

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

RFP NO. 18-02

PROJECT TITLE: Elections Modernization Project (EMP)

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: November 1, 2017 @ 5:00 PM

BIDDER ELIGIBILITY: This procurement is open only to those Bidders that satisfy the minimum qualifications stated herein and that are eligible to work in Washington State.

CONTENTS OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. General Information for Bidders**
- 3. Proposal Contents**

Exhibits

- Exhibit A Functional Requirements Matrix
- Exhibit B Technical Requirements Matrix
- Exhibit C Cost Worksheet
- Exhibit D Sample Contract
- Exhibit E Use Cases
- Exhibit F Current System Diagram
- Exhibit G Certifications and Assurances & Wage Theft Certification

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND	5
1.2 SCOPE	7
1.3 OBJECTIVES.....	8
1.4 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS	8
1.5 FUNDING.....	9
1.6 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE.....	9
1.7 DEFINITIONS / ACRONYMS.....	9
2. GENERAL INFORMATION FOR BIDDERS.....	11
2.1 RFP COORDINATOR	11
2.2 ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES	11
2.3 PREPROPOSAL CONFERENCE	11
2.4 LETTER OF INTENT TO PROPOSE	11
2.5 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS	12
2.6 PROPRIETARY INFORMATION/PUBLIC DISCLOSURE	12
2.7 REVISIONS TO THE RFP	12
2.8 ACCEPTANCE PERIOD.....	13
2.9 MOST FAVORABLE TERMS.....	13
2.10 CONTRACT AND GENERAL TERMS & CONDITIONS	13
2.11 COSTS TO PROPOSE.....	13
2.12 NO OBLIGATION TO CONTRACT	13
2.13 REJECTION OF PROPOSALS	13
2.14 MINORITY & WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION	13
2.15 COMMITMENT OF FUNDS.....	13
2.16 ELECTRONIC PAYMENT.....	14
2.17 INSURANCE AND WORKERS' COMPENSATION COVERAGE	14
2.18 RESULTING CONTRACT.....	14
2.19 RESPONSIVENESS	14
2.20 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS.....	14
2.21 EVALUATION PROCEDURE	14
2.22 ORAL PRESENTATIONS MAY BE REQUIRED.....	15
2.23 NOTIFICATION TO BIDDERS	15
2.24 DEBRIEFING OF UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS	16
2.25 PROTEST PROCEDURE.....	16
2.26 OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION/NEGOTIATION AND/OR ORAL PRESENTATION	17
2.27 BEST AND FINAL OFFERS (BAFO).....	17
3. PROPOSAL CONTENTS.....	18
3.1 CHECKLIST	18
3.1.1 LETTER OF SUBMITTAL (MANDATORY).....	18
3.1.2 BIDDER PROFILE (MANDATORY).....	19
3.1.3 REFERENCES (SCORED)	20
3.1.4 SUBCONTRACTORS (MANDATORY).....	21
3.1.5 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS MATRIX (SCORED)	21
3.1.6 TECHNICAL AND INTERFACE REQUIREMENTS MATRIX (SCORED)	23
3.1.7 OVERVIEW OF TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS & SPECIFICATIONS	23

3.2	IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH (SCORED).....	26
3.3	COST WORKSHEET (SCORED)	31
3.4	MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS PROPOSAL (SCORED).....	31

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The Washington State Office of the Secretary of State, hereinafter called "OSOS," is initiating this RFP to solicit Proposals from firms interested in providing and implementing a modern Elections Management System (EMS) for Washington State.

The OSOS and the 39 counties of Washington State (hereinafter "OSOS/Counties") have collaborated to define requirements for a statewide EMS that meets or exceeds the requirements of Washington State stakeholders. The project has been named the Elections Modernization Project (EMP).

Current Environment

Although currently stable and secure, Washington's system is over ten years old and needs to be modernized in order to meet the challenges that we face today. Our current system challenges include:

- Limited ability to exchange data between elections and voter registration applications;
- Limited ability to address redundancy of data;
- Limited ability to synchronize our data between all systems and our 39 counties;
- Limited ability to adapt to changes in law or needs;
- Limited capabilities of both the hardware and software;
- Limited ability to offer access to services and information online and on mobile devices
- Multiple election management solutions/systems at the local / county level;
- Inability to set up and proof an election in multiple systems without having to enter data multiple times (WEI, EMS, on-line, ballot-on-demand).

The WA OSOS/Counties project team has identified dozens of functional and technical/interface requirements. These requirements address the current functionality as well as new functionality required to achieve future objectives and vision.

Requirements Gathering Process Overview

A comprehensive analysis of the business processes has been conducted to ensure that the next generation voter registration system shall be aligned with the practices followed by State and County Elections officials. The functional requirements were identified through a series of steps, with multiple stakeholders' inputs, including the identification of the current business functions of the existing systems, data sharing opportunities, and development of future processes. These processes are documented in the use cases and requirements contained within Exhibit #E (Use_Cases.docx), and the requirements listed in Exhibit A (Functional Requirements Matrix) to respond to how their proposed solution meets the requirements listed below.

Operational Guiding Principles

The guiding principles of the Elections Modernization Project (EMP) are:

- Multijurisdictional – it should be intrinsically multijurisdictional in design and operation;
- Adaptable – the proposed solution must be adaptable to future statutory, regulatory, policy, or technology changes as required to meet ongoing changes to State and County needs;
- Data Synchronization – the proposed solution must synchronize specific data between systems maintained by OSOS, Counties, external departments, and other key stakeholders

- without duplication of entry of the data;
- Legal Requirements – the proposed solution must provide for compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local statutory requirements;
- Usability – the proposed solution must verify that the system provides all the tools that the users require to perform a given task;

Information Technology Guiding Principles

OSOS/Counties seek to implement a solution to support county and statewide voter registration and elections systems management needs for the next decade and beyond. Information technology guiding principles include:

- Database of Record – Establish a central statewide voter registration database of record, which serves the counties’ needs for both voter registration and elections management.
- Data Compliance – The system shall comply with current VIP, ERIC, IEEE and NIST standards.
- Product Roadmap – The underlying technology stack must consist of widely used components with a long-term viable product roadmap.
- Hosting – The solution must support a hosted deployment while still potentially leveraging cloud-based infrastructure and software-as-a-service model.
- Security – Design and implementation must be driven by a “security first” perspective, recognizing that the trust in voter registration data and elections management systems is paramount.
- Integration - Shall provide full integration with WA DOL, WA DOC, WA DOH, DHS (Department of Homeland Security), and be easily extensible to accommodate other future interfaces.
- Configuration Capability – Provide a robust ability for configuration over customization to enable rapid system changes.
- Modern Architecture – The software architecture must represent a modern, robust, browser-based user interface without plug-ins, and a service-oriented back-end and an API-based integration tier.

Currently, OSOS information technology development staff supports all of the state-supported systems. The Bidder support relationships in place for the 39 EMS/VR and Online Ballot Delivery Systems vary by county and have been entered into and managed at the discretion of each county.

No system architecture has been prescribed by OSOS/Counties in order to allow Bidders to prescribe an Elections Management System that best meets Washington State’s needs and desires. While the geography and disjointed architecture currently in place presents challenges with interoperability, data synchronization and standardization, it provides certain elements of security such as no single point of failure. It also promotes competition amongst the 3 state-certified EMS/VR providers to ensure an optimal level of support and service to counties (which range in size from 1,500 to 1,200,000 [registered voters](#)).

