

RFP 26-005: Electronic Fish Ticket Mobile Application for West Coast Commercial Fisheries

Q&A document

1.

1.1. Under the “Proposal Requirements and Scoring” section, the RFP states that “Proposals should detail each of the three areas described below,” including the “Cost Proposal,” and also instructs offerors to “submit a cost proposal using the provided template.” Please confirm whether you intend the Cost Proposal to be:

1.1.1. a. provided exclusively in the Excel cost proposal template, or

1.1.2. b. included both as a narrative Cost Proposal section within the main proposal document and in the completed Excel template.

Only the Excel proposal is required, though narrative may be used if needed for additional explanation.

1.2. The RFP specifies proposal content areas and submission deadlines but does not appear to specify page limits, font/margin requirements, or a required section order for the main proposal document. Please confirm that there are no page limits or specific formatting requirements beyond addressing the three areas under “Proposal Requirements and Scoring” and submitting the cost proposal in the format confirmed by question 1.

There are no set limits or formatting requirements.

1.3. How often does PSMFC expect formal progress reporting (bi-weekly, monthly), and in what format?

Progress reporting is expected to be provided informally in bi-weekly meetings rather than in formal reports.

1.4. Will PSMFC provide dedicated test users or fish dealers to participate in field testing and feedback during the pilot?

PSMFC staff and partners will be able to participate as test users on an ongoing basis. PSMFC will be responsible for recruiting fish dealers for participation in field testing and providing feedback, however these participants are voluntary so they may provide feedback more intermittently rather than in a dedicated way.

1.5. Should proposals include UI/UX wireframes or sample mock-ups as part of the submission, or are textual descriptions sufficient?

Mock-ups or wireframes are not expected since PSMFC anticipates working with the vendor on design and flow of the application.

- 1.6. Can you clarify the level of training and documentation deliverables expected for PSMFC staff prior to project closeout?

PSMFC would require sufficient documentation such that another IT staff member or vendor could reasonably maintain and continue to update the application. This does not need to be a formal document, but should include full access to the code repository, an ER diagram of local storage as applicable, etc.

- 1.7. Does PSMFC anticipate the contractor will manage the app store deployment process (Google Play / Apple App Store), or will this be handled internally?

Yes, if the app is deployed through an app store, the vendor should manage that process. PSMFC will also consider options that do not involve deployment through an app store.

- 1.8. Is there an expected budget range or ceiling for Phase 1 development? Likewise, are there anticipated budget ranges for the other phases?

No- costs and budget should be based on the best possible estimate derived from the defined scope of work.

- 1.9. For the optional renewal years, does PSMFC anticipate task-order or annual work plan contracting structures?

Subcontracts are executed following completion of the RFP process and are not applicable during this phase.

- 1.10. Can you confirm whether subcontractors must also sign confidentiality agreements directly with PSMFC, or only under the prime vendor's agreement?

Subcontracts are subject to confidentiality requirements after the RFP phase.

- 1.11. Can you provide the nature of PSMFC hosting (e.g., Azure Cloud-based, custom internal, etc.) and confirm that any needed additions (e.g., API, review environment) would be handled internally by PSMFC and cloud hosting pricing is not part of the ask.

The application will be hosted on PSMFC custom internal servers. Any additional needs would be handled by PSMFC and cloud hosting is not anticipated and would not be part of the vendor responsibility.

2.
 - 2.1. Q 1. Would PSMFC consider contracting with a state agency that has experience producing this kind of application?
Yes
 - 2.2. Q 2. Would PSMFC be open to rebranding and modifying *an existing mobile fish ticket system* for the pilot, provided that federal reporting fields, permit requirements, and workflows are incorporated to meet E-Tix specifications?
Yes
3. In the scope of work on page 5 of the RFP, are the deliverables below required in this first phase of the E-Tix project (the pilot mobile application)?
 - 3.1. 2.4. Reports, 2.4.1. Tax and regulatory reports can be generated by dealers that summarize catch and value based on entered fish tickets.
No
 - 3.2. 2.5 Help Information, 2.5.1. User guides are provided for each state.
No
4.
 - 4.1. API Documentation and Contract:
 - 4.1.1. Will PSMFC provide comprehensive API documentation, including data dictionaries, response formats, and endpoint specifications for the existing ETix back-end system?
Yes
 - 4.1.2. Are there existing Service Level Agreements (SLAs) or expected performance requirements for API response times that the mobile application should adhere to?
There are no established requirements.
 - 4.2. Database Structure and Integration:
 - 4.2.1. Will PSMFC provide an Entity-Relationship Diagram (ERD) or detailed data dictionary/schema documentation for the relevant tables within the existing ETix SQL Server database to facilitate efficient integration planning?
Yes
 - 4.3. Technological Requirements and Constraints:
 - 4.3.1. Beyond the requirement to interface with the SQL Server back-end, are there any specific constraints or preferred technologies regarding the front-end development platform (e.g.,

specific cross-platform frameworks, minimum required OS versions) that should be considered in the technical approach description?

