RFP 18-02 AMENDMENT 4 - Q&A

This amendment contains responses to questions submitted within the designated timeline.

Q1. The first paragraph of Section 3.1 states that the response should be in the same order as the RFP. Will you please clarify if this means the order of the "Table of Contents" or as in the "Checklist" which is in a different order, with all of the Exhibits at the end?

A1. Please follow the structure outlined in the Checklist (Section 3.1).

Q2. Will the PowerPoint presentation be posted on WEBS site at some point?

A2. Yes. The pre-proposal bidder conference slides have been posted on WEBS.

Q3. Would OSOS consider extending the question due date until 10/5/17 to allow vendors to thoroughly review the RFP requirements?

A3. The deadline for questions was extended to 10/6/17.

Q4. To determine if we can bid, we are in need of the definition for "offshore". Section 1.4 Minimum Qualifications states: The Bidder must agree not to utilize offshore labor for OSOS solutions or activities. We are a UK based company with US operations in Florida. Development offices in Canada and Panama. A key partner would be in South Dakota. Simply, can we bid under these circumstances?

A4. Please see the Cost Worksheet Instructions and Key Assumptions contained in the RFP. For purposes of this RFP, any work done outside of the United States is considered "offshore". All bidders, regardless of where the company is headquartered, must agree not to use offshore labor. Companies located or headquartered outside of the United States are welcome to bid so long as they can meet the requirement that all work under the contract be done within the United States. This requirement minimizes risks to the elections system and future elections.

Q5. I wanted to see if there were any vendors under contract for support of the current aging system or are all current efforts handled by state employees?

A5. The current systems are supported by a combination of vendors and public employees.

Q6. What is the estimated cost of the Election Management System project?

A6. Please see section 1.5 of RFP 18-02.

Q7. Has OSOS allocated funding for the Election Management System yet? If so, through which source (budget, CIP, state/federal grant etc.)?

A7. Please see section 1.5 of RFP 18-02.

Q8. How is OSOS currently meeting this need? Which vendor provides the incumbent Election Management System?

A8. The current systems are supported by a combination of vendors and public employees.

Q9. Which other systems will have to integrate or interface with the Election Management System, and will the State provide incumbent vendors for each system?

A9. Please see section 1.2 Scope of the RFP. Also, see Exhibit F: Current System Diagram.

Q10. Which operating platform does OSOS currently use? / Is desired for the Election Management System?

A10. Please see section 3.4. in the RFP.

Q11. What is the number of users anticipated for the Election Management System?

A11. Currently, we have approximately 170 active county and state users. This does not include public users that will interact with the public site.

Q12. Who is the technical contact and/or project manager for the Election Management System?

A12. Please see section 2.1 of RFP 18-02 for the allowable contact related to this procurement.

Q13. Have you had any external assistance preparing this RFP?

A13. The question is unclear.

Q14. Does OSOS anticipate procuring any services related to the effort? For example: IV&V, QA, staff augmentation, integration, solicitation prep, etc. If so, what, when and how?

A14. Procurements for services outside the scope of RFP 18-02, if needed, will follow standard procedures.

Q15. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (Like, from India or Canada)

A15. Please see the Cost Worksheet Instructions and Key Assumptions contained in the RFP. For purposes of this RFP, any work done outside of the United States is considered "offshore". All bidders, regardless of where the company is headquartered, must agree not to use offshore labor. Companies located or headquartered outside of the United States are welcome to bid so long as they can meet the requirement that all work under the contract be done within the United States. This requirement minimizes risks to the elections system and future elections.

Q16. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

A16. OSOS anticipates that the primary work location will be the OSOS location identified in the Solicitation. Remote work is not anticipated.

Q17. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (Like, from India or Canada)

A17. Please see the Cost Worksheet Instructions and Key Assumptions contained in the RFP. For purposes of this RFP, any work done outside of the United States is considered "offshore". All bidders, regardless of where the company is headquartered, must agree not to use offshore labor. Companies located or headquartered outside of the United States are welcome to bid so long as they can meet the requirement that all work under the contract be done within the United States. This requirement minimizes risks to the elections system and future elections.

Q18. Can we submit the proposals via email?

A18. Please see section 2.5 of RFP 18-02.

Q19. Would OSOS consider extending the question due date until 10/5/17 to allow vendors to thoroughly review the RFP requirements?