Bidders are encouraged to be creative in formulating technical solutions – within the constraints articulated by the OSOS and these guiding principles. You may propose a single solution to satisfy all requirements, or an integration of best-of-breed, commercial-off-the-shelf systems (COTS), or something in between and unconceived.

All Bidder communications concerning this RFP shall become a public record pursuant to Chapter 42.56 Revised Code of Washington (RCW).

1.2 SCOPE

The intent is to replace the current systems in place throughout the state including:

- 39 county elections management systems/voter registration (EMS/VR) systems (all 39 county systems currently provided by 3 separate Bidders)
- 39 county online ballot delivery systems (currently provided by 2 Bidders and the state)
- State-supported elections systems:
 - VRDB (Voter Registration Database)
 - VRDB Admin
 - WEI (Washington Election Information) System
 - MyVote, providing personalized election information including:
 - Candidates and measures
 - Ballot drop box and vote center location
 - Ballot status
 - Elections in which I voted
 - Districts and elected officials
 - MOVE Act compliant ballot
 - Online voter registration
 - Offices open for election
 - Online candidate filing
 - Candidate statement submission
 - Lists of candidates who have filed
 - Online voters' guide
 - WEI admin
 - WEI online help manual
 - Language admin tool (OSOS use only)
 - Initiative filing
 - Signature check
 - County website hosting
 - Election night reporting
 - Election night results mobile app

County ballot creation and tabulation systems are the only elections systems excluded from the scope of this RFP.

CURRENT AND FUTURE INTERFACES

There are a number of current interfaces in the OSOS environment. The 39 individual county Voter Registration (VR) Databases and Elections Management Systems (EMS), and the county Online Ballot Delivery systems, interface with the OSOS-supported Voter Registration Database (VRDB) and Washington Election Information (WEI) system. OSOS also has established interfaces with other state and federal organizations:

- State of Washington Department of Licensing (WA DOL)
- State of Washington Department of Health (WA DOH)
- State of Washington Department of Corrections (WA DOC)
- Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (WA AOC)
- Election Registration Information Center (ERIC)
- Social Security Administration Interface (SSN)
- County Mail Sorting equipment
- County Signature Verification equipment
- Future Interfaces - OSOS and the Counties have several future envisioned changes and/or

modifications to interfaces with proposed other systems. The proposed solution shall either provide the current capability to interface with these systems, or the Bidder should propose how the proposed system would be modified to provide these interfaces.

- Secure payment processing system - The proposed solution shall provide the capability to interface with a secure payment processing system capable of credit card, cash, petition, check, ACH, and other payments.
- WA DOL DRIVES - The proposed solution shall provide the capability to interface with WA Department of Licensing (WA DOL) new system (DRIVES) which is underway with a project to modernize their systems. Target Go-Live for their project is September 2018.

The system diagram found in Exhibit #F illustrates the current environment.

1.3 OBJECTIVES

The objective of this procurement is to purchase and implement a new system as outlined in section 1.2 above for the OSOS/Counties which will be thoroughly vetted and available for elections use throughout the state on or before January 1, 2019. Achievement of the OSOS/Counties timeline is of paramount importance.

Additionally:

- The project must be delivered on-time and on-budget.
- The system must offer a measurable improvement in the following:
 - Adaptability to future statutory, regulatory, policy or technology changes
 - Data interoperability and interfaces
 - Data synchronization between systems, partners, and other key stakeholders
 - Compliance with all federal, state, and local statutory (legal) requirements
 - Usability, efficiency and reduced effort for end users
 - Reliability and security of operations and technology
 - Workflow
 - Integration with GIS capabilities
 - Reporting integrity (consistent and accurate results) and ad hoc reporting
- In production, changes to the application can be configured, tested and migrated to production within 90 days from requirements analysis.
- Improve the ability to exchange voter registration and election data between the state and its 39 counties while eliminating the need for redundant data entry.
- Implement a standardized data model.
- Enable security at all layers of the solution, providing access to only authorized users. The system shall implement strong intrusion protection mechanisms to ensure access control of voter data and comply with federal, including future DHS Cyber Security Requirements, and Washington Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) security policies.
- The solution shall have the capability and flexibility to evolve with advances in technology.
- Ensure compliance with the HAVA requirement that both the State and local (County) election officials have immediate access to the voter registration list.
- Comply with the HAVA requirement that the State must direct the degree of access and control any one official or class of officials have over the list's data.
- Develop a permanent operational support model that maximizes limited resources and reduces maintenance costs to the state.

1.4 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

- The Bidder must be licensed to do business in the state of Washington.
- The Bidder must be registered to do business with the state and have a current Unified Business Identifier (UBI) number.
- Bidder must have two prior state implementations of VRDB/EMS/HAVA compliant solutions.
- The Bidder must provide at least two positive references for its products and services.
- The Bidder must be able to provide evidence of its future stability.
- The Bidder must be able to offer ongoing maintenance and support for its solution.
- The Bidder must agree not to utilize offshore labor for OSOS solutions or activities.
- The Bidder must be able to complete and deliver the scope of the project by January 1, 2019.

1.5 FUNDING

OSOS has secured funding for this project from the legislature. Rather than give Bidders a fixed amount to work with, OSOS invites Bidders to submit their best offers for products and services.

Any contract awarded as a result of this procurement is contingent upon the availability of funding.

1.6 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance of any contract resulting from this RFP is expected to begin on or about January 1, 2018. The Implementation of the solution must be by January 1, 2019, with final Project Close-out and Acceptance no later than June 30, 2019, with an additional 5-year minimum term for software maintenance and operations.

1.7 DEFINITIONS / ACRONYMS

Key acronyms are defined below. Also, definitions for key terms are listed.

- AG – Attorney General’s Office
- Bidder – Individual or company submitting a Proposal in order to attain a contract with OSOS. Sometimes called Proposer or Offeror.
- CASS – Coding Accuracy Support System (CASS)
- Contractor – Individual or company whose Proposal has been accepted by OSOS and is awarded a fully executed, written contract.
- EAC – Election Assistance Commission
- EMP – Elections Modernization Project
- EMS/VR - Elections Management System / Voter Registration [system]
- ERIC – Electronic Registration Information Center
- HAVA – Help America Vote Act
- OFM – Office of Financial Management
- OSOS – The Office of the Secretary of State is the office of the state of Washington that is issuing this RFP.
- OSOS/Counties – The combined stakeholder group encompassing both the Secretary of State’s Office staff and the 39 counties in Washington State who will use the system.
- Proposal – A formal offer submitted in response to this solicitation.
- Request for Proposals (RFP) – Formal procurement document in which a service or need is identified but no specific method to achieve it has been chosen. The purpose of an RFP is to permit the Bidder community to suggest various approaches to meet the need at a given price.
- VRDB – Voter Registration Database

The rest of this page is intentionally left blank.

