

**WA OSOS RFI 16-04 Elections Modernization System  
Amendment 3  
Q&A November 5, 2015**

Q19: Can you provide a list of which tabulation vendor each county uses?

A19:

County	Tabulation Vendor
KING	Dominion-Assure
FRANKLIN	Dominion
PIERCE	Dominion
SNOHOMISH	Dominion
WHATCOM	Dominion
ADAMS	ES&S
JEFFERSON	ES&S
PEND OREILLE	ES&S
SPOKANE	ES&S
THURSTON	ES&S
WAHKIAKUM	ES&S
WALLA WALLA	ES&S
WHITMAN	ES&S
ASOTIN	Hart
BENTON	Hart
CHELAN	Hart
CLALLAM	Hart
CLARK	Hart
COLUMBIA	Hart
COWLITZ	Hart
DOUGLAS	Hart
FERRY	Hart
GARFIELD	Hart
GRANT	Hart
GRAYS HARBOR	Hart

**WA OSOS RFI 16-04 Elections Modernization System  
Amendment 3  
Q&A November 5, 2015**

ISLAND	Hart
KITSAP	Hart
KITTITAS	Hart
KLICKITAT	Hart
LEWIS	Hart
LINCOLN	Hart
MASON	Hart
OKANOGAN	Hart
PACIFIC	Hart
SAN JUAN	Hart
SKAGIT	Hart
SKAMANIA	Hart
STEVENS	Hart
YAKIMA	Hart

Q20: What is the age of the Washington SVRS?

A20: Washington launched the Voter Registration Database (VRDB) in January of 2006. County Voter Registration Systems were originally implemented anywhere from 6 to 10 years.

Q21: What operation/servicing model does Washington use to manage SVRS? (e.g. State-operated SVRS, Outsourced, Hybrid, etc.)

A21: The Washington Office of the Secretary of State manages the VRDB. Each county owns and operates their own Election Management/Voter Registration System, which interfaces with the VRDB. Counties leverage vendor support to a varying degree. Larger counties have election-specific IT staff that provide support for their voter registration system. However, small counties rely solely on their vendor for all voter registration system IT support.

Q22: Which operations (coding/development, testing, etc.) are outsourced (if any)?

A22: No VRDB operations are outsourced.

Q23: Is the current state of SVRS Internet based? Has the future state approach for the Washington SVRS been developed?

A23: The VRDB is not internet based. However, Washington's Elections Information (WEI) is internet based. The WEI provides online voter registration, candidate filing and other support services for Washington Voters.

Q24: What initiated the change to start the modernization process now? (e.g. system age, technical/financial pain points, etc.)

A24: Aged technology, limitation of existing systems prohibit effective interoperability and evolution to next-generation elections support

**WA OSOS RFI 16-04 Elections Modernization System**  
**Amendment 3**  
**Q&A November 5, 2015**

Q25: Does Washington have plans for a complete modernization or is the approach to develop module enhancements?

A25: Complete modernization of all technology with the exception of Tabulation

Q26: What language is written for the code of the current SVRS?

A26: The Washington VRDB is written in .Net. Both C# and VB.net are used.

Q27: What approach was used for the current SVRS?

- a. Based on key strokes
- b. Wizard based (like Turbo tax)
- c. Form based
- d. Hybrid, depending on particular modules?

A27: The Washington VRDB Administration module is form-based in design. Likewise, most county VR systems are also form based. One of the county VR systems uses wizards and forms, depending upon the module.

Q28: What approach is being planned for the new SVRS?

A28: That has not yet been determined.

Q29: How did the State of Washington work to understand code on the existing SVRS to identify any architectural / coding challenges?

A29: Question not understood, please rephrase.

Q30: Has the State of Washington developed requirements for the new SVRS?

- e. How many months were spent writing business requirements?
- f. Were the business requirements written in-house or was that activity outsourced?
- g. Who wrote the requirements and what roles were involved (e.g. Business Systems Analyst, Project Manager, etc.)

A30: Yes, we have developed requirements, which are presented as Exhibit B. It took approximately 6 months to complete the business analysis and requirements project. A consultant wrote the Washington Elections Modernization business requirements based upon significant input from Washington Counties and Office of the Secretary of State and other Washington Elections Stakeholders. Consultant resources included strong elections subject matter experts serviced as business analysts, technical writers, a project manager and a service delivery manager, in addition to a handful of technical resources.

Q31: How were the pain points on the current SVRS, identified?

A31: Washington State did not find it very useful to focus on pain points, but rather analyzed the processes that a modernized system must support to reach a set of business requirements detailing *what* the new system must do.

Q32: What were those pain points and how is Washington planning to address those in the new SVRS?

- h. Data Structure / Data Table Management
- i. Data Integrity
- j. Security
- k. Forms Management
- l. Business Intelligence Reporting / Special Queries
- m. Cloud-based applications
- n. Backup site / equipment
- o. Enhancement Training / Testing environment
- p. Online Voter Registration

**WA OSOS RFI 16-04 Elections Modernization System**  
**Amendment 3**  
**Q&A November 5, 2015**

A32: Please see A31 and Exhibit B.

Q33: What role did the Counties play in elicitation of requirements and/or review of requirements?

A33: Counties were highly engaged and via a steering committee comprised of 6 county representatives and 1 state representative, guided the business analysis and requirements project and deliverable completion.

Q34: What will be the ongoing role of the Counties as Washington transitions to the new SVRS?

A34: Washington State will continue to leverage county and state steering committees to craft procurement documentation, select the apparently successful contractor and ultimately, transition to the modernized system.

Q35: Were any User experience / User Design efforts included in this effort thus far or are any UX/UD efforts planned as part of next steps?

A35: Not yet. It is anticipated that the next phase will include UX analysis. Responses to RFI 16-04 will guide Washington State in defining UX requirements for inclusion of the RFP.