A19. The deadline for questions was extended to 10/6/17.

Q20. Section 3.4 Maintenance and Operations Proposal, Hardware and Software Costs, and Hosting Options / Does the OSOS have a hosting preference?

A20. Please see the Cost Worksheet Instructions and Key Assumptions contained in the RFP. Also, see A21.

Q21. There are some references to cloud and SaaS, but then the RFP does mention that "at a minimum" the state expects hosting in the OSOS data center. Please clarify.

A21. Please see the section 3.4 of the RFP, as well as the Cost Worksheet Instructions and Key Assumptions. OSOS does not anticipate hosting in a State Data Center. The hardware and software environment for the EMP is assumed to be housed at an OSOS location in Cheney, Washington. However, Bidders may propose any approach to meet the identified requirements. Detail what would be needed to successfully implement your proposed solution, including any items OSOS may need to procure (such as hardware and software).

Q22. Section 1.1 Purpose and Background, Information Technology Guiding Principles. The State has requested that there be "no browser plug-ins." However, the State has also requested imaging capabilities. Standard modern browsers are not equipped to allow web applications direct interaction with local system ports and resources. This purposeful limitation is circumvented only through the use of a bridging application that allows a trusted web application to gain access to a local resource. Without this, the solution is unable to allow for direct scanning and can only allow for file selection and upload. Would the State prefer the vendor to propose a file selection and upload feature in lieu of a direct scan-to-application? OR Would the State prefer to allow a secure browser plug-in to be used ONLY on machines that are expected to perform scanning functions, thus enabling direct scan-to-application features?

A22. Our intention is that the vendor propose the best solution possible that meets our functional and technical requirements. Please provide documentation on how/why you have chosen your recommendation

Q23. Section 1.2 Scope: What is the functionality in County Website Hosting?

A23. Currently, some counties have their own hosting but some utilize the state to provide website hosting, including content management.

Q24. Section 1.2 Scope: What is the functionality in Language admin tool?

A24. The Language Admin Tool is a custom built tool that allows users to enter translations of English text into Chinese, Spanish, Korean, and Vietnamese that are used by our public facing applications.

Q25. Section 3.2 Implementation Approach: With the 2018 election in play, what is the state and counties' availability for the project during the months of October, November and December 2018?

A25. The EMP is a top priority for OSOS and the counties. However, the Contractor will be expected to work around elections schedules in 2018 and 2019. See chart below for important election dates.

Important Election Dates for…..	2018	2019
Filing Week	5/14 -5/18	5/13-5/17
Mock Election	10/29 - 11/2	10/28 - 11/1
Results Upload Test	8/2	8/1
Petition Signature Verification	7/6	7/5
Deadline for online and mail voter registration or address/name changes	7/9	7/8
Primary 18-day voting period begins	7/20	7/19
Deadline for in-person registration	7/30	7/29
Primary Election Day	8/7	8/6
Counties upload election results daily	8/8	8/7
National Voter Registration Day	9/25	9/24
Deadline for online and mail voter registration or address/name changes	10/8	10/7
General Election 18-day voting period begins	10/19	10/18
Deadline for in-person registration	10/29	10/28
General Election Dry Run - Results upload test	11/1	10/31
General Election	11/6	11/5
Counties upload election results daily	11/7-11/27	11/6-11/26
Deadline to submit petition signatures supporting initiatives to the Legislature	N/A	1/3

Q26. Can the State confirm that all project team members on the State side will be available to ensure project deliverables are not impeded?

A26. Within the responses to Section 3.2 Implementation Approach, Bidder's should call out the resources required for their proposed approach, including State and County resources, for Key Questions #2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, as that will be part of the evaluation of the responses to those questions.

Q27. Are ALL of the 39 counties going to be using this new system? Or will some counties be permitted to retain some or all of their current system?

A27. The expectation is that all 39 counties will be using the new system.

Q28. Our understanding is that King county has recently acquired a new system to handle their county-level VR and EMS. Is the new statewide solution meant to interface with the King County system or replace it entirely?

A28. The expectation is that all 39 counties will be using the new system.

Q29. Will the State release a list of participants from the pre-proposal conference?

A29. OSOS does not intend to post a list of participants from the pre-proposal conference.