2. GENERAL INFORMATION FOR BIDDERS

2.1 RFP COORDINATOR

The RFP Coordinator is the sole point of contact in OSOS for this procurement. All communication between the Bidder and OSOS upon receipt of this RFP shall be with the RFP Coordinator, as follows:

Name	Janell Stewart
Delivery Address	6880 Capitol Blvd SE, Tumwater, WA 98501
Mailing Address	PO Box 40224, Olympia, WA 98504
Phone Number	360-704-5263
Fax Number	360-704-7830
E-Mail Address	contracts@sos.wa.gov

Any other communication will be considered unofficial and non-binding on OSOS. Bidders are to rely on written statements issued by the RFP Coordinator. Communication directed to parties other than the RFP Coordinator may result in disqualification of the Bidder.

2.2 ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES

Issue Request for Proposals	September 20, 2017
Bidder Preproposal Conference	September 26, 2017
Last day for questions regarding RFP	September 28, 2017
Place complete list of Q&As on WEBS and OSOS web site	October 4, 2017
Letter of Intent to Propose due	October 5, 2017
Last day for amendment to RFP	October 13, 2017
Last day for complaints	October 25, 2017
Proposals due	November 1, 2017
Contract(s) negotiations and BAFO period	November 8 – December 12, 2017
Oral presentations, scripted demos and IT panel interviews (if required)	TBD
Announce Apparent Successful Bidder (ASB) and notify unsuccessful Bidders	December 13, 2017
Hold debriefing conferences (if requested)	See Section 2.24
Begin contract work	January 1, 2018

OSOS reserves the right to revise the above schedule.

2.3 PREPROPOSAL CONFERENCE

A mandatory preproposal conference is scheduled to be held on September 26, 2017 in Thurston County, Washington. All prospective Bidders are encouraged to attend; however, attendance by telephone is acceptable. Written questions may be submitted in advance to the RFP Coordinator. OSOS shall be bound only by its written answers to questions. Any verbal responses given at the preproposal conference shall be considered unofficial. A copy of questions and answers from the preproposal conference will be placed on WEBS and the OSOS web site.

2.4 LETTER OF INTENT TO PROPOSE

Bidders interested in submitting a Proposal in response to this RFP must have an authorized

representative provide a Letter of Intent to Propose via e-mail (preferred) or fax to the RFP Coordinator no later than October 5, 2017, 4:00 PM, Pacific Time. Failure to submit a Letter of Intent to Propose as scheduled may be grounds to consider a Proposal non-responsive.

2.5 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Bidders are required to submit BOTH an electronic copy of their Proposal via email – as well as 2 paper copies of the Proposal. Attachments to the e-mail shall be in Microsoft Office (Word/Excel), PDF, or other standard electronic format.

Bidders are required to submit two (2) paper copies of their Proposal. The two copies must have original signatures. Electronic and paper versions of Proposals must be received by the due date in Section 2.2. Proposals must be sent to the RFP Coordinator identified in Section 2.1, and be clearly marked to the attention of the RFP Coordinator.

Bidders should allow sufficient delivery time to ensure timely receipt of their Proposals. Bidders assume the risk for the method of delivery chosen. OSOS assumes no responsibility for delays caused by any delivery service.

Late Proposals will not be accepted and will be automatically disqualified from further consideration. All Proposals and any accompanying documentation become the property of OSOS and will not be returned.

Proposals must address all of the solicitation requirements. Do not respond by referencing material presented elsewhere. Failure to respond to any portion may result in rejection of the Proposal as non-responsive.

2.6 PROPRIETARY INFORMATION/PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Materials submitted in response to this competitive procurement shall become the property of OSOS.

All Proposals received shall remain confidential until the contract, if any, resulting from this RFP is executed; thereafter, the Proposals shall be deemed public records as defined under the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW.

Any information in the Proposal that the Bidder desires to claim as proprietary and exempt from disclosure under the provisions of RCW 42.56.270 must be clearly designated. The page, and the particular exception from disclosure upon which the Bidder is making the claim, must be identified. Each page claimed to be exempt from disclosure must be clearly identified by the word "Confidential" printed on the lower right hand corner of the page.

OSOS will consider a Bidder's request for exemption from disclosure; however, OSOS will make a decision predicated upon chapter 42.56 RCW and chapter 143-06 of the Washington Administrative Code. Marking the entire Proposal exempt from disclosure will not be honored. The Bidder must be reasonable in designating information as confidential. If any information is marked as proprietary in the Proposal, such information will not be made available until the affected Bidder has been given an opportunity to seek a court injunction against the requested disclosure.

A charge will be made for copying and shipping, as outlined in RCW 42.56.120 or in OSOS' rules and statutes. No fee shall be charged for inspection of contract files, but twenty-four (24) hours' notice to the RFP Coordinator is required. All requests for information should be directed to the RFP Coordinator.

2.7 REVISIONS TO THE RFP

Any amendments or revisions to this RFP, including any questions and answers, will be published on WEBS and the OSOS website. The OSOS procurement website address is: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/office/procurements.aspx>.

OSOS also reserves the right to cancel or reissue the RFP, in whole or in part, prior to execution of a contract.

2.8 ACCEPTANCE PERIOD

Bidder, by submitting a Proposal, agrees to hold open its offer to OSOS for at least 60 days after submission of the Proposal.

2.9 MOST FAVORABLE TERMS

OSOS reserves the right to make an award without further discussion of the Proposal submitted. Therefore, the Proposal should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms which the Bidder can propose. OSOS does reserve the right to contact a Bidder for clarification of its Proposal.

Bidders should be prepared to accept this RFP for incorporation into any resulting contract. The Contract may incorporate some or all of the Bidder's Proposal. The Proposal will become a part of the official procurement file on this matter, without obligation to OSOS.

2.10 CONTRACT AND GENERAL TERMS & CONDITIONS

The apparently successful bidder will be expected to enter into a contract which is substantially the same as the OSOS sample contract (including its General Terms and Conditions) attached to this RFP as Exhibit D. In no event is a Bidder to submit its own standard contract terms and conditions in response to this RFP. The Bidder may submit exceptions as allowed in the Certifications and Assurances form attached to this RFP in Exhibit G. All exceptions to the contract terms and conditions must be submitted as an attachment to the Certifications and Assurances form. OSOS will review requested exceptions and accept or reject the same at its sole discretion.

2.11 COSTS TO PROPOSE

OSOS will not be liable for any costs incurred by the Bidder in relation to its Proposal, presentation, or any other activities related to an RFP response.

2.12 NO OBLIGATION TO CONTRACT

This RFP does not obligate the State of Washington or OSOS to contract for services specified herein.

2.13 REJECTION OF PROPOSALS

OSOS reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to reject any and all Proposals received.

2.14 MINORITY & WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

The State of Washington encourages participation by firms certified by the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises (OMWBE). Participation may be either on a direct basis in response to this RFP or on a subcontractor basis. However, no preference will be included in the evaluation of Proposals, no minimum level of MWBE participation shall be required as a condition for receiving an award, and Proposals will not be rejected or considered non-responsive on that basis.

2.15 COMMITMENT OF FUNDS

The Secretary of State or her delegate are the only individuals who may legally commit OSOS to the expenditures of funds for a contract resulting from this RFP. No cost chargeable to the proposed contract may be incurred before receipt of a fully executed contract.

2.16 ELECTRONIC PAYMENT

The State of Washington prefers to utilize electronic payments. The Contractor will be provided a form to authorize such payment method.

2.17 INSURANCE AND WORKERS' COMPENSATION COVERAGE

Should a contract be awarded pursuant to this RFP, the Contractor will be required to provide insurance coverage as described in Exhibit D to this RFP. The Contractor must also comply with all applicable workers' compensation, occupational disease, and occupational health and safety laws, statutes, and regulations.

