

CACASA Pesticide Permitting and Use Reporting, RFP #10

This document contains official answers to questions received from interested vendors as of September 14, 2009 (before, during, and after the Sept. 10 Pre-proposal conference). Questions asked more than once have been consolidated.

Answers to frequently asked Questions requiring a detailed response:

- A) Question: Will proposals for a centralized system architecture be accepted – as opposed to client/server architecture installed in each county? Is a proposal similar to SPURS – Statewide Pesticide Use Reporting System (Phase I report p. 10, Phase II report p. 2) with centralization of county data acceptable?

Answer:

As stated in the RFP (Section 1.2.1 p.5): *“There are no restrictions on the proposed system regarding software development environment, technologies, or system architectures that may be employed.”* Therefore, CACASA will consider proposals for a more centralized infrastructure with web-enabled components beyond the mandatory PUR and NOI web interfaces described in the RFP.

However, as also stated in the same section of the RFP: *“Each county will manage its own database which will only store information pertaining to pesticide regulatory functions within its own county, and no data may be sold or otherwise distributed by any other party without prior written authorization from the county’s Agriculture Department...”* This provision effectively rules out a SPURS-like unified statewide database model in which all county data are merged and local control is blurred. Proposals to centrally store and manage individual county databases as separate database instances are acceptable. Proposals to centrally store and manage a unified statewide database as a single instance may be acceptable but only if all of the following conditions can be met:

- Each county only has *write* access *only* to its own data.
- Each county can control whether or not other counties or the state may have *read* access to that county’s data.
- No public entity, whether county or state, can export or otherwise distribute county data to which it does not have write access (even if read access has been granted).

In terms of hosting or establishment of co-location facilities for application and data storage/management, it is acceptable to propose that such facilities be publicly controlled (i.e. using county facilities) or private commercial data center operations. If public, there is no need to identify specific county hosts, but the three bulleted conditions above must still apply if data from one county are housed within a different county.

- B) Question: Is there any preference for either a new solution or one of the existing AgGIS/RMMS systems if they include the necessary enhancements?

Answer:

There is no preference for either a new or existing solution. All proposals will be evaluated solely on their own merits to fulfill objectives for a system that is

functional, well documented, sustainable, scalable, and cost effective. CACASA's commitment to an open solicitation process is demonstrated by its commissioning of the *System Requirements Specification* to be included with the RFP. This was done specifically to provide greater parity of understanding among all interested vendors, as well as to clarify functional requirements.

C) Question: How should implementation infrastructure needs be estimated given that for a decentralized client/server architecture there may be items such as servers and/or third party software licenses that can be reused with the new system?

Answer:

Vendors should structure their cost proposals to assume that all specified equipment and any commercial software licenses must be purchased as new assets. This is necessary to facilitate side by side comparisons among proposals. Then, as part of the contract negotiation with the selected vendor, CACASA will:

- A. Structure the contract so that only direct costs actually incurred may be invoiced, meaning that the contractor will not be compensated for computing infrastructure components included in its cost estimate that are instead supplied by reusing existing components, and
- B. Compile an (approximate) inventory of available reusable components meeting contractor solution specifications. The replacement cost of reusable items will then be deducted from the original cost estimate.

Answers to Individual Questions (in the order received):

1) Question: Is there a budget for this, what is the budget amount?

Answer: No budget threshold has been specified.

2) Question: Are there any existing co-location services being used by the CACASA where we can house the new system being developed?

Answer: No, the successful contractor is responsible for securing the infrastructure platforms, including co-location services, upon which to house and run the system. Note in the answer to frequent Question A above, either publicly or privately controlled hosting arrangements may be proposed.

3) Question: Will CACASA provide all of the pesticide data and polygonal configuration of GIS interest areas?

Answer: Counties are responsible for supplying and maintaining all of their Pesticide (permitting and use) and GIS data. The successful contractor is responsible only for translating existing county data to the new system's database schema.

4) Question: Do all counties using this system have access to high speed internet services?

Answer: The answer is a qualified "yes." High speed Internet may not currently be available in some remote rural counties with very low volume pesticide permitting/use transactions, or in certain district offices within larger counties. Network and Internet connectivity upgrades are happening constantly. The successful contractor is responsible for conducting a

complete survey of network connectivity needs and availability prior to system implementation.

