

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE
ELECTIONS DIVISION**

**RFQQ 25-10
ELECTION RESULTS ARCHIVE STORAGE
AMENDMENT NO. 4
(April 14, 2025)**

SUMMARY

This Amendment No. 4 to RFQQ 25-10 compiles all the questions received from vendors during the Question-and-Answer Period from March 7, 2025, to April 10, 2025, and provides the official responses from the Office of the Secretary of State (OSOS). These Questions and Answers are now incorporated into the solicitation as an official addendum.

COMPLETE LIST OF QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Q1: Can you please confirm that the current public access portal is here? [Election Results and Voters' Pamphlets | WA Secretary of State](#)

A1: The current Election Results Archive application can be found on the Secretary of State's website here: [Election Results Search - Elections & Voting - WA Secretary of State](#)

Q2: Does the current solution contain structured and/ or unstructured data?

A2: The current Election Results Archive operates using structured data from a SQL database.

Q3: Do you also have a sense of the size of those databases?

A3: The 1906-2006 results data, that includes only state and federal contests and measures, has a maximum table size of 212,000 rows. The 2006-2019 results data have a maximum table size of 49,247,306 rows. The 2019-2025 results data currently contain a table size of 8,238,587 rows, with more rows being added as elections take place.

Q4: Can you clarify who you think the users of the archive would be and what they would be able to do?

A4: Users of this archive are expected to be voters, campaigns, elected officials, election administrators, media, and academic researchers. We expect them to continue to be able to search for past elections by candidate name, jurisdiction type, office, election, and/or year.

Q5: Does the existing solution simply query the SQL databases to display results and report back? So, the existing solution is effectively just a front-end running queries on a SQL backend.

A5: Yes, that is correct.

Q6: Are you looking for a single solution that can provide an up-to-date portal for the voting information as well as providing the digital assets that Laura mentioned earlier?

A6: No, we do not expect the solution to provide up to date voting information. The Election Results Archive will only provide results after they've been certified by the county and state.

The OSOS currently has access to the state and federal certifications of prior elections and can make those available as digital assets for any proposed solution.

Q7: For the vendor experience requirement, can we utilize similar and applicable solutions? Or do we need to have election results archive experience?

A7: Yes, experience with similar election results solutions.

Q8: Does OSOS currently use Microsoft 365? If so, are you interested in connecting this Archive into your existing M365 environment as a content management solution + public access with appropriate permissions?

A8: Yes, The OSOS currently uses M365.

Q9: Is it fair to say the data that resides in the archive will need to reside there in perpetuity?

A9: Yes, the election results data will be maintained in compliance with the Records Retention Schedule.

Q10: Is there a specific data export strategy for the existing digital assets you mentioned outside of the database files? For example, should they be exported to a repository for uploading?

A10: No, there is no data export strategy. The OSOS will work with the successful bidder to transfer the necessary data and assets securely.

Q11: Do you have a specific timeline within which the new system would need to be populated and then go live from the point of starting migration?

A11: No, there is no specific timeline. The OSOS will work with the successful bidder to implement the new system.

Q12: You mentioned converting files from one format to another, is that something you do with another consultancy service outside of this platform?

A12: The OSOS uses internal and existing resources and capabilities to convert files from one format to another.

Q13: Is the election result data considered permanent records? And, if so, is this data subject to legal retention policies (e.g. must be transferred to the State Archives)?

A13: Yes, the election results data will be maintained in compliance with the Records Retention Schedule.

Q14: Is there a requirement or wish that the new solution can also provide reporting and web analytics etc.? I.e. who is looking at what and how often?

A14: The OSOS currently uses Google Analytics to gather web analytics. That can be shared with the successful bidder to provide reporting and web analytics, or an alternative can be provided within the solution.

Q15: What type of internal IT reports are desired from the new Archive system?

A15: The only reporting requirements are related to system performance, monitored using the OSOS-provided tool, DataDog.

Q16: Are you able to speak at all to the funding available for this new solution? I imagine there are maintenance and perhaps some staff time costs for the current system, but have you anticipated an increased annual cost for a more modern solution?