Q30. Section 1.1 Purpose and Background: Does the state have any predefined responsibilities identified for State staff vs. Vendor staff for support services provided on a system using the State's data center?

A30. Bidders may propose any approach to meet the identified requirements.

Q31. 1.4 Minimum Qualifications: Please confirm that the mandatory qualifications must be met by the prime contractor and not by a subcontractor.

A31. The primary bidder must meet the qualifications set forth in the RFP. As indicated in the sample contract, all contract terms, conditions, assurances and certifications must flow down to any subcontractors.

Q32. Exhibit A - Functional Requirements, 3.1.5.6 System Administration:
- Reqs 133-142 reference UC 8.4 Manage Mass Updates but should be 8.5.
- Reqs 143-151 reference UC 8.5 Manage Requests for Data but should be 8.6.
- Reqs 152-156 reference UC 8.6 Manage System Parameters but should be 8.7.
- Reqs 157-165 reference UC 8.7 Manage User Roles but should be 8.8.
- Reqs 166-83 reference UC 8.8 Generate Report but should be 8.9.

Please confirm?

A32. That is correct.

Q33. 3.1.5 Functional Requirements Matrix (scored): 3.1.5.6 Identified System Administration with a sub area of Manage Offices and Manage Ballot Measures, however there are no requirements identified in Exhibit A, nor are there any use cases. Please advise if vendors will receive requirements and use cases.

A33. Functional requirements for offices and ballots measures can be found under the Managing Candidates section and use cases.

Q34. Interface Requirements - 2.1.3.3 (I-3) has an incomplete reference to the file layout in the first paragraph. Please clarify.

A34. OSOS will not be providing file layouts as part of this RFP package. Please disregard the incomplete sentence in 2.1.3.3 of the RFP.

Q35. Section 3.1.7 - Overview of Technical Requirements and Specifications: Exhibit B - Technical Requirements Scoring Matrix identifies Current and Future Interface Requirements, however those requirements 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 are not listed for the Narrative. Should the vendor add this narrative within Section 3.1.7 Overview of Technical Requirements and Specifications?

A35. Yes.

Q36. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.1 Voter Registration, Req 98, UC 3.4 Process Application for Voter Registration: System shall allow a scanned document to be updated. Can we assume updating a scanned document is limited to replacing with a new version?

A36. No, documents should be retained per Functional Requirement section 3.1.7.9.

Q37. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.4 Petitions, Req 5, UC 6.1 Initial Filing of Petition Application: System shall allow for fee to be paid by interfacing with the Treasurer's payment system online or by submitting a check or cash for the amount in-person. Is the interface a web service or a payment gateway integration?

A37. The Treasurer's payment system is capable of utilizing either approach. Bidders are encouraged to propose an approach that provides the best value to the State.

Q38. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.4 Petitions, Req 76, UC 6.4 Records Signature Verification Findings / The system shall allow the user to view the randomly selected signature lines for verification at the same time the user is viewing voter registration information. Can OSOS clarify?

A38. This will allow staff to compare what is on the petition sheet to what is currently on file in the system.

Q39. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.5 Elections Management, Req 70, UC 7.5 Receive Ballot: System shall be able to interact with a sorter: Accept files produced from sorters containing signature images; Produce files that can be imported into a sorter showing the results of the signature verification step for each of the ballots in a given batch; Provide the ability to configure batches e.g. Legislative district, precinct, etc. How many different sorters are used in WA and do they use the same formats for import and export?

A39. Currently three (3) companies provide ballot sorting (more commonly known as mail sorting) equipment to six counties in the State of Washington. Import and export file formats from the various types of sorters are not readily available to OSOS at this time.

Q40. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.5 Elections Management, Req 102, UC 7.5 Receive Ballot: System shall have the capability for a user to authenticate to the system using the Common Access Card (CAC) in the case that Washington State Legislature enacts supporting law. This feature will not be engaged unless such legislation is passed.

- Would this functionality only apply to UOCAVA voters?
- What is the envisioned functionality of authentication using CAC?
- Since legislation is not enacted yet should the vendor include this functionality in the current proposed pricing?

A40. Yes, this would apply to UOCAVA voters. This would be used for signing a ballot return envelope. Yes, this is part of our functional requirements.