5) Question: Is there a mobile component for this service whereby a field technician can input their pesticide usage and take advantage of GIS discovery on the mobile device?

Answer: There is a requirement for this capability, as described in the **System Requirements Specification** document in Sections 20.2.1 and 20.3.5. Also, Appendix A Section A10 describes a potential future enhancement related to this capability.

6) Question: Does CACASA have any professional IT personnel who will participate in conjunction with the contractor?

Answer: CACASA will provide staff to manage the project from the client side, including contract oversight and review of deliverables. County personnel will also participate in implementation tasks within their counties. Offerors must specify in their proposals all assumptions and expectations they have regarding task and time commitments needed from CACASA or county staff to carry out or coordinate system implementation activities with the successful contractor.

7) Question: Are you open to using licensed products, such as ESRI tools for GIS? Are there any other licensing considerations for the new system?

Answer: This is strictly a matter of functionality and cost. Offerors should propose whatever they consider to be the most cost effective method to meet all functional requirements.

8) Question: How much funding is secured and guaranteed given the current financial and budgeting issues?

Answer: The funding source (Residual Mill derived from pesticide sales) is secure and is considered to be insulated from state and local financial challenges. No guaranteed amount has been set aside in advance for this project.

9) Question: Page 64 of the "Phase I Needs Assessment Report" says that there is an unspent amount of \$1.23M. How much of this amount will be available to the current project?

Answer: The information referenced is essentially a snapshot in time and is not meant to reflect anything about funding availability.

10) Question: What is CACASA's plan to leverage the past investment of \$1.7M?

Answer: This investment was part of the evolutionary process to transition away from the legacy RMPP system. The concern now is to complete that process by establishing a consistent and sustainable statewide standard, regardless of the extent to which past investments can be leveraged.

11) Question: Can you share some data of installation per county so that we can give a more realistic estimate of installation and transition?

Answer: All installation data currently available is summarized in the Phase I report. The contractor will need to refine this information as part of its Implementation/Transition Plan. For the proposal, offerors should clearly state all relevant assumptions on which their cost estimates are based.

Refer to the answer for frequent Question C above.

- 12) Question: Are there any State IT standards to be followed if CDPR is funding part of the development and implementation of the new system?
Answer: The only state standards are those pertaining to interfacing with DPR databases and formatting PUR data as described in the SRS.
- 13) Question: Who will approve the detailed system design, an outside IT vendor or the CACASA staff?
Answer: Staff under the direction of CACASA's Executive Director.
- 14) Question: How many design/vision meetings should we include in our estimate?
Answer: As many as the contractor believes are necessary. Please provide details and assumptions about the design and implementation process in proposals.
- 15) Question: Currently does the main district office (or county HQ) synchronize its data with the other field district offices of the county?
Answer: Yes, counties with multiple servers synchronize data among all of them.
- 16) Question: For a centralized approach, would there be a database administrator assigned to resolve internal database replication / synchronization conflict scenarios?
Answer: Offerors may propose whatever process they consider most appropriate for maintaining database integrity and resolving synchronization conflicts.
- 17) Question: Can some part of the project engineering activities be carried out off-site?
Answer: Offerors must specify who will be performing all system design/development activities, including where the company or companies are located. There are no de facto restrictions concerning where the work may be carried out.
- 18) Question: How will the traveling costs be billed to CACASA?
Answer: All direct costs, including travel, must be itemized on invoices as specified in the Professional Services Agreement section in the RFP.
- 19) Question: Do the counties have remote access for system developers currently?
Answer: Yes, most counties employ remote access techniques to give developers access to user's desktop machines.
- 20) Question: Does the contract require California MSA / CMAS certifications?
Answer: No.
- 21) Question: Is spatial data currently available with all the counties?
Answer: Some counties have no GIS field boundary data, but a majority have either partial or full coverage. The contractor for this project is not responsible for creating any spatial data, though they must be able to import or directly read existing data.

22) Question: Is there a requirement for data archival?

Answer: Yes, the minimum number of years for archiving data is governed by organizational and regulatory compliance requirements for records retention. In this case, each county may have its own standards and so each county must be able to control which records to retain on-line, which to archive off-line, and which to discard.