2.18 RESULTING CONTRACT

This RFP and any addenda, the Proposer's RFP response, including any amendments, a best and final offer (if any), and any clarification question responses may be incorporated by reference in any resulting contract.

2.19 RESPONSIVENESS

A "**Responsible offeror**" is an offeror who meets the elements demonstrating ability, integrity, and performance set out in RCW 39.26.160(2) and RFP 18-02.

A "**Responsive offeror**" is an offeror who has submitted an offer which meets all the minimum mandatory requirements and specifications for the products and solicited in RFP 18-02.

OSOS will classify all Proposals as either "responsive" or "nonresponsive". OSOS may deem a Proposal nonresponsive if: (1) any of the required information is not provided; (2) the submitted price is found to be excessive or inadequate as measured by the RFP criteria; or (3) the Proposal does not meet RFP requirements and specifications. OSOS may find any Proposal to be nonresponsive at any time during the procurement process. If OSOS deems a Proposal nonresponsive, it will not be considered further.

2.20 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Responsive and responsible Proposals will be evaluated based on stated criteria. Evaluation may include discussion, negotiation, or a best and final offer. In scoring against stated criteria, evaluators may consider such factors as accepted industry standards and a comparative evaluation of other Proposals in terms of differing price and quality. These scores will be used to determine the most advantageous offering to OSOS. One or more contracts may be awarded from this solicitation.

2.21 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Responsive Proposals will be evaluated strictly in accordance with the requirements stated in this RFP and any addenda issued. The evaluation team designated by OSOS will score the Proposals. Demonstrations, IT panel interviews, and presentations may be utilized, along with scores from written Proposals, in selecting the Apparent Successful Bidder. OSOS, at its sole discretion, may select the top-scoring Bidders to provide demonstrations and participate on the IT panel.

OSOS will adhere to an evaluation process that requires Bidders to fulfill the requirements of each

stage in order to progress to the next stage. OSOS will only consider those Bidders who pass or satisfy the criteria for each stage.

Stage	Description	Scoring Method	Criteria/Notes	Minimum Score
0	RFP Responsiveness	Pass/Fail	Bidder may be deemed non-responsive at any point in procurement process.	Pass
1	Bidder Responsibility Review	Pass/Fail	Includes financial viability review of Bidder. Bidder may be deemed non-responsible at any point in procurement process.	Pass
2	Functional and Technical Requirements	Scored (750 points maximum)	Bidder must receive a top score at Stage 2 to advance for Stage 3 review.	650 points
3	Implementation Approach, Cost Worksheet, and Maintenance & Operations	Scored (300 points maximum)	Bidder must receive a top score at Stage 3 to advance for Stage 4 review.	200 points
4	Oral interviews, including any demonstrations or IT panel evaluations	Scored (200 points maximum)	Failure to participate, if requested, may be grounds for rejection of Proposal.	100 points
5	Security Design Review	Pass/Fail	Security Design Review may occur at any time during the procurement and contracting process. Failure to pass security design review may be grounds for rejection of Proposal.	Pass
6	References	Scored (100 points maximum)	OSOS reserves the right to use references at any point in the procurement and contracting process. Bidder may be deemed non-responsible based upon any negative or unsatisfactory response.	50 points
8	Contract Negotiations	Pass/Fail	Failure to satisfactorily complete contract negotiations, including any BAFO process, may be grounds for rejection of Proposal.	Pass

2.22 ORAL PRESENTATIONS MAY BE REQUIRED

Written submissions, and oral presentations if necessary, will be utilized to select the winning Proposal. OSOS, at its sole discretion, may select top scoring finalists from the written evaluation for an oral presentation and product demonstration. OSOS will contact the top-scoring firm(s) regarding scheduling any such presentation. Commitments made by Bidder during the oral presentation, if any, will be considered binding. The score from the oral presentation will be considered independently, and will help determine the apparent successful Contractor.

2.23 NOTIFICATION TO BIDDERS

Bidders not selected for further negotiation or award will be notified via e-mail.

2.24 DEBRIEFING OF UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS

Upon request, a debriefing conference will be scheduled with an unsuccessful Bidder. The request for a debriefing conference must be received by the RFP Coordinator within 3 business days following notification to unsuccessful Bidders. Any debriefing will be held within 3 business days of the request.

Discussion will be limited to a critique of the requesting Bidder's Proposal. Comparisons between Proposals or evaluations of the other Proposals will not be allowed. Debriefing conferences may be conducted in person or by telephone, and will be scheduled for a maximum of 1 hour.

2.25 PROTEST PROCEDURE

The protest procedure is available to Bidders who submitted a Proposal in response to this RFP and participated in a debriefing conference. Protests that do not follow the below procedures will not be considered. This protest procedure constitutes the sole administrative remedy available to Bidders under this procurement.

All protests must be in writing and signed by the protesting party or an authorized agent. Protests must be dated, and received by the OSOS RFP Coordinator within 5 business days following the Bidder's debriefing conference. A signed protest may be submitted electronically, but should be followed by hardcopy with an original signature. It must state the grounds for the protest, with specific facts and complete statements of the action(s) being protested. It should also describe the requested relief or corrective action.

Only protests stipulating an issue of fact concerning the following subjects shall be considered:

- A matter of bias, discrimination or conflict of interest on the part of the evaluator.
- Errors in computing the score.
- Non-compliance with procedures described in the procurement document or OSOS policy.

Protests not based on procedural matters will not be considered. Protests will be rejected as without merit if they address issues such as: 1) an evaluator's professional judgment on the quality of a Proposal, or 2) OSOS' assessment of its own and/or other agencies needs or requirements.

Upon receipt of a protest, a protest review will be held by OSOS. An OSOS designee delegated by the Assistant Secretary of State or Elections Director who was not involved in the procurement will consider the record and all available facts and issue a decision within five business days of receipt of the protest. If additional time is required, the protesting party will be notified of the delay.

In the event a protest may affect the interest of another Bidder which submitted a Proposal, such Bidder will be given an opportunity to submit its views and any relevant information on the protest to the RFP Coordinator.

The final determination of the protest shall:

- Find the protest lacking in merit and uphold OSOS' action; or
- Find only technical or harmless errors in OSOS' process and determine OSOS to be in substantial compliance and reject the protest; or
- Find merit in the protest and provide OSOS options which may include:
 - Correcting the errors and re-evaluating Proposals,
 - Initiating a new solicitation process, and/or

- Making other findings and taking other courses of action as appropriate.

If OSOS determines that the protest is without merit, OSOS will enter into a contract with the apparently successful Contractor. If the protest is determined to have merit, one of the alternatives noted in the preceding paragraph will be taken.

2.26 OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION/NEGOTIATION AND/OR ORAL PRESENTATION

Prior to the identification of an Apparent Successful Bidder, OSOS may, at its sole discretion, initiate discussions with top scoring Bidder(s) for clarification or negotiation. Top scoring Bidders may also be asked to make oral presentations to clarify their RFP response or further define their offer. Should OSOS elect to hold oral presentations, the top scoring Bidder(s) will be contacted to schedule a date, time, and location for the presentation. Bidder cut-off may be based on several considerations including responsiveness, qualifications, competitiveness, suitability of the products and services offered, cost and economy, ability of the vendor to perform, and so on.