Q41. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.6 System Administration, Req 60, UC 8.4 Managed Candidates: System shall automatically assign candidates to Primary or General based on the filing and office details. What data in the filing details are used to indicate primary or general?

A41. Candidates are assigned to Primary or General based on multiple factors, including the number of filings for an office, whether it is partisan/nonpartisan, and whether the filing occurred during the regular filing period.

Q42. Will you be positing the bidders' conference attendee list?

A42. OSOS does not intend to post a list of participants from the pre-proposal conference.

Q43. Exhibit F, System Diagram: In Exhibit F, the State shows that there is a local copy of the VR data at the Secretary of State. Is this expected to continue with the new solution? If yes, please describe 1) the purpose of the local copy, 2) whether it is an exact mirror of production data, and 3) what is the frequency of refresh?

A43. No, as long as staff has access to the data for integrity, analysis, and support.

Q44. 3.2 Implementation Approach: Data Conversion, and Migration, and Interface Approach: 1) Will the data conversion be from a singular state database or will each county be providing its own data? 2) If counties are providing their own data, please specify how many different formats can be expected by the vendor, and 3) If there are image files please provide information regarding the type and volume of images.

A44. We expect that data will come from each county due to the fact they have much more data that is not in the central state database. There currently are three vendors in Washington which will provide data in their format.

Q45. 3.1.5 Functional Requirements Matrix (scored): 3.1.5.2 Identified Managed Rolls with a sub area of Manage Protected Voter, however there are no requirements identified in Exhibit A but there is a use case #4.6. Please advise if vendors will receive requirements for this use case.

A45. No, there will be no requirements.

Q46. Exhibit A - Functional Requirements, 3.1.5.5 Elections Management: Requirements 142 through 171 do not specify a use case. Please clarify.

A46. Not all requirements have use cases.

Q47. How many users require training? How many system administrators? Would the State like vendors to train users from all counties or prefer the "Train-the-Trainer" approach? How many regional training centers does the State recommend?

A47. Approximately 170 users will require training. Approximately 4 system administrators (depending on role). We have not identified a preference for training approach. We look for the best solution from the vendor.

Q48. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.5 Elections Management, Req 64, UC 7.4 Ballot Issuance: System shall produce test matrix/information for Logic and Accuracy test (WAC 434-335-323). What information and format is needed for Logic and Accuracy Test?

A48. Please see WAC 434-335-323 for Logic and Accuracy Test matrix requirements. Currently the matrix format is Excel.

Q49. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.6 System Administration, Req 50, UC 8.4 Managed Candidates: System shall show statement word count for the purpose of enforcement of county/office specific word count requirements, which will prevent user from being able to submit unpermitted word counts. Prevention of submission must be optional as a county configuration. Prevent submission by county based on the unpermitted word count or for any reason?

A49. Prevent submission for word count.

Q50. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.6 System Administration, Req 56, UC 8.4 Managed Candidates: System must allow for lot drawing. What is the specific functionality of Lot drawing?

A50. Please see RCW 29A.36.131

Q51. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.6 System Administration, Req 63, UC 8.4 Managed Candidates: System shall support the required data for Advisory Votes measure detail. What is the required data for Advisory Votes measure detail?

A51. Please see RCW 29A.32.070 (11).

Q52. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.6 System Administration, Req 71, UC 8.4 Managed Candidates: System shall support addition of tables in measure details. What are the tables in the above requirements?

A52. Please see RCW 29A.32.070. Most tables are in the fiscal impact statements. Prior examples can be found here: https://www.sos.wa.gov/elections/research/Election-Results-and-Voters-Pamphlets.aspx

Q53. Exhibit A - 3.1.5.6 System Administration, Req 90, UC 8.4 Managed Candidates: The system shall allow County Staff to create Special Filing Periods for local offices or districts. What is the definition of Special Filing Period and under what circumstances is it created?

A53. Please see RCW 29A.24.181.

Q54. Exhibit A – 3.1.5.1 Voter Registration, Req 21: The system shall have a web application for organizations to register and request access to the Online Voter Registration API. Which organizations will be making such requests? What specific functionality or interaction will the Online Voter Registration API enable?

A54. Interested organizations can build tools off of an online voter registration API that seamlessly and securely pass data to the state voter registration system for validation without requiring a visit to the state website.