A16: The current state budget includes additional funding that was intended for a modern results reporting solution. We are confident that this funding will remain in the budget.

Q17: How is the archive on the WA SOS website deployed currently? How does authentication work between the website and the backend database?

A17: The current Election Results Archive has remained unchanged for many years and has not been re-deployed recently. The OSOS will work with the successful bidder on any authentication work required for the proposed solution.

Q18: Are all election results in this archive considered to have permanent retention, and therefore require long-term or perpetual digital preservation?

A18: Yes. The election results data will be maintained in compliance with the Records Retention Schedule.

Q19: What is the volume of election results in the archive (number of files, average file size, total file size (TB, PB, etc.)?)

A19: The 1906-2006 results data, that includes only state and federal contests and measures, has a maximum table size of 212,000 rows. The 2006-2019 results data have a maximum table size of 49,247,306 rows. The 2019-2025 results data contain a current table size (as more elections are conducted more rows are added) of 8,238,587 rows.

Q20: What file types are in the archive of election results (TIFF, PDF, txt, etc)?

A20: The data is currently stored in an SQL database. The OSOS currently has access to the state and federal certifications of prior elections and can make those available as digital assets for any proposed solution.

Q21: Is it possible for the OSOS to provide an example of the current database structure and some sample data?

A21: For security reasons, the OSOS will only provide current database structure to the successful bidder. However, we can provide example data sets for the 2006-current data standard.

Q22: Please provide any OSOS standards and best practices that the new digital archive should comply with, such as CIO Security Requirements, accessibility standards, etc.

A22: There are no OSOS standards or best practices required. We look forward to hearing the innovative and creative solutions that best serve the needs of the voter within the submitted proposals. However, the system must be compliant with OCIO Security Requirements.

Q23: Archival storage solutions are designed to handle a variety of archives and records. Is OSOS open to partnering with a vendor who has decades of experience in providing archival storage solutions to local government agencies across a range of record types, but does not hold the required level of experience providing a digital archive solution for election results specifically?

A23: Contractor must possess at least eight (8) years' demonstrated experience providing archival storage solutions for election results.

Q24: What is the size of the SQL DB in GB?

A24: When the data is exported from SQL into text files, those 10 files are approximately 5 MB total.

Q25: Does this RFQQ fall under the state's Supplier Diversity procurement rules (i.e. Executive Order 22-01: Equity in Public Contracting, and DES policy DES-090-06)? If so, will additional evaluation points be awarded to qualified WA state small & veteran-owned businesses?

A25: The Office of the Secretary of State (OSOS) supports the principles of Executive Order 22-01 – Equity in Public Contracting [22-01 - Equity in Public Contracting.pdf](#), which encourages increasing access to public contracting for small, diverse, and veteran-owned businesses.

However, this procurement does not include evaluation preferences based on business status, as the total contract value exceeds the \$150,000 threshold referenced in DES Policy DES-090-06, Section C.4 [POL-DES-090-06SupplierDiversity.pdf](#), and therefore does not meet the terms of that requirement.

As clarified in RFQQ 25-10 – Amendment No. 3:

“The correct total budgeted amount for the five-year contract is Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000.00), with a maximum budgeted amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) per year.”

Business ownership or certification status may be disclosed in Exhibits A-1 and A-2, but no additional evaluation points are awarded under this RFQQ 25-10 on that basis.

Q26: Additionally, since this award is valued at less than \$150K annually, if a responsive and responsible bidder is a WA state small business or veteran-owned business, is the contract required to be awarded to that bidder before considering other bids per DES-090-06 Policy Section C.4?

A26: No. Although the estimated annual value of the contract is \$100,000, the contract resulting from this RFQQ 25-10 will exceed the threshold defined in DES Policy DES-090-06 Section C.4 [Supplier Diversity - DES-090-06 | Department of Enterprise Services \(DES\)](#) when measured by total contract value.

Per Section 1.4 of RFQQ 25-10, the period of performance is:

“...tentatively scheduled to begin on or about July 1, 2025, and to end on June 30, 2030.”

