurable reporting and analytics capabilities relevant to employer or government use cases.

Section 4 — Skills Intelligence, Career Pathing, and Employment Outcomes (Section 5.1)

4.1 Section 5.1.1 references AI-driven personalized learning or career pathways. Could you provide more detail on your expectations regarding:

- **How transparent and explainable recommendations should be to learners and employers,**
- **The level of auditability required for government clients (e.g., for compliance, program evaluation, or public accountability),**
- **Safeguards you expect to see to reduce the risk of bias in skills inference, matching, and job recommendations?**

D2L Response:

D2L places strong emphasis on **responsible and trustworthy use of AI**. Vendors may describe how their solution addresses transparency, auditability, and responsible AI practices (e.g., safeguards to mitigate bias and support equitable outcomes) in the context of their solution.

4.2 A key differentiator in modern workforce platforms is the ability to connect course recommendations directly to live labour-market demand signals (real job postings, vacancy data, regional skills shortages, high-growth occupations). Would D2L place additional value on a marketplace that ties course and micro-credential recommendations to current job-market data and surfaces those insights to learners, employers, and government program administrators?

D2L Response:

Vendors may describe how their solution incorporates labour-market insights and how those insights are surfaced to learners, employers, and program administrators as part of their solution capabilities.

4.3 Would D2L consider it advantageous for the marketplace partner to bring a domain-specific, workforce-focused AI capability — such as specialized models for job search, resume critique, skills inference, and labour-market intelligence — rather than relying solely on generic AI features available in conventional learning platforms?

D2L Response:

Vendors may describe such capabilities where relevant to the requirements and should clearly distinguish between current functionality and future-looking features.

4.4 Section 5.1.3 asks how your marketplace meets the needs of employers and government agencies looking to offer reskilling and upskilling. Are employment outcomes — such as job placements, wage progression, promotions, time-to-employment, and durability of employment — important KPIs for the marketplace in addition to learning analytics, particularly for public sector customers?

D2L Response:

Requirement 5.1.3 asks how the solution meets employer and government needs for reskilling and upskilling. Vendors may describe outcome-related metrics supported by their solution here or where relevant to the RFP Requirements.

Section 5 — Integration with Brightspace and Technical Architecture

5.1 What level of technical integration does D2L expect between the marketplace and Brightspace at launch — for example:

- **Single Sign-On (SSO) only,**
- **Embedded course launch via LTI 1.3,**
- **Full API-level integration with course completions and learner records passed back to Brightspace,**
- **Deeper data exchange including skills, credentials, and career path data?**

D2L Response:

The scope of the RFP is focused on a **reseller or jointly positioned marketplace arrangement**. The RFP does not require technical integration between solutions as part of this initial scope.

5.2 Does D2L have a published API or integration framework vendors should adhere to? If so, can this be shared as a supplement to the RFP?

D2L Response:

The scope of this RFP is focused on a **reseller or jointly positioned marketplace arrangement**. The RFP does not require technical integration between solutions as part of this initial scope.

5.3 For customers who use Brightspace as their LMS, how should the marketplace handle course completions and certifications — should these be surfaced in the learner's Brightspace record, reported independently, or both?

D2L Response:

The scope of this RFP is focused on a **reseller or jointly positioned marketplace arrangement**. The RFP does not require technical integration between solutions as part of the initial scope.

Section 6 — Co-Innovation and Joint Product Development

6.1 Would D2L be interested in a phased approach where a vendor launches with a strong foundation of existing capabilities and commits to specific enhancements and scale-up milestones post-award? If so, what is D2L's expected timeline from award to full go-live, and how flexible is the evaluation process regarding roadmap commitments versus current features?

D2L Response:

The scope of this RFP is focused on a reseller or jointly positioned marketplace arrangement.

Vendors may describe planned enhancements or roadmap items in response to Section 5.7 (Vendor Experience & Roadmap). D2L is looking to understand current capabilities separately from future looking or roadmap items.

Timelines beyond proposal submission are TBD.

Section 7 — Data Residency, Security, and Compliance

7.1 Section 5.8.2 requires confirmation that all Canadian customer data can be stored exclusively in Canadian data centres. Does this requirement extend to:

- **AI model training workloads and analytics processing,**
- **Non-PII or fully anonymized data,**
- **or is it limited to personally identifiable data and learner records?**

D2L Response:

Vendors are asked to confirm the ability to store Canadian customer data exclusively in Canadian data centers. Vendors should describe any data transfers or processing outside of Canada.

7.2 Are there specific Canadian provincial privacy laws — beyond PIPEDA — that D2L's current government customers require compliance with, such as Alberta's PIPA, Quebec's Law 25, or BC's PIPA?

D2L Response:

As per requirement 5.9.1, vendors are asked to confirm they comply with relevant privacy regulations, including provincial and international regulations.

Section 8 — Evaluation and Success Criteria

8.1 The RFP states D2L awards based on "best value, not lowest price." Could you offer any further guidance on how commercial competitiveness is balanced against functional fit, particularly where a vendor with stronger functional fit proposes a higher price point?

D2L Response:

As outlined in Section 6 of the RFP, proposals are evaluated based on best overall value, considering functional fit, vendor experience, security and privacy controls, business qualifications, and pricing. Pricing is assessed in the context of value delivered and overall alignment with D2L's requirements.

8.3 Under Vendor Experience and Roadmap (Section 5.7), will D2L give additional weight to:

- **Live deployments with public employment services ministries and agencies,**
- **Demonstrated impact on time-to-employment, job quality, and equity of outcomes,**
- **Multi-jurisdiction digital employment platforms (provincial, state, or federal-level implementations)?**

Any guidance on how these factors are weighted will help us align our case studies and evidence to your priorities.

D2L Response:

Vendor experience, including relevant customer deployments and demonstrated impact, is evaluated under Section 5.7 (Vendor Experience & Roadmap) and as described in Section 6 Evaluation Criteria. Vendors should highlight experience and evidence they believe best demonstrates alignment with D2L's priorities, project scope, and evaluation criteria.