Q55. The State indicated in the pre-bid meeting that they intend to host the VR application internally. The Cost sheets provided ask for vendors to provide pricing for hardware and software and installation of these environments. Vendors that meet the minimum requirements for Voter Registration Systems are not typically going to be Valued-Added Resellers who deal with procurement and installation of physical hardware and third-party software licensing, so bids will likely be all over the map depending on the vendor, partnerships we would have to obtain, or the retail pricing available online. The result would also likely be far more expensive than what a State Government like Washington would be able to procure through existing master contracts. It is also a modern practice in OCIO data centers to utilize virtual environments, so pricing new physical hardware may not be necessary. 1) Can the OSOS confirm that you intend for us to provide pricing for new physical hardware and third-party software (i.e. SQL Server etc.) for components that will reside in the OCIO Data Center?; and 2) If yes, can this pricing be excluded from the scoring of the cost proposals and only used as a general budgetary guide, as the State may determine it is in their best interest to use existing or internally purchased hardware/software, and would ensure apples-to-apples evaluations for vendors who are not hardware providers?

A55. See A21.

Q56. 1.2 Scope - Current and Future Interfaces, County Signature Verification Equipment: How many county signature verification systems are there and do they follow a standard format?

A56. There are currently none.

Q57. Does the state have any 508 compliance requirements for PDF, Charts, or other reporting products created by the application? Does this mean that some of the requirements are also at the vendors' discretion? The RFP states: The proposed solution must comply with other state and federal laws, including but not limited to Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disability Act. Public-facing portions of the system must be mobile friendly, meet Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0, and available in another language identified by the user. System shall also follow any other accessibility standards that is current at the time of the system implementation.

A57. Please see RFP requirements. The vendor must respond with how solution meets or does not meet each requirement.

Q58. The RFP states: The system shall comply with current VIP, ERIC, IEEE and NIST standards. Is the complete list for this specified here: https://ocio.wa.gov/policy/securing-information-technology-assets-standards and also in the RFP, or are there expectations of additional security requirements in the form of FIPS or NIST? More specifically, can the comprehensive list of required security standards be enumerated?

A58. Please see Exhibit B for Technical Requirements, including security and OCIO policies.

Q59. Are the current interfaces and protocols to the various agencies published as an open specification for the public?

A59. No.

Q60. The system mentions the use of managing and integrating GIS data as part of the requirements. The current Exhibit F does not show a GIS system in the architecture. Is the GIS component a state provided resource or is it expected that this be provided as a solution in the architecture?

A60. Currently, each county maintains their own GIS component, if resources allow. Please see Exhibit B for Functional Requirements, including Managing Geographic Information.

Q61. In Exhibit B: Tab 2.1.3 Interface Requirements, Section: Current Interfaces, Interface Requirement Number I-3 there appears to be missing information, in the sentence that begins "The file layout is defined in". Please confirm whether or not there is info missing.

A61. OSOS will not be providing file layouts as part of this RFP package. Please disregard the incomplete sentence in 2.1.3.3 of the RFP.

Q62. Can you expand on the scoring criteria for Exhibit A and B?

A62. Responses from the bidders will be scored as follows for Exhibit A and B:

For each Functional and/or Technical requirement, Bidders will be asked to respond by selecting a response code which speaks to "Whether" the proposed solution can meet, partially meet or not meet the requirement. Bidder will provide a written response to explain each limitation or deficiency.

Response Code: Whether	Definition	Value
F – Fully met	Requirement will be **fully and completely** met in the generally available version of the current product.	1.0
D – Deliver later	Requirement will be **fully met and available by the start of application testing.**	0.8
P – Partially met	Requirement will be **partially** met. Please indicate in the comments field an explanation as to which part is met and which part is not.	0.5
N – Not met	Requirement will **not** be met.	0

For each requirement with a response code of F/D/P (see above) Bidder will respond by selecting one of the following Response Codes which specifies "How" the requirement will be satisfied:

Response Code: How	Definition	Value
O - Out of the box	Requirement met **out-of-the-box** without additional configuration or development.	1.0
G - GUI Configuration	Requirement met via **core GUI configuration capabilities**, technical and/or scripting measures within the system.	0.8
T - Third Party	Requirement met through integration **with 3rd party software** product. Please indicate in the comments field whether or not the 3rd party product will be used out-of-the-box, configured, or customized.	0.4
C - Customization	Requirement will be met **via customization of source code** and components – by the start of application testing.	0.2

For each functional and technical requirement, the assigned value for the "Whether" response will be multiplied by the assigned value for the "How" response to determine a combined value. The combined values will then be added to determine the Bidder's overall functional and technical requirements score.

