Question #	Questions	Responsible to Answer	Answer
Modern iConcepts 001	Could the CCAITJPA provide annual statistics on Proposition 19 and related exemptions for the past few years per top 10 counties, as well as projected volume estimates for the next five years?	JPA PM	The system must be designed for scalability to handle a high volume of concurrent public and county user interactions, especially during key filing periods. Based on data collected from the BoE website (https://www.boe.ca.gov/dataportal/catalog.htm?category=Property%20Taxes), initial projections estimate: Approximately 13k Veterans, 4.6M Homeowners and less than 10k other (Church, School....) exemption-related transactions yearly across all counties at peak."
Modern iConcepts 002	Can the Authority provide additional details on the types of County Assessment Systems currently in use (e.g., vendor platforms, custom-built solutions, legacy systems)? Specifically, we would like to understand the diversity of technologies, the availability of APIs or integration interfaces, and whether the Authority intends to provide a standardized framework or expects vendors to design adaptable integration strategies per county.		For the purposes of cost estimation, an assumed # of counties of each integration type and complexity has been provided in Template I - Cost Workbook (Integration Tab). Proposers should assume that roughly 50% of integrations will be low complexity (e.g., APIs), 35% will be medium complexity (e.g., files transfer), and 15% will be high complexity (e.g., Legacy Data Exchange). Additional details are to be addressed through discovery and design activities. Proposers should state their assumptions in their cost workbook and technical response.
Modern iConcepts 003	Can you provide more details or specifications for the County Assessment Systems in use today (vendors, architecture, API availability)?		Addressed in previous response.
Modern iConcepts 004	Should the solution support multilingual forms or interfaces, and if so, which languages are required at go-live?		The specific languages to be supported other than English or Spanish are not explicitly listed at this time. Additional details are to be addressed through discovery and design activities. Proposers should state their assumptions regarding which languages will be supported in their cost workbook and technical response.
Modern iConcepts 005	Should the solution enforce ADA/WCAG compliance at a specific version (e.g., WCAG 2.1 AA)?		As outlined in Requirement T3.11, the System shall conform to Section 508 of the ADA and adhere to the accessibility standard as outlined in the web guidelines based on the W3C level 2 accessibility guidelines (https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/). This includes WCAG 2.1 level AA compliance

Modern iConcepts 006	Will the Authority be providing a standardized API schema or interface specification to facilitate County integrations?		No, the Authority will not be providing a standardized API schema or interface specification. The RFP states that the Vendor shall define a standard set of APIs, files, data elements, and options to enable the System to integrate with County Assessor systems (Requirement T1.12). The Vendor is also responsible for defining the data elements that need to be transmitted
Modern iConcepts 007	What are the expectations for the system's support of single sign-on (SSO) and federated identity for internal County users?		The System shall be developed to enable federated identity management and Single Sign On (SSO) that can integrate with Counties having these capabilities. Specifically, it shall enable SSO for any county with an identity provider supporting OpenID Connect (OIDC) or SAML (Requirement T3.32). For counties not opting into SSO, County Staff will register for system accounts using a verified email address (T3.33).
Modern iConcepts 008	Should the vendor propose a centralized data warehouse, or does the Authority prefer distributed data ownership per county?		The System is intended as a cloud-based SaaS solution supporting cross-county data sharing. While it facilitates information sharing between counties, the System shall logically separate data for each County such that it is not accessible by other counties (Requirement T3.28). This indicates a preference for logically separate data per county within the shared technical infrastructure, rather than a fully centralized model like a traditional data warehouse that merges all data without separation.
Modern iConcepts 009	Will the Authority provide a master data management (MDM) framework, or should the proposed solution include one for claimant and property data reconciliation across counties?	Technical Subject Matter Expert	Authority will not be providing an MDM framework. Vendors are encouraged to propose a solution consistent with the stated technical requirements, using federated identities or other approaches, that the Vendor believes will best serve the Authority's goals.

Modern iConcepts 010	Please expand the expectations when dealing with small counties that do not have a flexible robust system that will be required to integrate or interface with this system? Should this effort be part of this effort?		Yes, the effort to integrate with counties, regardless of the flexibility or robustness of their current systems, is explicitly part of this effort. The RFP includes County Onboarding Services that the Proposer is expected to provide to each adopting County. These services include County Consultation, Assessment System Integration (as elected), County Configuration, and Training. The System must be flexible to support multiple data formats from different County systems (Requirement T1.14), and the Vendor is expected to accommodate their specifications.