PACIFIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
205 SE Spokane Street, SUITE 100, Portland, OREGON 97202
PHONE (503) 595-3100 FAX (503) 595-3232

At-Sea Data Collection Mobile Application Development and Implementation RFP

Questions and Answers

Updated 08/19/14

1. I did not see a reference to access the paper form this new system would replace. Would I be able to get a copy of that form?

   A: The form has been posted with these answers.

2. I also didn't see a reference to any devices other than the iPad. Is the iPad the only device this application will need to run on?

   A: Our experience with similar projects has led us to determine that the iPad is the best device for this work.

3. In the Data Storage and Transfer section of page 6, the RFP mentions storing the data locally and then transferring to a PSMFC server daily. Is there a plan for how the communication of these two systems would work?

   A: On a similar project, data was transmitted to the server when the device was able to access a wireless connection via web services. The specific details for this project will need to be worked out during the course of development.

4. Do you expect that this application will need to be eventually supported on other mobile platforms (Windows, Android), or other form factors (iPhone)? If so, please describe which ones and potential dates.

   A: No, the iPad is our device of choice. Content is not amenable for iPhone format.

5. Do you envision/intend that this application will be distributed via the Apple AppStore (commercial), via the Enterprise Developer Program (in-house), or via ad-hoc (beta-tester) installations?

   A: The application should be designed for distribution through beta-testing initially, and then through the App Store for future distribution.

6. If there were an existing application in use today that met 80% of the requirements, would PSMFC seriously consider a proposal to modify such an application rather than building a complete application from the ground up? The implication for PSMFC would be that the cost would be substantially lower, but ownership and copyright rights may not be available. Understanding if there is flexibility on the stated ownership and copyright requirements will have a large influence our response approach.

A: There is flexibility on the stated ownership as long as the approach meets our needs, cost expectations and is amenable to changes/modifications to the app in the future.

7. What is the accuracy level required by the GPS?

   A: Accuracy should be as close as the industry standards will allow.

8. When is the tentative start date of the project
   A: Planning and programming should start upon vendor selection. Pilot testing in the field is expected to start in February 2015

9. Would PSMFC require the resources to be situated on-site?

   A: Resources would not have to be on-site, but available for some in-person meetings as needed.

10. It's stated that you want the app to be customizable, can you specify what features or specifications would need to be customized?

    A: The core functionality of the application will remain consistent over time, however, as management needs change, certain questions will be added for a specific time period and later removed or changed over time. The application will need to be designed to accommodate this.

11. This is more of a comment, maybe could be confirmed or addressed in some manner: Full day of use (with GPS) depends on hardware not just software, both need to be taken into consideration.

    A: Auxiliary battery packs can be used if necessary.

12. Will the devices be purchased new for the project?

    A: Yes, PSMFC/ODFW will take responsibility for purchasing the iPads and all accessories.

13. Can you explain what you mean by "Devices will be in weather proof cases?" Is it a certain brand, are they hard plastic cases, or soft plastic?

    A: Our experience has shown that the Lifeproof cases will meet our needs best. The Lifejacket extension will be added since these will be used on-board a fishing vessel.

14. Are there currently published validation rules for the electronic data? Or will these be created as the project evolves?

    A: Currently the data is collected on paper forms that are then sent in to a central office for data entry. There are many validation rules built into the data entry code. This code is written in Javascript and the validation rules can be shared with the selected vendor. It is

possible that some additional validation rules will be added during the course of development.

15. There is reference that GPS positions should be taken "every 30 sec of each drift." Is there any requirement to take GPS position while not in a drift? Approximately how long does the average drift last?

    A: GPS positions will only be taken during a drift, not while moving to a new location. The average drift duration is 12 minutes with some lasting up to one hour. The duration between GPS positions should be customizable to allow the sampler to set this at-sea. The highest frequency allowed should be once every thirty seconds, with the ability to turn it off if necessary. Specific details can be worked out during programming.

16. Who will be managing device registration and accounts?

    A: PSMFC/ODFW will handle device registration and management.

17. Who will install and deploy the apps?

    A: PSMFC/ODFW will manage installation and deployment.

18. We interpret the approach to suggest that you want app users to upload a “package” of data upon returning from a trip. Are there any thoughts about syncing the data to a website. Under this approach, the content from the trip, once connected to wireless / the internet, would sync back to the server via web services. This would also provide opportunities for creating web-based reporting dashboard downstream and some lightweight web administration. We just want to ensure we understand the current thinking and openness to potential other technical solutions (i.e., do you want us to present an approach or options versus a prescribed and predetermined approach).

    A: This is the way that one of our current projects is working, with a web interface to get a quick look at data as it is loaded. This functionality is something we would definitely embrace.

19. In section 2.5.4 you look to do most initial testing in-house then engage samplers at sea. What are the thoughts on doing more of an ‘agile’ process for application development. This approach would engage users early in the process and deliver product iterations early in the process and in 2-or-3-week increments. This allows us, and your team, to see progress very early, catch issues very early, stay highly-engaged through rapid iterations (versus longer lags with no activity and perhaps missed expectations once delivered). Any thoughts on approaches to delivering the application would be helpful. It’s also important to note that testing would happen by our team during each iteration minimizing the testing cycles (and related rework) further downstream in the process.