Archiving will be defined as the process of selecting and copying inactive or infrequently accessed records for storage away from the primary production database. The archived records are deleted from the primary production database as a means to optimize system performance and overcome any data storage limitations. When database records are archived, there is an assumption that the archived records can be restored and made accessible for review as needed some time in the future.

23) Question: Could you please explain your current hardware environment? Do you have any hardware policy in place that we need to adhere to while designing our system?

Answer: Each county may have slightly different policies and conventions, so there is no uniform hardware policy that must be adhered to. Please refer to the Phase I report for available hardware environment information, and to Section 20 of the SRS for additional environment information and constraints. In general, counties have demonstrated the ability to be flexible in adapting to hardware and software that differs from their established conventions – provided that unconventional components will not pose security, operational, or maintenance complications.

24) Question: Page 5 of RFP section 4.2.2 says → "Project Work Plan and Schedule (reference Scope of Services Section 3.8) Proposals must include an overall project plan and schedule as described in the Scope of Services Project Management subsection above (Section 3.8.2). The project plan must include sufficient detail to allow the proposal evaluation team to make comparative assessments of each offeror's project planning approach and proposed work flow for the project". We could not locate section 3.8.2 in the RFP. We have only 3.8.1. Please provide info on section 3.8.2.

Answer: This is a typo, it should say **3.9.2**. John Gless apologizes for the error.

25) Question: Page 7 of RFP says → "In addition to these general component requirements, CACASA wishes to procure a pesticide IT solution that is designed to be scalable in terms of". Could you please explain the kind of pesticide IT solution that state is procuring? We would like to know the product / solution name, associated technology and key features.

Answer: There is no other pesticide IT solution that will be procured. The passage about scalability refers to the solution being sought by this RFP.

26) Question: To better understand the data migration situation, can CACASA provide the schemas and table information for existing systems and complete set of information on individual county database sizes, table and column info by county?

Answer: Schemas for existing systems are only available from the current vendors, and since they are likely competitors for the project CACASA will not require them to divulge any more details about their systems beyond what has been reported in the Phase I and II reports. The SRS document

contains extensive discussion of the desired system's data elements, and all interested vendors should be able to get a clear sense of existing database content from that. The best available source for database record size information and transaction volume is the table on page 82 of the SRS, which was reproduced from research described in the Phase I report.

27) Question: Page 8 of RFP says → "Translate current RMP/Op-ID and PUR data from each county's existing database to the database in the new system, in accordance with the data migration plan." Are you planning to retire all county databases once data is migrated to centralized database? Please explain in detail.

Answer: The question presumes there will be a centralized database of some kind, but whether or not this occurs depends on the proposed solution of the chosen contractor (see answer to frequent Question A). More generally on the question of data "retirement", CACASA and counties want all data that is to be retained migrated to the new system so that all existing systems may be retired. Depending on individual county data retention policies, vendors should assume that a minimum of three years and a maximum of five years worth of data will need to be migrated. The actual amount for each county will be determined during the Implementation/Transition planning process.

28) Question: Page 8 of RFP says → "Operate an active technical support system (help desk) accessible via toll free telephone and e-mail that is staffed during normal business hours." What is your normal business hour? Does it include weekend and holidays?

Answer: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding state holidays and weekends.

29) Question: Please indicate the level of (Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3) technical support system (help desk) that you require? Also we request you to define Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 for our better understanding.

Answer: CACASA has not defined tech support according to any Level system. Vendor may quantify the levels of active tech support (help desk) they can offer for the proposed price in terms of average initial response time, mean time to resolve problems, etc. However, the focus should be on how help desk services will be configured and managed, integration with passive support, and the amount of active support users are anticipated to need based on the ease of use and reliability of the delivered system.

30) Question: Page 8 of RFP says → "Repair software coding errors reported by users as "bugs" or system crashes". Do you have any bug tracking tool in place? Do you want us to use your bug tracking system or we can use our own system?

Answer: Contractor must propose its own bug tracking system.

31) Question: Do you have any other products used by counties other than AgGIS and RMMS? If yes please provide their name, number of counties using this, customer satisfaction level on these products.

