

RFP 14-13
Addendum 1

Washington Office of the Secretary of State Elections Division
Elections Business Analysis and Business Requirements
Pre-Proposal Q&A

Q1: Page 4 of the RFP PDF (paragraph 1.2) states the proposer must describe "Documentation of current systems and processes". Is there a place where the State details its own and its counties' current systems and processes, other than the background provided in the Introduction paragraph 1.1? If not, may the proposer contact the counties to investigate and research the current systems and processes in order to thoroughly describe them in the proposal?

A1: No, there is not a place where the State clearly details its own or the counties' current system processes. State process-related documentation pertaining to Elections is embedded in a SharePoint website titled VRDB Helpdesk. The documentation is cumbersome and not easy to follow without "tribal" knowledge of Washington State Elections. This is the precise reason and necessity for the work prescribed in this RFP. The contract work solicited is just that: the selected vendor will document current systems and process during the work period of 02/27/15-08/7/2014. It is not expected that this work be delivered in a proposal, but rather a description of how the work will be conducted and how it will be presented to OSOS. Vendors should not contact the counties to investigate or research work related to this RFP, per section 2.1, "Communication directed to parties other than the RFP Coordinator may result in disqualification of the Consultant."

Section 1.2 describes the objective of the project work and lists the items that OSOS expects the apparently successful contractor to address with the deliverables they prescribe in order to accomplish the OSOS project objective.

Q2: The same section (1.2) states the proposer must describe desired-state business process for the State and counties. Does "desired-state" mean the proposer's recommended business processes to further the goals stated in Exhibit D, 2990 Amended WA State Plan?

A2: No. "Desired-state" processes as referenced in the third bullet in section 1.2 can be defined as: a preferred set of processes that will be used as a goal for future OSOS and county processes as they relate to Elections services. The Desired-state processes, as determined through this project work, will be the basis for the apparently successful contractor's deliverable in which business requirements are documented.

Q3: If a contractor bids on RFP No. 14-13, will the contractor be precluded from bidding on subsequent implementation phases or the resultant system project?

A3: No. Contractors bidding on RFP 14-13 will not be precluded from bidding on subsequent implementation phases or the resultant system project. Likewise, the selected, apparently successful contractor will not be precluded from bidding on or being awarded any subsequent project contract work.

Q4: Does the delivery of RFP No. 14-13 provide an option to extend directly from the requirements gathering to the planning and implementation phases of the project?

RFP 14-13
Addendum 1

A4: No.

Q5: Can election technology vendors respond?

A5: Yes.

Q6: If an election technology vendor does respond and is awarded the contract, can the vendor bid on the OSOS replacement of the existing state-wide elections system?

A6: Yes.

Q7: How many OSOS staff do you expect to be directly involved in business process assessment and requirements gathering sessions?

A7: The OSOS Elections Division is comprised of 15 employees. In addition, 6 IT staff support the division. It is likely that not all 21 employees will be included, but OSOS will work with the apparently successful contractor to identify appropriate and necessary participation.

Q8: How many County staff should we expect to be directly involved in the project?

A8: There are 39 counties in Washington State. The exact count of county staff to be interviewed and directly involved in this project is not known at this time. OSOS will work with the counties and the apparently successful contractor to identify county staff participants to ensure that county processes are effectively assessed and considered during the project to net efficient results for the business analysis and business requirements. At least three counties representing the three different voter registration vendors in use in Washington State will be included.

Q9: Does the OSOS have an inventory or listing of the business processes to be assessed under this engagement?

- How many business processes in total?
- Can the list of business processes be provided to bidders (pre-proposal)?
- How many business process span organizations external to OSOS (e.g., County elections offices)?

A9: No, we do not presently have an inventory of business processes to be assessed under this engagement. However, we will work to compile a list and update our response to this question as soon as possible.

Q10: Regarding the minimum qualifications to propose (RFP Section 1.3)

- Does the minimum 5 years of experience in elections technology and process apply to the proposing firm, only?
- May the experience of the staff being proposed be included as “consultant” experience?