    A: An agile process would be preferable. We emphasized “in-house” testing as a means to make sure survey logic and basic functionality was working before being tested at-sea. We agree an agile, iterative process would be beneficial, particularly when at-sea testing begins.

20. Are you able to share a budget range for the application and any ongoing support needs? We typically ask this question as there are many ways we can construct an application. If we have a target budget, that helps us greatly in honing the approach to target the budget.

    A: Budget information is not available at this time, but we encourage all to put forth the most cost effective solution that will meet our needs.

21. Are there any other expected interactions with the data beyond the upload to your servers? E.g., pushes or syncs to ODFW servers, NOAA etc.?

    A: No. Any additional data feeds will be handled in-house or taken on as a new project in the future.

ONBOARD SAMPLING FORM - Oregon

Sheet ___ of ___

Assign ___ Stops: ___ Spp: ___

Sampler= ___

Date ___

Boat # ___

=Boat ___

Cnty= ___

Site / Lndg= ___

Elg.Angs ___

Trip Type= ___

Area ___ =Capt ___

TrpTyp: 1=am1/2 2=pm1/2 3=mid1/2 4=twilight 5=3/4-1day (>5 hrs) 6=overnight 7=other
Area: 1=US<=3mi 2=US>3mi
Ftyp: 1=Drift 2=Stat 3=Anchor 4=Troll
Gfmt: 3=deg,min,sec 1=deg,min.100th/min

		# ___	# ___	# ___	# ___	# ___
START	Lat					
	Lon 1					
	Time					
END	Lat					
	Lon 1					
	Time	1 Gfmt	1 Gfmt	1 Gfmt	1 Gfmt	1 Gfmt
	START Depth (ft)	End depth (in addition to start depth) of each drift is collected if GPS is not allowed.				
	START Temp (F)	9998	9998	9998	9998	
	ObsAng	Ftyp	Ftyp	Ftyp	Ftyp	Ftyp
	1=Yes 0=No	Seal Movd	Seal Movd	Seal Movd	Seal Movd	Seal Movd
LOST	Gear Time	G T	G T	G T	G T	G T
	Bait Fish	B F	B F	B F	B F	B F

		KEPT / REL alive-dead					
1	Species are listed here as they're encountered.						
2				A tally by species is recorded in this area: numbers of fish kept, released alive, and released dead.			
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							

DISCARDED FISH

1. *Interviewer

Year 2 0 | Month | Day — 4. *Date

3 2.*Subregion (=Oregon)

1 <<Assign # 5. Vessel Code >>

TYPE 0 - EXAMINED DISCARDED CATCH MEASUREMENTS

	ODFW USE ONLY	Common Name	* Species	*Modex	*Fork Len. (mm)	*Dispo	Sex (M, F)	*Stop (drift) #	
1	yeye w/			6					1
2	yeye w/			6					2
3	yeye w/			6					3
4	yeye w/			6					4
5	yeye w/			6					5
6	yeye w/			6					6
7	yeye w/			6					7
8	yeye w/			6					8
9	yeye w/			6					9
10	yeye w/			6					10
11	yeye w/			6					11
12	yeye w/			6					12
13	yeye w/			6					13
14	yeye w/			6					14
15	yeye w/			6					15
16	yeye w/			6					16
17	yeye w/			6					17
18	yeye w/			6					18
19	yeye w/			6					19
20	yeye w/			6					20
21	yeye w/			6					21
22	yeye w/			6					22
23	yeye w/			6					23
24	yeye w/			6					24

If a yelloweye rockfish is caught, we indicate here on which hook it was caught.

An asterisk is placed next to any fish above that was released with a descending device.

Dispo: What happened to the fish? - **0**=Retained by boat, **1**=Thrown back alive, **6**=Thrown back dead (includes bait)

MODEx - ~~1=MM~~ ~~2=BB~~ **6**=PC ~~7=PR~~

Sex - **M**=male **F**=female ~~T=transitional~~

AREAx - **1**=Ocean < 3 miles **2**=Ocean > 3 miles ~~5=Inland~~

Subregion - ~~1=S.CA~~ ~~2=N.CA~~ **3**=OR ~~4=WA~~

Gear Form

Effective Drift #

Notes: **Recomp. device used**

Tackle: **casting** (1) **spin** (2)

 # hooks per rod: **1** **2** **3** **Terminal wgt ►** **jighead** (1) **diamond dbl hk** (2) **football dbl hk** (3) **pencil dbl hk** (4) **other hooked** (5) **NO hooks** (6)

Terminal wgt oz ► **Terminal wgt with BAIT ►** **yes** (1) **no** (0)

Lure Type:

shrimp flies	*n*=	per rod. **Majority color:**	-or- **various** (v)
worms	*n*=	per rod. **Majority color:**	-or- **various** (v)
cocahoes	*n*=	per rod. **Majority color:**	-or- **various** (v)
scampi	*n*=	per rod. **Majority color:**	-or- **various** (v)

Fresh bait: **not used** (0) **chunk** (2) **half** (3) **whole** (4) **Hook size & style:**