Answer: This information is all contained in the Phase I report. One county uses the Permit6 system exclusively. The latest and most reliable information

available on RMPP system usage is that 12 counties use it for permit and use report entry, and another four counties use AgGIS or RMMS as their primary system but still use RMPP for other purposes such as to generate reports and information requests for prior years where RMPP data has not been migrated to a newer system.

32) Question: What is the volume of users in the system (including property owners)? Also provide a list of user type.

Answer: The table on the following page contains a summary of results for these questions compiled from the February 2009 county survey described in the Phase I report (blank fields indicate no response). At present there is no precise estimate of the number of permittees (property owners, operators, pesticide applicators) who currently use either of the public websites (Permit6 or RMMSweb) or a third party grower management software application website to submit PUR and NOI records electronically. The survey asked counties to provide percentages of web PUR/NOI and the results are reported in the table on page 82 of the SRS. These results can be used as a general guide, but are still somewhat imprecise because some of the counties did not understand the question.

County Name:	Maximum #			
	Total users:	Frequent users:	Users:	District Offices:
AgGIS County				
RMMS County				
RMPP County				
Amador	3	2	< 3	0
Butte	13	11	3-5	2
El Dorado/Alpine	4	4	3-5	0
Glenn	20	8	3-5	0
Humboldt	2	2	< 3	0
Imperial	10	4	3-5	2
Lake	2	2	< 3	0
Madera	10	7	5-10	0
Modoc				
Nevada	3	3	< 3	0
Placer	3	3	< 3	0
Plumas/Sierra				
Sacramento	12	10	3-5	2
Siskiyou				
Sutter	8	8	5-10	0
Trinity	2	2	< 3	0
Yolo	8	8	5-10	0
Yuba	6	4	3-5	0
Napa	15	11	3-5	0
Solano	16	8	10-15	1
Merced	22	18	5-10	1
Alameda	20	15	5-10	2
Calaveras	4	3	3-5	1
Contra Costa	18	12	5-10	1
Fresno	40	25	10-15	7
Inyo	2	2	< 3	0
Kern	13	9	5-10	0
Kings	8	5	5-10	0
Lassen	4	2	< 3	1
Los Angeles				
Marin	9	3	3-5	0

Mono	2	2 < 3	0
Monterey	25	20 15-25	2
Orange			
San Bernardino	7	4 3-5	3
San Diego	27	18 10-15	1
San Joaquin	28	20 10-15	3
San Luis Obispo	32	16 10-15	2
San Mateo	8	6 3-5	2
Santa Barbara	15	15 5-10	5
Santa Clara	15	10 10-15	1
Shasta	5	3 < 3	0
Sonoma	21	16 5-10	2
Stanislaus	36	28 15-25	
Tehama	10	8 3-5	0
Tulare			
Tuolumne	6	3 < 3	0
Ventura	10	7 5-10	0
Colusa	5	5 3-5	0
Del Norte	1	1 < 3	0
Mariposa	2	1 < 3	0
Mendocino	6	3 < 3	0
Riverside	10	6 5-10	3
San Benito	6	6 3-5	0
San Francisco	1	1 < 3	0
Santa Cruz	10	8 5-10	0

33) Question: Are paper form (samples) of PUR and NOI available?

Answer: [The DPR Pesticide Use Reporting web page: http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/pur/forms/purforms.htm](http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/pur/forms/purforms.htm) contains links to pdf versions of the various types of use report and NOI forms.

34) Question: Please provide details on Training requirements:

- Number of people need to get trained by county?
- Will there be cross county training?
- What type of training is expected like Classroom training, web based training etc.?
- Also explain type of users by role who need training like Programmers, Admin, Configuration Manager, end users etc. with count

Answer: Refer to the table after Question 32 above for estimates of approximate numbers of total users to be trained.

Training individuals from multiple counties at the same time (cross-county training) is fine as long as it is more efficient and takes into account any differences between counties.

The mode of training offered is not restricted. Proposals should describe the approach(es) to be taken and the rationale to support them.