2.27 BEST AND FINAL OFFERS (BAFO)

Bidders are encouraged to submit their most competitive offer, but there is a potential for a best and final (BAFO) process. This section defines the BAFO process.

Once a Proposal has been submitted, Bidders will not be allowed to make material changes to those Proposals unless they receive a request for a BAFO from OSOS. The circumstances under which a BAFO may be requested are described in this Section.

The notice will be in writing and will set a specific time and date certain by which the BAFO must be submitted to OSOS. The BAFO notice may set additional conditions and requirements for the submission of the BAFO. The notice will advise Bidders that the BAFO shall be in writing and that upon the closing date for submission, OSOS intends to select a lowest Responsive and Responsible Bidder. The BAFO Notice will be posted on WEBS. At OSOS' discretion, prior to the BAFO submission closing date, OSOS may engage in discussion with Responsive and Responsible Bidders regarding how Bidders can make their Proposals more responsive to the selection criteria in the RFP. All Bidders shall be accorded fair and equal treatment with respect to any opportunity for discussion and revision of Proposals, and such revisions may be permitted after submissions and prior to award for the purpose of obtaining BAFOs. In conducting discussions, there shall be no disclosure of any information derived from Proposals submitted by competing Bidders.

For purposes of the BAFO, Bidders may make such changes to their original bids as they believe appropriate to enhance their potential for selection and award under the selection criteria set forth in the RFP and BAFO notice. Changes to the original bid must be clearly identified in the re-submitted Proposal using the track changes function in Microsoft Word or other standard electronic format.

Evaluation of BAFOs and selection of a successful Bidder will be based upon the evaluation criteria set out in the RFP. Terms proposed as part of a BAFO must be substantially in accordance with the terms requested in this RFP and may not materially alter the requirements of the RFP.

Proposers are not required to submit a BAFO, and may instead submit a written response stating that their Proposal remains as originally submitted.

Proposer(s) may be requested to make an oral presentation regarding their BAFO. The evaluators will have full discretion to accept or reject any information submitted in a BAFO.

BAFO discussions shall not disclose the content or pricing of another Bidder.

If a BAFO process is initiated, all Bidders will be eligible for a debriefing conference.

Following negotiations, OSOS may require that a Bidder submit a signed Contract as a BAFO pending OSOS' acceptance.

3. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

Items in this section marked "mandatory" must be included as part of the Proposal for the Proposal to be considered responsive; however, these items are not scored. Items marked "scored" are those that are awarded points as part of the evaluation conducted by the evaluation team.

3.1 CHECKLIST

Proposals must provide information in the same order they are presented in this RFP, and with the same headings. This will not only be helpful to the evaluators, but should assist the Bidder in preparing a thorough Proposal.

Items in this RFP identified as "mandatory" must be included as part of the Proposal for the Proposal to be considered responsive; however, these items are not scored. Items marked "scored" are those that are awarded points as part of the evaluation conducted by the evaluation team.

For your convenience, below is a checklist of all documents in the RFP which must be returned to OSOS be fully responsive:

#	Attachments
1	Primary RFP Response Sections Required: 3.1.1 Letter of Submittal 3.1.2 Bidder Profile – Finance Attachments 3.1.3 References 3.1.4 Subcontractors 3.2 Implementation Approach 3.4 Maintenance and Operations Approach
A	EXHIBIT A: Functional Requirements Matrix (3.1.5)
B	EXHIBIT B: Technical Requirements Matrix (3.1.7)
C	EXHIBIT C: Cost Worksheet (3.3)
D	EXHIBIT D: Sample Contract
K	EXHIBIT G: Certifications and Assurances / Wage Theft Certification

3.1.1 LETTER OF SUBMITTAL (MANDATORY)

The Letter of Submittal must be signed and dated by a person authorized to legally bind the Bidder to a contractual relationship (e.g., the President or Executive Director if a corporation, the managing partner if a partnership, or the proprietor if a sole proprietorship). Along with introductory remarks, the Letter of Submittal is to include:

- Explanation of the experience the Bidder and any subcontractors have in delivering the solution.
- Indication of any relevant experience that indicates the qualifications of the Bidder.

- A list of contracts the Bidder has had during the last 5 years.

3.1.2 BIDDER PROFILE (MANDATORY)

Company Information	
Legal company name and address	Indicate entity type (LLC, Inc, Corp., etc.):
	Indicate state of registration/incorporation:
RFP Point of Contact	Name: _____ Address: <i>(if different from above)</i> Email: _____ Phone: _____
Wash. Dept. of Revenue Registration No.	
Federal Tax ID No. (TIN) If TIN is a Social Security number, provide only the last four digits.	
Is your firm certified as a minority or woman owned business with OMWBE? Is your firm a certified small business?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, provide MWBE/other certification no.
Is your firm certified as veteran-owned with the Washington State Department of Veteran Affairs?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, provide WSDVA certification no.
Number of current employees:	
Number of employees who have experience implementing the proposed solution:	
Number of years in business:	
Headquarters in the USA?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Number of years providing the proposed solution – including the current release and any prior releases of the same product:	
Quantity and type of customers (e.g. public sector) currently using the proposed solution:	
How long have you provided services to your longest tenured client?	
If the Bidder or any subcontractor contracted with the state of Washington (or any county in the state) during the past 24 months, indicate the name of the county/agency, the contract number and project description and/or other information available to identify the contract.	

<p>If the Bidder's staff or subcontractor's staff was an employee of the state of Washington during the past 24 months, or is currently a Washington state employee, identify the individual by name, job title or position held and separation date.</p>	
<p>Has there been any material litigation against the Bidder within last five (5) years that the Bidder should reasonably believe could adversely affect its ability to meet requirements pursuant to this RFP or have a material adverse effect on the Bidder's financial condition? If YES, list each litigation separately and explain the relevant details.</p>	
<p>Provide a statement and any relevant details addressing whether the Bidder:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) is presently debarred, suspended or proposed for debarment by any federal or state department or agency. b) has within the past three (3) years been convicted of (or had a civil judgement rendered against Bidder) for fraud, theft, forgery or falsification. c) has within a three (3) year period preceding the RFP had one or more public transactions (federal, state, or local) terminated for cause or default. 	
<p>Bidder will provide financial statements clarifying Net Position and Statements of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position for the last two (2) fiscal years, as well as any other credit and audit information to help validate Bidder's stability and financial viability. Please provide financial statements as an appendix to this Bidder Profile – labeled BIDDERNAME_FINANCIALS_RFP18-02.</p>	

3.1.3 REFERENCES (SCORED)

Provide a minimum of three (3) commercial/private or government references for which the Bidder has delivered goods and/or services similar in scope to those described in this RFP. OSOS/Counties will be contacting these references and by providing this contact information Bidder grants permission to OSOS/Counties to contact them. Do not include current OSOS staff as references. References will be contacted for the top scoring Proposals only. OSOS/Counties will make two attempts to reach these references to complete a brief survey. OSOS may, at its discretion, contact other clients of Bidder not listed as references.