And RFQQ 25-10 – Amendment No. 3 confirms:

“The correct total budgeted amount for the five-year contract is Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000.00), with a maximum budgeted amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) per year.”

By policy, DES-090-06, Section C.4 [POL-DES-090-06SupplierDiversity.pdf](#) states:

“Award competitively procured contracts with an initial value less than \$150,000 to the highest-ranked responsive and responsible small or veteran-owned business, unless there was no responsive and responsible bid from a small or veteran-owned business.”

Because the total value of the contract exceeds \$150,000, this procurement does not meet the terms of the requirement described in Section C.4.

Q27: There does not seem to be anywhere in the proposal to include a Technical Approach or describe the bidder’s Proposed Solution and no award evaluation points allocated for this. Should we include this content within the Management Proposal section somewhere or will OSOS consider adding a Technical Approach section & adding award points for this new section? Typical content might include and provide equal award points weight as the Management Proposal section: a. Project Approach/Methodology; b. Work Plan & Schedule; c. Proposed Solution; d. Deliverables.

A27: While this content could be included in the Management Proposal, OSOS will add a “Technical Approach” section worth 70 points, and reduce “Management Proposal” to 70 points. This ensures more balanced evaluation.

Q28: Is there an incumbent supplier that provides similar services today?

A28: No, there is no contracted vendor providing these services. The current solution was designed in-house but those developers are no longer with the OSOS.

Q29: Amendment #2 Question #7 - Could you clarify the answer to this question from the Pre-Bid and amend the RFP to clarify that the narrowly worded minimum qualification has been

relaxed and similar “open-government” & “civic technology” implementation experience is the real minimum requirement and that experience specifically with “archival storage solutions for election results” is preferred, but not required?

A29: Yes, if you have experience with archival storage solutions for election results or similar election results solution. Please keep in mind that one of the specific duties for the contractor is to provide a fully developed, off-the-shelf solution with only minor customizations.

Q30: Will OSOS remain responsible for all hosting cost and Production environment infrastructure administration (web server, database admin, etc.) with the awarded vendor’s role limited to delivery of code releases, deployments, and software maintenance of the archive solution to OSOS for deployment into Production? Will OSOS provide additional Test, Staging, or UAT environments for this project?

A30: The RFQQ is silent on hosting location and administration. Our intention is to allow for creativity and innovation in the proposals submitted. If the OSOS is required to provide additional Test, Staging, or UAT environments for the proposed solution, that should be included in your proposal.

Q31: Please confirm that all data used in the application is categorized as “Category 1 - Public Information” and that the database & data source used contain no personally identifiable information (PII).

A31: The current Election Results Archive dataset contains only public information.

Q32: For our proposal, would the following scope be correct for determining cost estimates: a. Conversion of the current “Election Results Search” page functionality found here: [Election Results Search - Elections & Voting - WA Secretary of State](#); a.1. Where improvements can be made to the user-experience during the conversion effort, make these, but without sacrificing existing functionality or costing more; b. Implement an intuitive, responsive web application that can be used on handheld devices; c. Improve and meet minimum standards for accessibility; d. Resolve bad links and page references; e. Import of future years data > 2006 as it becomes available; f. Assumed Not in Scope - Significant changes to data structures or substantial additions of functionality, new reports, etc.; g. Assumed Not in Scope - User surveys for usability & UX research with users.

A32: Yes, the information you provided should be considered when determining cost estimates. The items identified as “assumed not in scope” are not specific duties included in the objective, however those may be included in the Technical or Management Proposal if recommended as part as the proposed solution. Our intention is to allow for creativity and innovation in the proposals submitted.

Q33: If we have ideas for future improvements, should we include these separately in the proposal, but not include them in the cost estimates so that OSOS can make like-for-like comparisons between proposals?

A33: Yes, our intention is to allow for creativity and innovation in the proposals submitted. If your proposal includes additional features or ideas for future improvements, include those within your proposal. You can separate those improvements from the required Cost Proposal.

Q34: Is it possible to get a copy of the SQL Server database schema (description of tables & columns) used to currently store the source data?

A34: The OSOS will work with the successful bidder and provide the standardized election results data.