There is no breakdown available for number of users by role. The extent to which roles such as programmers or system administrators need to be trained will depend on the proposed system and its architecture (e.g. whether systems requiring county staff administration will be installed inside counties or not). Regardless of system configuration, vendors should assume the need at least for role-based training for Pesticide Use Enforcement (PUE) officers who will be issuing permits, and for data entry

staff who will be entering data from hardcopy PUR and NOI.

35) Question: Has there been county level customization done to the database schemas of the two products? There are no specific requirements around the data migration from existing systems to the proposed system.

Answer: County level schema customization is minimal or non-existent in the most up to date versions of AgGIS and RMMS. However, a few counties are still using older versions of these two systems which may have different schemas (See Phase I report p. 11 for system versions in use). Schemas for RMPP systems in the counties using them are also consistent. Data migration requirements not addressed in the RFP packet are addressed more extensively in answers to other questions in this document. The successful contractor will need to discover all of the details surrounding data migration as part of the Implementation/Transition planning process, and proposals should describe the approach that will be taken to perform this discovery process and any assumptions on which costs are based.

36) Question: Could you please explain the type of reports that are being generated currently? How many reports are county level and summary level? Also if you have some sample reports could you please share those reports?

Answer: Reporting requirements are described in Section 13 of the SRS. In general, CACASA is seeking a very flexible report generation capability in order to accommodate diverse needs among counties. There is no information available to quantify current reports by type, nor have sample reports been collected for review.

37) Question: What are the quantitative and qualitative benefits expected out of new system which will replace the existing systems?

Answer: Desired benefits that are described frequently in the RFP and background materials are for a system that is functional, well documented, sustainable, scalable, and cost effective.

38) Question: We see a lot of change management activity as part of this project. Do you have a Change Management group in place? Could you please explain their roles and responsibilities with respect to this project?

Answer: There is no formal change management group currently established for this project. The RFP asks for (see Sections 1.2.5, 3.9, 4.2.11) proposals to address and describe a proposed change management process, which can include recommendations on personnel to be involved on both the client and contractor sides. Vendors should assume that CACASA oversight (i.e. the CACASA Executive Director), the CACASA Board of Directors (and possibly designated committees), and DPR management could potentially all be involved depending upon specific issues.

39) Question: Please provide CACASA project team structure and their roles who will work with the selected vendor?

Answer: The contractor will work most directly with the CACASA Executive Director (scheduled to be formally hired this October) who will report directly to the CACASA Board of Directors which has ultimate decision making authority for the project. At the county level, the contractor will work with each

c

ounty's Ag Commissioner and any key staff designated by him/her to carry out coordination activities with the contractor. At the state level, DPR staff and management will be involved to the extent required as part of their normal duties to oversee regulatory activities within counties. This means that DPR will monitor system development and implementation and could potentially make significant comments or demands in order to ensure compatibility and compliance with pesticide enforcement regulations.

40) Question: Please explain the process of how each county will communicate, provide help and required support to selected vendor in conducting data migration, user training and other activities.

Answer: These are all items that vendors should describe as part of the recommended approach and assumptions within their proposals.

41) Question: Do you have any Spatial Data Engine in the current landscape? If yes please provide details on the same. Also, could you please explain the current format of GIS data like .shp or file GEO db files?

Answer: Spatial data is currently stored in the PostGIS extension format of the PostGRE open source database product (AgGIS counties) or various ESRI formats (other counties). Both are able to export vector data to shapefile format.

42) Question: What are your performance requirements on the GIS?

Answer: See SRS Sections 11.11 and 17.

43) Question: Do you have any security / access control requirements while accessing different county data using GIS?

Answer: Access control for GIS field boundary data should be configurable as described in SRS Section 14.3 for all other data and software modules.

44) Question: What is the size of data that needs to be migrated to new GIS Database? What are all various data types that needs to get migrated to new GIS System?

Answer: The table on page 26 of the Phase I report provides estimates for the number of field sites (polygons) in responding counties, whether they are currently stored in a GIS, and the estimated number of sites that need to be edited each year (includes permit reassignments, and other spatial and attribute edits). There is no information on the volume of data in other layers that may need to be migrated. For common base map layers (roads, surface water, ortho-photography, etc.) CACASA prefers a system that can either display existing county data in native formats or can easily import spatial data on a regular, as needed basis.