Please provide the following for each of the references submitted:

- Dates of engagement (start & end)

- Project description
- Products installed/implemented
- Services provided
- Project outcomes
- Challenges encountered and how addressed

Reference 1	Project Description
Entity Name: Contact Name: Contact Phone: Contact Email:	
Reference 2	Project Description
Entity Name: Contact Name: Contact Phone: Contact Email:	
Reference 3	Project Description
Entity Name: Contact Name: Contact Phone: Contact Email:	

3.1.4 SUBCONTRACTORS (MANDATORY)

If applicable, identify any and all subcontractors who will perform services in fulfillment of contract requirements. State the nature of services to be performed and include a federal tax identification number (TIN) for each subcontractor. If TIN is an SSN, only provide the last four (4) digits. If a subcontractor is a certified minority-owned, woman-owned, veteran-owned or a small business, indicate that status in the table below. Expand the table below as needed.

The Bidder, by including subcontractor(s) as part of the signed Proposal, agrees to assume responsibility for contract obligations and any liability for all actions of such subcontractors. OSOS reserves the right to approve or reject any proposed subcontractor.

Subcontractor Name	TIN	Certification Status (Minority, Woman, Veteran, other)	Services to be provided by subcontractor

3.1.5 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS MATRIX (SCORED)

The Functional Requirements Matrix is a detailed list of all scorable functional system requirements. It is labeled Exhibit A. Bidder instructions are detailed in the Exhibit. Bidders are invited to respond to each requirement in the matrix with a specific response code specifying whether the Bidder can provide the functionality and how the Bidder plans to deliver the features. OSOS/Counties will score the responses.

Exhibit A: Functional Requirements Matrix must be completed in its entirety and submitted to the RFP coordinator in Microsoft Excel format as BIDDERSNAME_FUNCTIONAL_RFP18-02. The outline numbers below correspond to those in Exhibit A and Exhibit E.

The matrix in Exhibit A describes the Functional Requirements for EMP. It is meant to describe the core functional aspects of the system, and accompanies the Use Cases and Functional Requirements

documentation. The Bidder will need to reference both Exhibit #E (Use Cases) and Exhibit A (Functional Requirements) for full details of the requirements.

The OSOS vision for the Functional Requirements is that the Voter Registration Database, Voter Registration Application, the Election Management System, as well as the Geographical Information System work together in a seamless manner for the user.

3.1.5.1 Voter Registration

- Perform Service Inquiry
- View & Manage Voter Information
- Apply for or Update Voter Registration

3.1.5.2 Manage Rolls

- Manage Duplicates
- Process Felon/Incompetent
- Process Deceased Voter
- Manage Protected Voter
- Cancel Voter

3.1.5.3 Notices

- Issue Notice
- Manage Notices
- Respond to Notice
- Process Responses to Notices

3.1.5.4 Petitions

- Initial Filing of Petition Application
- Receive Petition & Signature sheets
- Create Random Sample for Signature Verification
- Record Signature Verification Findings
- Close Petition & Report Findings

3.1.5.5 Elections Management

- Manage an Election Definition
- Manage Ballot Styles
- Ballot Layout
- Ballot Issuance
- Receive Ballot
- Receive Provisional Ballots
- Manage Vote Centers and Drop Boxes

3.1.5.6 System Administration

- Manage Geographic Information
- Manage Districts
- Manage Precincts
- Manage Candidates
- Manage Offices
- Manage Ballot Measures
- Manage Mass Updates
- Manage Public Records Requests

- Manage System Tables
- Manage User Roles
- Generate Report

3.1.6 TECHNICAL AND INTERFACE REQUIREMENTS MATRIX (SCORED)

The Technical and Interface Requirements Matrix is a detailed list of all scorable technical system requirements. It is labeled Exhibit B. Bidder instructions are detailed in the Exhibit document. Bidders are invited to respond to each requirement in the matrix with a special response code identifying whether the Bidder can provide the functionality and how the Bidder plans to deliver the features. OSOS/Counties will score the responses.

Exhibit B: Technical Requirements Matrix must be completed in its entirety and submitted to the RFP coordinator in Microsoft Excel format as BIDDERTNAME_TECHNICAL_RFP18-02.

3.1.7 OVERVIEW OF TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS & SPECIFICATIONS

This section describes the technical requirements for the EMP. It is meant to describe the interface and technology requirements of the solution, and it is supported by the Use Cases and Functional Requirements documentation.

NOTE: The Bidder will need to reference Exhibit B (Technical Requirements_Scoring.xlsx) to describe how their proposed solution meets the requirements listed below. The outline numbers below correspond to those in Exhibit B and Exhibit E (Use Cases). The technical requirements include:

3.1.7.1 Proposed solution should be built on modern technology

- The proposed solution should be “future proof” in terms of operating on widely used technology components and infrastructure. The solution should be able to progress when the component parts improve their capabilities.
- Usage patterns and client devices will change. The user interface of the solution should be able to be operated in a browser-based environment without device or operating dependencies.
- The back-end solution should expose service-based integration points (APIs) to support modern integration patterns with other State and County agencies, or other entities.
- The programming environment should consist of a widely-used programming platform, framework and runtime environment.
- The solution should support integrated automated testing.

3.1.7.2 Proposed solution shall contain a central database

- The proposed solution shall contain a central database, which is the statewide database of record, containing master voter data.
- The database must be implemented with a widely-used database platform, with a preference for processing to be external from the database.
- The statewide database must be inherently multi-jurisdictional, and be shared by the participating counties, while segmenting the data for the counties to only access their own data, while providing read-only access to the data of all other counties.

3.1.7.3 Proposed solution must be flexible in design

- The solution should be scalable.

- System shall support current versions of major modern web browsers in use at the time of system delivery. Bidder support must include ability to keep current with major browser enhancements.
- The browsers shall not require plug-ins.

3.1.7.4 Proposed solution shall be adaptable

- The proposed solution shall be adaptable to changing business needs and statutory changes, supporting rapid modifications through configuration where possible, without dependency on rigidly-scheduled releases.
- The proposed solution shall contain a configuration mechanism that drives the solution's behavior, with the ability to implement modifications more quickly.
- System shall have the feature to scale up/down error logging with configuration.

3.1.7.5 Proposed solution shall support Security and Data Visibility

- The proposed solution must adhere to [State of Washington OCIO Policy 141 Securing Information Technology Assets Standards](#) (8/19/2013) for maintaining system and network security, data integrity, and confidentiality.
- The proposed solution must adhere to all federal, State, and County standards and guidelines regarding safeguarding of data.
- The database must be protected from unauthorized use within and outside of the WA OSOS and County organizations.
- All data modifications must be fully auditable.
- The proposed solution shall include an Identity Access Management mechanism, and use the application should be strictly controlled to authorized users only.
- The proposed solution shall provide for single sign-on across all components for use of the system.
- The proposed solution shall allow for Administrators to be able to cancel user sessions.
- The proposed solution must support strong encryption for data in motion and data at rest.

3.1.7.6 Proposed solution shall support High Availability and Disaster Recovery

- The proposed solution shall support high availability and disaster recovery through standards set by [State of Washington OCIO Policy 151 – Information Technology Disaster Recovery Planning](#) (12/6/2016) for Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP).
- High availability shall be supported and enabled through configuration, using redundancy at the application and data tiers.
- Disaster recovery must be capable of supporting a Recovery Point Objective (RPO) of 4 hours, and a Recovery Time Objective (RTO) of 2 hours.
- The proposed solution for allow for the planning of maintenance windows that are on a schedule determinable by OSOS and the Counties.