There are no specific restraints or preferred technologies, but for general consideration it is important that the application be usable on different types of devices (PC, table, mobile) and OS. Users may have older devices so solutions that accommodate a wide range of platforms and versions are preferred

4.4. Data Confidentiality and Offline Security:

4.4.1. What are the specific requirements or standards PSMFC mandates for encrypting and securing confidential data stored locally on the mobile devices to meet federal fisheries confidentiality requirements?

PSMFC is working towards FISMA certification and so FISMA standards for securing confidential data should be met.

4.5. Documentation Ownership and Maintenance:

4.5.1. The final version of the application and all associated code will be owned by PSMFC, allowing them to adapt and further develop the product independently. Beyond code, what specific documentation (e.g., technical design documents, deployment guides, unit test reports) is required as a final deliverable to ensure PSMFC staff can easily take over the maintenance and future development of the application?

PSMFC does not have a list of required documentation, but any supporting documents like ER diagrams of local storage or design documents that could help PSMFC easily take over the application would be requested.

4.6. User Feedback and Iteration:

4.6.1. PSMFC expects a close and dynamic working relationship, including bi-weekly meetings, and the vendor must update the application based on testing and ongoing user feedback. What is the formalized process or platform PSMFC uses for collecting, tracking, and prioritizing the user feedback and changes in requirements that will drive the ongoing updates required throughout the five potential years of the contract?

The process has not yet been established. PSMFC and the vendor will need to work together to identify a process or platform that works for both parties.

- 5.
- 5.1. Can the application be designed to be tablet-specific, or must phones be supported?
Phones must be supported (android and iOS)
- 5.2. Will application support be standardized to any specific model device(s), or will users be able to supply any device model they choose?
The devices and models are supplied by the users, so the application should work across the majority of possible devices.
- 5.3. Does PSMFC have expectations for timelines for Phases 2, 3, and 4?
Due to the uncertainty of funding, PSMFC cannot commit to a timeline of when each phase can be accomplished. If funding were readily available, we would hope to complete phases 2-4 within a few years, though there are no deadlines set that must be met.
- 5.4. Are mobile users located at a location with IT infrastructure (i.e. internet, printer) or are they remote, potentially with no internet connection.
Users may potentially have limited internet or cell connectivity, so they should have a way to start and save a ticket locally until a connection is available.
- 5.5. Will portable printer support be required?
Yes, during Phase 2. Note that this requirement may change, but please assume so for the RFP response.
- 5.6. Will existing web code be available for usage in mobile app?
Yes
- 5.7. Will the application be required to create new Fish Tickets while offline? This implies the next sequential number will need to be available to the user while offline?
Yes, the user will need to be able to start a ticket offline with local storage. The next sequential fish ticket number could be retrieved and assigned after the ticket is created, so long as it is assigned prior to saving a draft to the ETix database or making a final ticket submission to the ETix database.
- 5.8. Will the vendor be expected to create and support any API's or will API's be supplied and supported by PSMFC? If the vendor is expected to create and support the API's, what infrastructure will be provided by PSMFC?
APIs will be supplied and supported by PSMFC
- 5.9. Will the New User form be required to be developed by the vendor, or will a PSMFC-provided form be used? Will the vendor be responsible for the API to communicate a new user request to PSMFC?

The application in Phase 1 will need to offer a form that can be submitted through the app to request a new user account. The review and approval of the application will happen in PSMFC's existing web application. An API for receiving the new user request form will be provided by PSMFC.

5.10. Will the vendor need to provide a global administrator that has access across all organizations? If so, will they have full access or read only access?

Appendix A, item 10 describes two related roles needed. The first would be like a global administrator (edit organizations and users, read only for fish tickets). PSMFC staff will serve this role. The second would be read-only for all fish tickets and will be used by multiple users from the management agencies.

6.

6.1. Is there any incumbent for this opportunity?

Yes

6.2. If there is an incumbent then why you are looking for other companies? Are you not happy with them?

Our funding source requires a competitive bidding process, and we seek the best vendor for this scope of work regardless of past selections.

6.3. If there is an incumbent then are they bidding for this opportunity?

We anticipate the incumbent will bid for this opportunity.

6.4. What is the allocated budget for this RFP?

Costs and budget should be based on the best possible estimate derived from the defined scope of work.