Note: The maximum available points for functional and technical requirements will be 760, rather than 750 as originally stated.

Q63. Section 3.4 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS PROPOSAL mentions the current server hardware and software. Can we also get information on the client hardware, operating systems, and browsers that will be used to access the application, specifically those used within the state and county offices?

A63. This information is not readily available at this time.

Q64. To ensure that vendors with recent Voting System implementation experience can participate, we request that OSOS consider modifying section 1.4 Minimum Qualifications, bullet 3 to be: "Bidder must have two prior state implementations: one for a VRDB/EMS/HAVA compliant solution and one for a solution of similar scope and complexity."

A64. OSOS has elected not to change section 1.4.

Q65. To ensure that vendors with recent Voting System implementation experience can participate, we request that OSOS consider modifying section 1.4 Minimum Qualifications, bullet 3 to be: "Bidder and/or subcontractor must have two prior implementations of VRDB/EMS/HAVA compliant solutions at the state level or at the county level where the county implementation was of similar scope and complexity."

A65. OSOS has elected not to change section 1.4.

Q66. 3.2 Implementation Approach, #1 Executive Summary; p. 27. Is the entire executive summary to be five pages or just the response to the first key question: "Please condense and highlight… RFP (Exhibit A and B)?"

A66. The entire Executive Summary should be five pages.

Q67. How will Exhibits A and B be scored? For example, are points allocated based on the responses for "Whether" and "How?" If so, what are those allocations? Does a designation of F - fully met and O - out of the box for a single requirement equal one point?

A67. Please see the response to Q62 as well as the "Instructions" tab in both Exhibit A and Exhibit B.

Q68. Regarding the scoring process for Exhibits A and B, how will the information entered into the column "Describe Proposed Solution" be factored into the scoring for the corresponding requirement?

A68. Please see the response to Q62 as well as the "Instructions" tab in both Exhibit A and Exhibit B.

Q69. Section 3.1.7 appears to be informational regarding the content in Exhibit B. Please confirm that Bidders are not required to respond to section 3.1.7 separately from completing Exhibit B as instructed in section 3.1.6.

A69. Section 3.1.7 responses will be captured in Exhibit B.

Q70. For the electronic submittal of the Bidder's response, what is the maximum file size that OSOS can receive via email? If the file size of the electronic submittal is larger than what OSOS can receive in one email, may the Bidder send two emails?

A70. Maximum file size is 20MB. Please send your Proposal, including all exhibits required, within a single email submittal if possible. If your submittal exceeds 20MB, you may break up your response into multiple emails as needed. Please clearly indicate how many emails you are sending. Bidders are advised to not submit any items with .exe extensions or use any .7z products to zip submitted items.

Q71. What role does OSOS Election Staff perform with processing petition signature sheet, random sampling, and signature verification?

A71. OSOS Election Staff accept and process all state initiatives and referendums including processing petitions signature sheets, conducting the random sampling, and signature verification.

Q72. How does OSOS intend to manage confidential voters in the new System?

A72. Please see Use Case 4.6 Manage Protected Voter.

Q73. Please provide any technical or functional documentation that you have on WEI.

A73. That documentation is not available to bidders at this time.

Q74. Regarding requirement in Exh. A - 3.1.5.6 System Administration - 46, what information will be exchanged between the System and the State Treasurer's system for processing of filing fee?

A74. That documentation is not available to bidders at this time.

Q75. Regarding requirement Exh. A - 3.1.5.6 System Administration - 142, would OSOS identify the use cases for which this requirement would be applicable?

A75. Not all requirements have use cases.

Q76. Regarding scoring of the References, what criteria will OSOS apply in determining the point value for each reference?

A76. The following criteria will be applied to each of the 3 required references. Each reference is worth 33.3% of the 100 possible points.

> 80-100: Outstanding. Reference exceeds expectations and indicates Bidder has an excellent ability to meet our needs.