45) Question: Do you have data describing endangered species habitats, schools, health care facilities, highways and any other related info required as part GIS implementation?

Answer: Some counties have these layers and some do not. The system must be able to display or import these layers as described in the previous answer.

Note: The following 5 questions were asked and unofficially answered at the September 10 pre-proposal conference. The bulk of questions asked at that time are not listed because they dealt with architecture centralization (which is addressed in frequent Question A at the beginning of this document) or other issues addressed in answers to written questions.

46) Question: (from pre-proposal conference) Where is the line between county responsibility for managing system infrastructure and vendor responsibility?

Answer: This depends on the system architecture (centralized/decentralized) chosen as well as the recommendations and assumptions contained in the proposal of the selected contractor. Vendors should be sure to describe any duties they assume that counties will need to perform regarding system administration and what duties the vendor will perform.

47) Question: (from pre-proposal conference) Is it possible to have a single standard for baseline data content and procedures that CACASA would enforce on the counties but allow counties to pick their own vendor to implement the interfaces, tools, and infrastructure needed to meet the minimum standards? This could potentially result in many vendors serving groups of counties.

Answer: This is somewhat analogous to the current situation except that there are only regulatory standards all counties must follow and few uniform technical standards. This situation has been deemed unworkable and that is why this RFP is seeking a standard solution from a single vendor that would be used in every county, but that is sufficiently flexible, customizable, and adjustable to accommodate the diversity of situations encountered among counties as a whole.

48) Question: (from pre-proposal conference) How reliable is the RFP background information in terms of capturing the range of county requirements and desires?

Answer: Section 1.B of the Phase I report describes the methodology that was used to gather much of the information on county needs. It includes a discussion on the number of individuals contacted in person and the number of counties represented. Page 21 in that report summarizes the number and diversity of respondents to an extensive online survey compiled in February 2009. The RFP and supporting materials have been further informed by additional in-depth on site meetings conducted with eight counties in June 2009 and an online survey about general IT infrastructure issues conducted around that same time.

Although the information gathering effort has been extensive and has been vetted by CACASA members, vendors must still describe all supplementary information gathering activities that are proposed to be necessary to implement their recommended solution.

49) Question: (from pre-proposal conference) Have counties looked at the trend toward reduced income from the pesticide mill assessment due to declines in agricultural pesticide usage?

Answer: DPR has looked at that and found that urban uses of pesticides are increasing and short term fluctuations in mill funds (e.g. due to agricultural land going fallow during drought periods) have not impaired the stability of this funding source over time.

50) Question: (from pre-proposal conference) When is the cutoff date to ask questions about the RFP?

Answer: This is discussed in Section 2.4 of the RFP. Official written answers to questions will be e-mailed to all registered vendors on at least a weekly basis until October 9th, one week before the proposal due date.

The remaining questions below were submitted in writing after the pre-proposal conference.

51) Question: Please confirm that CACASA is entertaining proposals from established software vendors offering a commercial-off-the-shelf product that is in use by multi-departmental and/or statewide agencies.

Answer: Yes, proposals for a COTS-based system will be accepted. Vendors of such systems will need to thoroughly explain how their system can be configured to meet the needs for this project and must clearly identify any components that may need to be custom developed. As with all proposals, the evaluation will be based on the ability of the proposed system and its vendor to meet functional requirements in the most cost effective way. Cost proposals for COTS-based systems should include all licensing fees for the primary system in the column for "Commercial Software" on the Task Direct Cost worksheet tab of the PesticideITCost.xls spreadsheet file. Explanation and itemization of licensing costs must be included in the narrative that accompanies the cost proposal spreadsheet.

52) Question: Is CACASA open to reviewing vendor options that have been used by other government agencies in lieu of the 50% Performance Bond (e.g. increased retainage, etc.)?

Answer: Vendors should identify any objections to provisions in the RFP (including contractual provisions in the Professional Services Agreement PSA) and may propose alternatives to these provisions which will be subject to negotiations with the selected vendor.

53) Question: The RFP package includes a System Requirements Specification (SRS) document; however bidders are only asked to discuss those requirements that are anticipated to require modifications or further definition. Please confirm that as part of this submittal, bidders are neither required to respond directly to each of these requirements nor explain how these requirements will be handled.