6.5. Will the State accept a custom-developed solution, or are you specifically expecting a COTS platform configured to your needs?

PSMFC will consider proposals with either custom or COTS platform options so long as all requirements are met

6.6. Would you prefer a web application designed with a mobile-first approach, or would you like a separate mobile application alongside a distinct web application for PC users?

PSMFC needs ultimately to have application(s) usable by both mobile and PC users. We are open to both approaches described above depending on what best meets both technical requirements and minimizes cost.

6.7. Will the mobile app allow users to capture photos or other media as part of the ticket creation process?

No

6.8. Will the vendor be involved in the field testing of the mobile app with real users, and how will feedback be collected and integrated into the development process?

PSMFC and state agency staff will be actively involved in testing the application to make sure all requirements are met. PSMFC will also recruit fish dealers for testing at various phases of development. PSMFC will collect the feedback from all users and provide back to the vendor with priorities for development.

6.9. Could you clarify whether the cost proposal should include only the development of Phase 1, or should it also encompass future phases (e.g., 5-year maintenance, scalability improvements, etc.)?

The cost proposal should include a cost estimate for each of Phases 1-4 as listed in the "Phases of Work" section

6.10. Are there any anticipated additional costs related to long-term support, bug fixes, or updates to the mobile app after Phase 1 completion?

The vendor selected in the RFP may be used for up to 5 years at the billing rates provided in the cost proposal to make additional improvements including bug fixes and support.

6.11. If subcontractors are to be used, what type of qualifications or certifications are required? Should they have specific experience with fisheries data or mobile applications?

No certifications are required of subcontractors. The Qualification & Experience portion of the scoring will include both technical and fisheries data experience. This evaluation will apply to the combined capabilities of the entire team - including the prime vendor and any subcontractors - rather than imposing a separate subcontractor-specific requirement.

6.12. How will the user authentication system be integrated with the existing ETix system, particularly for new users?

The application in Phase 1 will need to offer a form that can be submitted through the app to request a new user account. The review and approval of the application will happen in PSMFC's existing web application. An API for receiving the new user request form will be provided by PSMFC and be saved to the SQL Server back-end database.

7.

7.1. RFP Overview & Background Pages, Hosting Environment / Technical Integration, Can you provide a detailed description of the current hosting environment for the ETix SQL Server database and APIs (e.g., on-premises, cloud provider, network architecture), including any security or access requirements for integration?

Hosting is on SQL Server on premises. No API is currently integrated since users are required to be online currently.

7.2. RFP Section 2.4, pages 4,5,Reporting Requirements,Can PSMFC provide a detailed breakdown of the number and types of calculations, as well as the user input fields required for each tax and regulatory report to be implemented in the application?

The calculations are performed on the database side. The application will need to pass parameters (selection of dealer, locations, date range and 0-3 adjustment numeric values), and receive response from the database. For the RFP response, please assume all reports have similar complexity to the example report shown in Appendix 1.

7.3. RFP Sections 1.2, 2.4.1, 2.7; pages 1, 6-7,Compatibility Requirements,Are there any browser or device compatibility requirements or restrictions for the desktop and mobile versions (e.g., minimum OS versions, supported browsers)?

Specific minimums and supported browsers have not been set, however it is expected that the users include a wide range and age of devices and the majority of these should be supported.

7.4. RFP Section 4.1; page 6,Security Compliance,Are there specific federal or state security standards (e.g., FISMA, NIST, FedRAMP) that the application must comply with, beyond the confidentiality agreement?

Yes, the application should be FISMA compliant

7.5. General ,Multi-Lingual Support,Are there any requirements for multilingual support in the application interface, user guides, or reports (e.g., Spanish, Vietnamese, etc.)?

Not at this time. While these requirements could change in the longer term, for the RFP response you can assume the answer to be no.

7.6. RFP Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2; page 4,Authentication / Security,Are there requirements or preferences for supporting biometric authentication (e.g., Face ID, fingerprint) or multi-factor authentication for user login to the mobile application?

No requirements of this type exist at this time. While these requirements could change in the longer term, for the RFP response you can assume the answer to be no.

7.7. RFP Sections 2.3.3, 2.3.4; pages 5-6,Ticket Updates & Regulatory Changes,How frequently do you anticipate updates to fish ticket forms, ticket types, or validation rules (e.g., annually, as regulations change, or ad hoc)? Will the vendor be responsible for implementing these updates on a recurring basis?

Change requests can be ad hoc, in response to changes in regulations or other new circumstances. During the time the vendor is contracted to work with PSMFC, we expect to have the vendor make these changes.