> 60-79: Very Satisfactory. Reference indicates Bidder has an above-average ability to reach the goals and objectives of the EMP program.

> 40-59: Unsatisfactory. Reference provided negative or potentially risky information about the Bidder.

> <40: Poor. Reference provided information and insight that indicates Bidder would not meet expectations or would not fulfill state needs.

Q77. Is there an insurance requirement for cyber security breaches / incidents? If required, total amount of Coverage of Insurance (COI)?

A77. Please refer to Section 2.17 of the RFP for anticipated insurance requirements.

Q78. Post implementation, required hours of operation for help desk support; i.e. five days a week from 9 am to 5 pm PST?

A78. Please see RFP Section 3.4 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS PROPOSAL (SCORED) where you can provide your approach to help desk support.

Q79. Requirement 2: Staff has the ability to review, accept, and reject sponsor account applications. What is the system response for each status?

A79. These are not yet defined.

Q80. Requirement 21: The system shall have the capability to record a scanned copy of a paper application for petition. Does the OSOS want to extract data from the image? Is it a standard form?

A80. Please see Exhibit A for all Functional Requirements we've defined. The Affidavit for proposed initiative and Affidavit for proposed referendum can be found on our website.

Q81. Requirement 34. Sponsors shall have the ability to withdraw an application prior to the ballot title is issued. What are the different statuses needed in the application? What are some of the reasons for disqualification?

A81. Statuses are not defined at this time. This requirement does not refer to disqualification in any way, only voluntary withdraw.

Q82. Requirement 54. The system shall allow the user to indicate in the system that specific signature lines are disqualified and indicate a reason for signature line disqualification. What are the reason codes?

A82. Reason codes are not defined at this time.

Q83. Requirement 58: The system shall deem the petition still valid pending the random sampling of the remaining signatures, if the system determines the total number of signatures remaining is greater than or equal to the number required for the petition. Does this mean that the petition is certified if enough signatures are available after page review?

A83. No, this requirement means that after all signatures lines are disqualified, that there are presumably still a sufficient number of signatures for the initiative, referendum, or recall prior to the random sampling.

Q84. Requirement 78: The system shall allow the user to update the voter registration record of the signature with the history that the voter signed the given petition. Does the State need the system to export or integrate data to the voter registration system, and what field must be updated?

A84. Please respond in Exhibit A Functional Requirements with how your solution will meet this requirement as written.

Q85. Requirement 81: The system shall allow the user to double or triple check signature lines. Please clarify what "double or triple check signature lines" means.

A85. Questionable signatures can be escalated to veteran staff and/or supervisors.

Q86. Requirement 87: The system shall allow the user to certify his or her signature verification findings. Please provide clarity and define the action of "certify" by the user. How would the State like this to be represented in the system? Check box? Affidavit? Other?

A86. Please respond in Exhibit A Functional Requirements with how your solution will meet this requirement as written.

Q87. Requirement 89: The system shall allow the user to report on signature verification findings during the challenge period for petitions. What processes are required during the challenge period? Does the system need to track the timeframe of the challenge period'?

A87. Reporting signature verification findings are required during the challenge period. Please see Exhibit A Functional Requirements for all defined requirements, including Petitions.

Q88. Requirement 90: The system shall allow County Staff to manage configurable values of staff hourly rates and estimated hours worked.
- Please provide clarification as to what the State means by "staff hourly rates and estimated hours worked", and as to how this will be utilized.
- How will hours be tracked? Time logged into the system? Time logged into specific petitions?
- Will electronic or paper timesheets be required?
- Will users need to update/correct/submit electronic or paper timesheets?

A88. These reports will be utilized for budget purposes. Please respond in Exhibit A Functional Requirements with how your solution will meet this requirement as written. Electronic or paper timesheets are not required or defined in our functional requirements.

Q89. Document "RFP-18-02", pg. 6, paragraph 5-The OSOS states bidders are encouraged to be creative in formulating technical solutions and may propose a single solution, an integrated best of breed solution or something in between and unconceived.   With that said, would the OSOS consider a proposal if a vendor were only proposing a solution that met one of the six functional requirements?

A89. Please see sections 2.5 and 2.19 of RFP 18-02.

Q90. Exhibit A, 3.1.5.1, Requirement Number 1—Is the public site required to use the same domain as the state elections site?

A90. Yes.