Answer: Proposals should respond to the requirements in whatever ways vendors deem necessary to make a clear and competitive presentation. Extensive guidelines are provided throughout RFP Section 4 to indicate what is needed to develop a complete proposal. These guidelines do not require an exhaustive presentation on every aspect of the SRS, and vendors are encouraged to be both informative and concise.

54) Question: The rfp states: *"Both the system (custom software and installed hardware) and all data managed by the system will be owned by and under the exclusive control of individual counties, CACASA, or the State of California (ownership and control will vary for specific system and data elements). Each county will manage its own database which will only store information pertaining to pesticide regulatory functions within its own county, and no data may be sold or otherwise distributed*

by any other party without prior written authorization from the county's Agriculture Department – as in, for example, the normal process to grant public information requests.” We respectfully request clarification on the following items:

- a. If the State will manage specific data elements, does this mean the new PURS system will not require an interface with any third party State-sponsored system; and instead, the State will directly access and use the required data stored in the PURS system?
- b. It is clear that each county will have its own database. Will all counties track the same data elements or will these data vary by county? If the latter, please confirm that each county will have its own variation of user interface design to account for the omission and/or inclusion of specific fields.
- c. Please provide additional detail regarding the implementation approach to deploying the system to 58 counties. Does CACASA prefer a phased approach where a specified number of counties are deployed over specific time periods or phases? Is the CACASA interested in having the vendor train staff to lead the deployment efforts across other counties?

Answer: Regarding bullet **a**: The state (DPR) does not directly access data in the PPUR system. The principal technical requirements regarding DPR are that the system must be able to export PUR data to DPR using the prescribed format in SRS Appendix C, and the PPUR system must be able to interface (obtain downloads) with the DPR pesticide product label and licensee databases as described in SRS Section 21.

Regarding bullet **b**: All counties will employ the same database schema. As discussed in the SRS, there are variations among counties in the conventions used for populating some database fields, whether some fields are required or not, and in the specific validation routines used. Vendors are free to propose whether or not any of these variations are manifested in different user interface designs. There is a desire here to maintain an appropriate balance between flexibility, functionality, and cost effective standardization.

Regarding bullet **c**: Vendors should propose an implementation approach they consider to be most appropriate for their recommended system solution. RFP Section 1.3 gives a preferred overall implementation timeline. Vendors should design an approach to meet this timeline or may propose and provide justification for an alternative timeline. Vendors may also propose a “train the trainer” approach to system training, but should describe all assumptions regarding the time commitment for county staff trainers to become trained by the vendor and then conduct training sessions within their counties. The efficiency of this approach must be adequately demonstrated.

- 55) Question: Please provide detail regarding the report development requirements that are part of this implementation, such as: each county's report writing resources and do any Counties, as part of the training protocol, want to be trained in report writing and development; and if so, what percentage of reports do these counties wish the vendor to write as part of the implementation? (For example, vendor writes 5 reports, the county is trained to write 15 reports.)

Answer: See answer to Question #36. Also, there are probably only about 20 of the largest Ag Departments with personnel trained in a generic sense to produce custom database reports. Current PPUR systems have the ability to produce only a few standardized ("push button") reports and there is great demand for the new system to produce a wide variety of customized reports that can be defined by non-IT specialist users, so users must be adequately trained to perform this function.

56) Question: Are any data conversion resources available to participate in the conversion effort of moving legacy systems data to the new system? Do the Counties have resources to put the legacy data into a prescribed format, and then participate in the conversion process in the new system?

Answer: Vendors of the existing systems will be paid to cooperate with data migration activities as part of the support agreements for their systems during the transition period. The contractor for this project will be responsible for mapping the data elements from current systems to the new system schema and for writing any automated conversion tools. Counties only have the ability to export data into electronic formats such as delimited text files, which they commonly do to fulfill public information requests.

57) Question: Please clarify whether any third party application systems are required to be integrated with the new system as part of this implementation?

Answer: The only third party system integration requirement is described in SRS Section 21.3.1 which pertains to the ability to receive electronic PUR/NOI data entered into grower management software application web interfaces. However, the desire is for a PPUR system with scalable characteristics that would allow it to interface with other Ag Department systems in the future.