3.1.7.7 Proposed solution shall support Accessibility

- The proposed solution shall support standards set by [State of Washington OCIO Policy 188 – Accessibility](#) (9/12/2017) for use by people with disabilities to have access to and use of information and data and be provided access to the same services and content that is available to persons without disabilities unless providing direct access is not possible due to technical or legal limitations.
- 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.

3.1.7.8 Proposed solution shall support improved Performance

- The proposed solution shall support performance standards that are not less than the current Voter Registration and Election Management Systems.
- The proposed solution shall be a user-centric application that allows OSOS and County users to process voter registrations, manage petitions, and manage all elections with a user experience that assists staff efficiency.
- The proposed solution shall have an integrated, context-sensitive help facility that is centralized and available to all users.
- The proposed solution shall display information in an efficient and logical way to reduce keystrokes and mouse clicks.
- System shall provide input validation for the end user.
- The system shall have a tool that is integrated into the main application for users to submit, track, and comment on found issues, bugs, or errors.
- The system shall have an easy to use dashboard for users (depending on their roles) to view details of any error logged by the system.

3.1.7.9 Proposed solution shall support Data Retention and Archiving

- The proposed solution shall support the voter record being retained within the system indefinitely.
- The proposed solution must support the voter file within the retention policy set by the State of Washington.

3.1.7.10 Proposed solution shall have robust reporting capability

- The proposed solution shall be capable of implementing the current reports identified within the RFP Exhibit #E (Use Cases).
- The proposed solution shall contain an ad-hoc query capability to support OSOS and County users with query capability of all appropriate data, through an intuitive interface.
- The proposed solution reporting tool shall provide access to all county-level and statewide data governed by security rules for the system.
- Report execution shall not diminish the overall performance of the proposed solution.
- Report execution shall be able to be run on-line in real-time or in a scheduled fashion.
- Reports containing the same data elements and period shall match regardless of when they are dispatched.
- Reports shall be able to be printed on different types of paper stock and sizes.

3.1.7.11 Proposed solution shall support Imaging

- The proposed solution shall be able to scan supporting documentation into the system as images.
- The proposed solution shall have the capability to support images captured by WA DOL and other sources.
- The proposed solution shall be scalable within the overall system context to allow for changing business needs and statutory changes.

3.1.7.12 Proposed solution shall provide robust exception handling and exception reporting

- The proposed solution shall have robust Exception Handling and Reporting-
- The proposed solution should also have a feature to scale up/down error logging for each component.

- The proposed solution error logging and reporting must be easy for the user to use, and must not interfere or degrade system performance.

3.2 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH (SCORED)

Describe the Bidder's approach to providing a solution for each process area below; be sure to indicate whether your approach 1) leverages current features or 2) requires modification to an existing component of the Bidder's system. Use these narrative response opportunities to provide specific details of the Bidder's approach to meeting OSOS' requirements in each process area. If applicable, responses should reference OSOS requirements using the appropriate RFP requirement numbers from the matrices.

Responses in this section should be tightly focused on the OSOS' specific business processes and requirements and not on generic or high-level marketing descriptions of your solution capabilities.

As mentioned previously, the ability to complete the project within the state's critical timeline is essential. OSOS encourages Bidders to propose a timeline for 2018 that reflects the optimal sequence and duration of events to bring the system live by January 1, 2019. The table below summarizes the State of Washington OSOS concept for the execution of EMP activities.

DRAFT PROJECT SCHEDULE

Project Element	DRAFT Duration
Project Initiation	January 2018
Requirements Verification and Analysis	February 2018 to September 2018
Database Conversion and Migration	April 2018 to January 2019
Application Configuration/Build	June 2018 to November 2018
Unit Testing	July 2018 to December 2018
Organizational Change Management Documentation and Planning	April 2018 to September 2018
User Training Planning and Execution	September 2018 to December 2018
Mock Election and Disaster Recovery	December 2018
Implementation/Deployment	January 2019
Go Live	January 2019
Project Transition and Close-out	March 2019 to June 2019
Maintenance and Operations	July 2019 through June 2026 (TBD)

Responses will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Whether the question was answered (Y/N).
- Response is clear regarding how the solution will be delivered and meet stated requirements.
- Whether the question was answered thoughtfully with appropriate explanations and descriptions of solution capabilities.
- Whether the Bidder is clear on the number of times it has implemented each component of its approach.
- Whether the response supports OSOS guiding principles.
- Whether the response fits with OSOS/County business solution requirements.

- Whether the response enables future in-sourcing of maintenance and support operations. (OSOS does not plan to in-source support for the solution but has a keen interest in understanding whether it could if necessary).

#	Category	Key questions
1	Executive Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Please condense and highlight the contents of your implementation proposal in such a way as to provide the state with a broad understanding of your implementation approach and proposal in no more than five (5) pages. Please provide a concise summary of the proposed products to be utilized in the fulfillment/execution of the project and any proposed services. Please also specify how these proposed products and services address the requirements presented in the RFP (Exhibit A and B). – Please briefly describe your proposed project organization chart indicating necessary roles for the implementation. If possible, describe your approach to an integrated team with OSOS/Counties and Bidder personnel. – Please list any past successful public sector assignments that mirror this scope of work and highlight the relevant public sector experience and previous projects worked by proposed key personnel included in the proposal.
2	Approach and Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder must describe in sufficient detail their approach to the successful implementation of the proposed solution. – Bidder should cite examples of where each of their proposed approaches has been used for implementations for similar VRDB/EMS/HAVA compliant solutions for at least two other state customers. – Bidder shall call out any additional elements that are required to develop and implement the proposed solution. – Bidder shall provide an integrated project plan with a proposed project schedule for the EMP. <u>Please be sure to clarify what scope will be delivered by January 1, 2019.</u> – Bidder shall detail the processes required to ensure the various plans and activities are properly coordinated to ensure successful project completion.
3	Architecture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder shall outline the architecture of the proposed solution, supported by descriptions and diagrams. This shall include, but not limited to Security, Integration, Infrastructure, Database, and Application. – Bidder shall describe the solution approach to load balancing and/or clustering for extended scalability and performance, performance in transaction processing and report processing, Security, and Auditing. – Bidder shall describe what is configurable in the proposed solution and how that configurability is achieved (e.g. table based, scripting, code generation, rules engine, other).

#	Category	Key questions
4	Data Conversion, and Migration, and Interface Approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder shall describe in detail their approach to migrate the data from the current OSOS and County databases to the target database. – Bidder shall provide an approach that describes how they identify all requisite data that needs to be converted from legacy systems to the target database proposed for the solution. – The Bidder shall outline the recommended process for migration of the data from legacy systems to the final solution and include details of requisite conversion testing. – The approach shall describe any resources required of OSOS and/or County project team members. – Bidder shall provide an explanation of how they will successfully identify, scope, manage, test and deliver all interfaces needed for the solution. This shall include all external as well as internal interfaces and the resources required by OSOS, County, as well as other external resources that would be required. – Bidder shall describe how the approach for the proposed solution database architecture shall meet all the following data format standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – VIP 5.1 Specification: http://vip-specification.readthedocs.io/en/release/xml.html – Open Civic Data: https://opencivicdata.readthedocs.io/en/latest/ – EAC & NIST Common Data Format Working Group: http://collaborate.nist.gov/voting/bin/view/Voting/Interoperability – Election Results Reporting - VSSC/1622.2: https://www.nist.gov/itl/voting/nist-election-results-common-data-format-specification – ERIC – The Bidder shall describe the testing involved in Data Conversion and Migration.
5	Configuration and Development Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder shall describe their approach that describes how they will confirm the availability and full functionality of the Functional Requirements and Use Cases contained within Exhibit E of the RFP. – The Bidder should describe in general what components of the solution are ready out-of-the-box versus needing configuration for users within the Washington elections community. – If a component must be custom-developed to deliver the proposed solution, please detail how the proposed solution will be developed. – The Bidder shall describe the programming platform, framework, and runtime environment, and how those as well as the database address our guiding principles.