Q91. Exhibit A, 3.1.5.1, Requirement Number 13—"the system shall display the voters' guide of the user, including the contests on that ballot and the candidates of each contest." Are the contests part of a voter guide file or is there an additional feature to look up the contests and candidates?

A91. The contests are a part of the Voters' Guide.

Q92. Exhibit B, 3.1.7.8, Requirement Number T-31—Are performance and capacity metrics on the current system available?

A92. No.

Q93. Exhibit A, 3.1.5.1—Does the State desire to own the Self-service portal (where the vendor creates the system, the State to hosts and maintains)?

A93. Bidders may propose any approach to meet the identified requirements.

Q94. Proposal Due Date, p. 1 / Given the change of date for when the complete list of Q&As will be placed on WEBS, we request a change in the proposal due date. Would OSOS revise the proposal due date from November 1 at 5:00 PM PT to November 15 at 5:00 PM PT?

A94. OSOS has elected not to change the proposal due date of 11/1/17.

Q95. Exhibit A, 3.1.5.5 Elections Management, requirement 170 / For requirement 170 (Exhibit A, 3.1.5.5 Elections Management), is there a standard format that provides detail on the specific election billing items and a description of what the different County configurations are?

A95. See the Washington State BARS Manual:
http://portal.sao.wa.gov/SAOPortal/Public.aspx/ViewManual?FileName=BARS_p3_VotrRegstrnElectnCost

See also the Voter Registration Costs Recovery Workbook:
https://www.sos.wa.gov/_assets/elections/Voter%20Registration%20Costs%20Recovery%20Workbook.xls

Q96. Exhibit A, 3.1.5.6 System Administration, requirement 129 / For requirement 129 (Exhibit A, 3.1.5.6 System Administration), would OSOS provide clarification as to what is meant by "potential priority?"

A96. Exhibit A, 3.1.5.6 System Administration Requirement 129 requires that the user to indicate a precinct is inactive and to archive the precinct. Inactive or archived precincts would potentially not have a higher priority than active precincts in all situations.

Q97. HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE COSTS and HOSTING OPTIONS / Will bidder be deemed non-responsive/compliant if response excludes the price requested in Section 3.4 to procure, deliver, implement, and configure the environment? Reference – "OSOS envisions at minimum that the Voter Registration Database component of the solution will be hosted on premise in the OSOS Data Center, and the Bidder shall provide a detailed list of the hardware and software required for the solution, including a price for the Bidder to procure, deliver, implement, and configure the environment."

A97. A Proposal may be deemed non-responsive if details and prices are not provided.

Q98. Estimated Schedule of Procurement Activities / Will the State consider a 2 week extension to the response due date?

A98. OSOS has elected not to change the proposal due date of 11/1/17.

Q99. References (Scored) / Must bidder have directly contracted with references for the delivery of similar goods/services or can we provide references from bidder's subcontractors who have delivered similar goods/services?

A99. Bidders are required to provide 3 references. References may reflect the experience of a subcontractor.

Q100. Certifications and Assurances Document / Will a bidder be considered non-responsive if they cannot certify that "Unless otherwise required by law, the prices and/or cost data which have been submitted have not been knowingly disclosed by the Proposer and will not knowingly be disclosed by him/her prior to opening, directly or indirectly to any other Proposer or to any competitor," because their prices are published, commercial prices.

A100. Please see section 2.10 of RFP 18-02.

Q101. Information Technology Guiding Principles / In the Guiding Principles, it mentions both a hosted deployment, cloud and software-as-a-service. Later in the document there is a mention that only the Voter Registration Database must be in an OSOS Data Center and that the bidder shall provide an option for utilizing Hosting Services. Can you confirm that the preferred desire is to have the majority of the solution implemented outside of the OSOS Data Center if possible? Or is the preference to have the solution in the OSOS Data Center you will look at cloud solutions as well?

A101. See A21.

Q102. Section 3.4 / The document states "Bidder shall also provide a transition plan in the event that M&O is needed to be transitioned from the Bidder to OSOS and the 39 County partners." Is this to mean that you want the Bidder to document how the Bidder would not provide the 5 years of M&O support but instead provide some kind of knowledge transfer to OSOS and the 39 Counties?

A102. Please detail an option for 5 years of Bidder-provided M&O.