A10: Yes and yes.

Q11: Regarding Section 3.1 of the RFP – Response requires the “Location of the facility from which the Consultant would operate.”

RFP 14-13
Addendum 1

- Is the OSOS expecting the consulting firm to operate out of a facility close to Olympia?

A11: No, but we do expect the apparently successful contractor to be present in person to the degree necessary to ensure a successful project.

Q12: Please elaborate on the requirement to have five years' experience in elections technology and process. If the vendor proposes a team approach, would it suffice for one member of that team to have this experience? May we have experience in similar technologies and processes?

A12: Yes for bidding purposes it will suffice for one member of a proposing team to have the required elections technology experience. OSOS will have a strong preference for elections technology experience.

Q13: Does the OSOS have a preference regarding whether vendors propose a single consultant or a team approach for this effort?

A13: No. However, OSOS will look to a single contractor to manage the contract work. A single contractor will be accountable for the work conducted by contractor staff involved. OSOS will expect a single point of contact and point of escalation for work conducted by any partnering contractors. Likewise, OSOS will expect a single set of invoices from a single contractor for deliverables completed.

Q14: Can the OSOS share the budget for this project with bidders?

A14: No.

Q15: Has the OSOS received funding for the procurement of a replacement elections system?

A15: No.

Q16: Does the OSOS have any formal relationships with elections technology vendors beyond the current vendors (DFM, DIMS, and VOTEC)?

A16: OSOS does not currently have formal (contractual) relationships with the stated elections technology vendors. The counties do.

Q17: To what degree do the 39 counties expect to be involved in this effort?

A17: To the degree necessary to ensure effective consideration and assessment of county business processes and business requirements. Where similarities can be identified amongst various counties' business processes and requirements, the similarities should be leveraged to limit labor time from counties and the apparently successful contractor.

Q18: Will the vendor or the OSOS be expected to take responsibility for coordinating and communicating with the 39 counties?

A18: OSOS will coordinate communication with the 39 counties.

RFP 14-13
Addendum 1

Q19: Please define the term “matrix team”.

A19: A team comprised of individuals with varying reporting lines and cross-functional responsibilities. For example: OSOS Elections Division staff report to the Director of the Elections Division; OSOS IT staff report to the OSOS CIO; County staff report to their respective County Auditor; Likewise, staff members have varying subject matter expertise and business responsibilities.

Q20: What existing documentation does the State have regarding its current business processes? Have any formal or informal assessments/reviews been conducted of the current environment?

A20: State process-related documentation pertaining to Elections is embedded in a SharePoint website titled VRDB Helpdesk. The documentation is cumbersome and not easy to follow without “tribal” knowledge of Washington State Elections. No, there have not been any formal or informal assessments/reviews conducted of the current processes. There has been a recent security assessment conducted (completed September, 2014).

Q21: Does the OSOS expect current and desired-state business process analysis refer to OSOS processes or processes across the 39 counties?

A21: Both. Please see A17.

Q22: The objective states a goal of replacing the existing statewide elections system, yet the counties use three different systems; please clarify this. Can we assume that all 39 counties plan to implement the same elections management system after this effort?

A22: The purpose of this contract is to identify the best solution to modernize our systems to achieve maximum benefit at the county and state level. The answer to the stated question is one of the expected outcomes of this contract.

Q23: Should we put the Cost section into a particular format? Should cost be submitted as a separate file or included in the Technical response?

A23: Costs should be submitted per proposed deliverable. Please list a single cost per deliverable title. Costs should be included in the proposal document as a section of its own title.

Q24: Will OSOS extend the due date?

A24: No.

Q25: Is the current OSOS database HAVA compliant?

A25: Yes.

Q26: Is OSOS willing to share the VRDB Helpdesk with proposing vendors?

A26: No. The OSOS is not confident in the accuracy of the existing documentation.