#	Category	Key questions
6	System Design Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder shall provide a description of how requirements will be gathered and documented for the proposed solution to work with the State and County networks. – The Bidder shall describe how they will participate with OSOS/County project team, WaTech CTS, WaTech OCS, OCIO, as well as any other entity required by federal, state, and/or local laws and regulations during the network design phase to ensure the selected system is compatible with the state's network. – The Bidder shall provide a description and requirements definition for the network configuration of the proposed technical solution, including the identification of any pertinent element that would need to be addressed/upgraded to support the proposed solution. – The Bidder shall detail any recommended bandwidth requirements to support the anticipated user load of the proposed solution. – The Bidder shall describe how the database and application server environments can be scaled up by adding server resources, and if/how the application can support automated testing. – The Bidder shall include in the description what hardware and software is required for the solution, including components to be installed and configured on any Development, Test Automation, Quality Assurance and Production environments, and the timing of when those environments are required during the project. – Bidder shall identify any hardware and software required to be provided by OSOS and the County partners, versus those hardware and software provided by the Bidder as part of the solution, and describe how requisite products will comply with WA state and federal technical guidelines and policies. – If any part of the system is hosted in the cloud, the Bidder shall provide an architecture model articulated in detail, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of sharing application resources with other clients of the hosting environment. The level of sharing infrastructure with other clients. The hosting location relative to the State's environments. The level of access the Bidder's resources will have to the data, both from a systems and application perspective, and the processes to govern and audit this access.

#	Category	Key questions
7	Security Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder shall provide an approach that details how the proposed solution will manage system access as well as the Bidder shall describe security at all layers of the solution, including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Application Level Security ○ Server Level Security ○ Database Level Security ○ Data Exchange (Interface) Security ○ Network Security – Bidder shall describe in the approach how the proposed solution provides for single sign-on across all components of the solution, and how the proposed solution allows authorized users to cancel user sessions. – Bidder shall describe how all the elements of their approach to Security for proposed solution meets or exceeds compliance with all requirements of the State of Washington OCIO Standard 141.10 Securing Information Technology Assets. In addition, the Bidder shall describe how the proposed solution follows SP 800-63 standards for Digital Identity Guidelines. – The Bidder shall describe that if the solution handles Category 3 or 4 data, the solution must be SOC-2 Type 2 and FEDRAMP compliant and the Bidder must detail how they will annually provide SOC-2 Type 2 audit reports. – The Bidder shall, if identified as the “Apparently Successful Bidder”, work with the Washington State Office of Cyber Security to complete a Security Design Review. Bidder will be required to complete an IT security checklist and provide system diagrams and documentation to ensure the solution, as designed and deployed, complies with the state’s IT Security standards. – Bidder shall describe how encryption shall be implemented for data at-rest and in-motion. – Bidder shall describe how User Access Management will be implemented in the proposed solution.
8	Testing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder shall provide an approach on how testing will be implemented throughout the development process. This shall include System Testing and User Acceptance Testing (UAT). – Bidder shall describe how the Automated Testing Solution will be utilized and maintained through the development iterations. – Bidder shall describe all OSOS and County resources required during the testing phase. – Bidder shall describe how accessibility testing will be done, to make sure we are in compliance with WCAG 2.0 standards.

#	Category	Key questions
9	Transformation Management and Training Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder shall provide an approach for how to guide the project stakeholders in Organizational Change Management from the use of current Elections Systems applications and environment to the proposed solution. – Bidder shall describe how current workflows for Voter Registration, Elections Management, Candidate Filings, Petition Management, and Voter’s Pamphlet will be impacted in the proposed solution. – Bidder shall describe how the training of stakeholders will be accomplished. – Bidder shall detail the types of training to be used, the approach, and the proposed curriculum. – Bidder shall detail the schedule for the training, required resources and logistics, as well as all deliverables and criteria for successful trained users of the proposed solution.
10	Disaster Recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bidder shall provide its approach for addressing and ensuring Disaster Recovery.

3.3 COST WORKSHEET (SCORED)

Exhibit C: Cost Worksheet must be completed in its entirety and submitted to the RFP coordinator in Microsoft Excel format as BIDDERNAME_COST_RFP18-02.

The evaluation process is designed to award this procurement not necessarily to the Bidder of lowest cost, but rather to the Bidder whose Proposal best meets the requirements of the OSOS/Counties. However, Bidders are encouraged to submit Proposals which are consistent with state government efforts to conserve state resources.

- Ultimately, any contract resulting from this procurement will be configured as a deliverables-based agreement.
- Bidders are required to collect and pay Washington state sales tax, if applicable.
- The score for the cost Proposal will be computed by dividing the lowest cost bid received by the Bidder’s total cost. Then the resultant number will be multiplied by the maximum possible points for the cost section.

3.4 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS PROPOSAL (SCORED)

Bidder shall provide an approach for on-going Software Maintenance and Operations (M&O) required to maintain the proposed solution.

Bidder shall describe, at a minimum, how the Bidder will support OSOS and the 39 Counties, with the following items:

- Help Desk support
- Application Monitoring and Management
- Operations Management
- Incident Management

- Change Management for fixes (Change Control)
- Change Management for system enhancements (Change Control)
- Change Management for new releases of the proposed solution including any changes due to technology changes
- All system design as well as documentation and traceability to requirements
- Service Level Monitoring and Reporting
- User Training during Maintenance and Operations
- Upgrades

Bidder may describe any additional services for on-going M&O required to maintain the proposed solution.

Bidder shall also provide a price that includes all support, maintenance, changes, enhancements, and management of the support for a five (5) year period. Bidder shall provide the price estimate in Exhibit C: Cost Worksheet.

Bidder shall identify the resources required from OSOS and the 39 County partners to support the proposed M&O approach.

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.

HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE COSTS, and HOSTING OPTIONS

Bidder shall provide an approach for an option utilizing Hosting Services. 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. As an option, Bidder may provide a description for hosting options for public-facing components of the solution.

Bidder should provide a description for providing Disaster Recovery as part of the hosting option. Bidder should also provide an option for hosting of County websites. Bidder shall provide the five (5) year cost of these hosting options, including the hardware and software costs for licenses and maintenance. Bidder shall provide the price estimate in Exhibit C: Cost Worksheet.

NOTE TO BIDDERS: Current hardware and software environment is Hewlett-Packard hardware utilizing Microsoft Window Server – OS 2008, Microsoft SQL 2008 R2. Bidder should take into consideration that the current OSOS and County IT Staff resources are limited, and the expectation is that the Bidder will provide the majority, if not all, of the support services required for the solution.

The rest of this page is intentionally left blank.