7.8. RFP Phase 1 (p.8),Phase 1 Scope,What is the anticipated number of users and organizations included in the Phase 1 pilot?

The selected ticket type will determine this number, but there may be between 50-500 organizations (though not all are likely to use the mobile app). The number of users is generally

about 10% higher than the number of organizations.

7.9. RFP Phase 1 (p.8),Phase 1 Scope,Which fish ticket type will be used for Phase 1 and when will that selection be made?

This decision has not been made, but will be made prior to beginning work on Phase 1. The selected type will be aimed to be one of the simplest ticket types, while still have a sufficient user group and need for mobile reporting.

7.10. RFP Overview (p.2),Phase 1 Scope,Is Phase 1 funding fully secured, and is future-phase funding contingent on additional appropriations?

Phase 1 funding is secured, future phases are contingent on funding appropriations or seeking new sources of funding.

7.11. RFP Ticket Requirements (p.4–5),Scope Clarification,How frequently do updates occur to fish ticket forms, ticket types, or validation rules, and will the vendor be responsible for these updates?

Changes to ticket types, forms, and validation rules are uncommon. During the time the vendor is contracted to work with PSMFC, we expect to ask the vendor make these changes. The vendor may bill for the time required to make these changes based on the rate tables provided.

7.12. RFP Appendix A,Tech Documentation,Will PSMFC provide documentation describing variations among ticket types, or should vendors expect to reverse-engineer differences?

PSMFC will provide all needed documentation.

7.13. RFP Ticket Requirements (p.4),Tech Documentation,Will PSMFC provide a complete mapping of lookup field dependencies?

Yes

7.14. RFP Validations (p.5),Validation Rules,Will PSMFC provide a catalog of existing validation rules?

Yes, all validation rules (whether existing or new) will be catalogued

7.15. RFP Data Transmission (p.5),Offline Behavior,Should the application retry submissions automatically when connectivity is restored, or require users to manually retry?

It is okay to require a manual retry

7.16. RFP Data Transmission (p.5),Offline Behavior,Should core validations operate fully offline or be partially deferred until reconnection?

Validations may generally be deferred until reconnection

7.17. RFP Submission/Editing (p.5),Offline Sync,Should the application support conflict resolution if offline edits conflict with updates made through the ETix web application?

We do not anticipate needing conflict resolution, though the vendor may include this if appropriate for their technical approach.

7.18. RFP Database/API Integration (p.4–5),API Integration,Will PSMFC provide API documentation, including endpoints, payload structures, authentication requirements, and error codes?

Yes

7.19. RFP Reporting (p.6),Reporting,Will report templates (state or federal forms) be provided by PSMFC?

Yes

7.20. RFP Reporting (p.6),Reporting,Should reporting layouts match agency-issued PDF forms exactly, or can they follow a standardized design?

Most will need to follow agency issued PDF forms.

7.21. Appendix A – Ticket Books,Ticket Books,Should the application support multiple active ticket books per organization at one time?

Yes, as a user gets near the end of a ticket book they should have an option to request a new ticket book so that it is ready in advance.

7.22. Appendix A – Custom Lists,Custom Lists,Will user-created lists (e.g., operators, unloading stations) sync centrally?

Yes, these will be provided via API and then stored locally.

7.23. Appendix A – Custom Lists,Custom Lists,Should user-created lists be shared across users in the same organization?

Yes

7.24. Appendix A – Versioning,Versioning,Does ETix maintain version history for fish tickets, and should the mobile application display this history?

The ETix database stores version history, but only the most recent version should be accessible to the user.

7.25. RFP Security (p.6),Security (Softened),Are there expectations for encrypting locally stored draft tickets beyond native device protections?

Most likely this will be a requirement

7.26. RFP User Accounts (p.4),Authentication (Softened),Is PSMFC interested in supporting optional modern authentication features (e.g., biometrics) beyond the existing username/password model?

We do not have plans to do so at this time.

7.27. General, Accessibility (Softened), Does PSMFC follow any accessibility practices (such as WCAG) for applications used by fishers and dealers?

PSFMC does not have set practices, however this application may be required to meet federal requirements for accessibility

7.28. RFP Admin Tools (Phase 4 description), Admin Reference (Softened), Does PSMFC have existing administrative workflows or screens that would be helpful to reference for long-term planning?

No

7.29. RFP Testing (p.7), Field Testing, How many participants are expected to be involved in field testing, and what is the anticipated testing duration?

An exact number is not known and will depend on volunteer recruitment. We would aim to have around 10-25 testers initially. The testing duration has not been set. PSFMC will manage testing and compiling feedback to prioritize for the vendor.