

T 916. 375.4400

F 916. 375.4505

www.pd.dgs.ca.gov

November 30, 2010

Secretary of State (SOS) VoteCal Project
RFP SOS 0890-46
Question and Answer set #2

To All Interested Bidders:

Attached are questions from Vendors along with the State's response. In the event of a conflict in content between the State's electronically released document and the Bidder submitted document, the State's document will prevail.

The numbers provided in Q and A #25 are used as an estimate only, the State cannot guarantee that the numbers will remain constant.

If you have questions please contact me via e-mail at: Regina.weary@dgs.ca.gov or by telephone at (916) 375-4554.

Sincerely,

/Signature on File/

Regina Weary
Procurement Official

#	RFP REFERENCE	BIDDER QUESTION	STATE RESPONSE
1	Section I.A, third paragraph	Will SOS consider revising RFP to guarantee that the selected vendor is assured 5 one-year options for hardware maintenance and operations and 1 five-year option for software application support?	No. SOS is not going to guarantee that the winning bidder will provide extended maintenance.
2	Section VI.B.3, Requirement P9	If a bidder proposes a COTS or MOTS solution that has already been installed and is successfully being used to meet HAVA-based state centralized voter registration requirements, does the state intend that the vendor's test plan include testing the entire "product," even if core product functionality has been previously tested in other locations and is successfully operating in other states?	Yes, SOS expects that testing will, when executed, fully test every requirement, including load, performance, security, etc., and demonstrate successful installation and operation of the solution. This expectation applies regardless of the solution.
3	Section VI.B.3, Requirement P9	Will SOS consider replacing or augmenting the statement, "It will be the decision of the VoteCal Project Manager when acceptance testing has been successfully completed" with specific objective and measurable criteria that will be used to determine that VoteCal acceptance testing has successfully completed?	No; the statement is already clarified in the RFP in the description of Requirement 9: "the final approved detailed Test Plan will provide the basis for verifying that the system operates as documented and intended."
4	Attachment 1, paragraph 3(a)	Would the state consider revising the RFP to allow the key vendor staff to work remotely, and not make remote work an exception subject to SOS approval?	No..
5	Attachment 1, paragraph 6 – Full System Acceptance	Regarding Full System Acceptance, would the state consider allowing the contractor to define a completion date of any open incidents? There maybe non critical issues that come up during this phase and depending on the number of issues this could have a huge negative impact to the project if every incident must be completed.	No. System acceptance as described in Attachment 1 paragraph 6 will be contingent on resolution of all problems impacting conduct of an election and all severity one and severity two problems; these severity categories are defined in the RFP Glossary and in Attachment 1 Exhibits 4 and 5.
6	Attachment 1 paragraph 11(e) – Review Time for Contractor Document Deliverables	In light of the timeline and the urgency to get deliverables agreed upon, will the State revise language that currently states the <i>minimum</i> number of review/comment days for deliverables, to indicate instead a set number of days during which the SOS must provide review and feedback?	No, the State will not define the review time for deliverables. SOS expects that the Bidder will define maximum number of days for SOS review of deliverables in the course of development of the integrated project schedule and deliverable expectation documents.

#	RFP REFERENCE	BIDDER QUESTION	STATE RESPONSE
7	Attachment 1 paragraph 12(b)	Will SOS consider removing or revising the clauses in Attachment 1, paragraph 12.b that guarantee that enhancements or upgrades be made available to SOS at a price no greater than that offered to other government licensees or other entity that was provided the enhancement or upgrade?	No.
8	Attachment 1 Exhibit 2, Phase 2 Design Deliverables	Can the language that describes design phase deliverables be changed to address COTS and MOTS systems? It is assumed that in a COTS or MOTS application that only GAP items (defined as items that need to be developed) would go through a design phase.	No. Development of the VoteCal system must include design, development and testing phases that address all requirements as identified in the RFP, not just any GAP defined by a vendor.
9	Section I.F – Key Action Dates	Will the SOS consider extending the deadline for submittal of Pre-Qualification packages, to allow bidders more time to establish any needed subcontractor relationships?	Yes, the SOS will extend the deadline for Pre-Qualification packages, by two (2) weeks, to 1/20/2011. A revised timeline will be published in Addendum 2.
10	Section III.E.2(e); Section VI – Requirements S20.1 through S20.7	How many counties do manual entry of Report of Registration (ROR) statistics?	Historically, two to three counties have directly keyed their Report of Registration (ROR) statistics. For all other counties, statistics have been either reported electronically or reported on paper for SOS staff to manually enter. Note that under VoteCal, SOS expects the ROR statistics to be extracted and compiled directly from the central VoteCal database.
11	Section IV.B and Section IV.E	How many EMSs that are currently in use will be remediated? How many of the current EMSs will be replaced?	No EMS will be replaced as a result of VoteCal. Some degree of remediation will be required for every EMS installation, at least for the interface with VoteCal. The remediation itself will be the responsibility of the EMS vendors, not the VoteCal Contractor; however, the VoteCal Contractor will need to coordinate with EMS vendors in support of the latter's remediation work.

#	RFP REFERENCE	BIDDER QUESTION	STATE RESPONSE
12	Section IV.E.3 - "The EMS will be required to upload VRC and signature images with each registration record added or updated, in the format in which they are currently stored at the county; the system will convert those images as necessary."	Does the SOS have a current standard they would like signature images converted to or will that be at the discretion of the bidder?	Yes. Current SOS standard calls for signature images to be stored in an ANSI/AIIM compatible format.
13	Section IV.E.5(i) - "SOS will own all hardware and software licenses provided for this system without having to purchase new licenses when the system is turned over to SOS at acceptance."	Does SOS intend to purchase all the hardware and licenses for said hardware based on the bidder's recommendations? Or would the state prefer the bidder purchase on the state's behalf all required hardware and licenses for the hardware with extended license periods past the point of the acceptance?	The Contractor is to purchase all required hardware and licenses. RFP Section V.A.4 and Section V.A.6 specify that all software licenses shall be held by the Contractor until completion of Phase VII. Section IV.E.5(i) indicates that at final system acceptance (end of Phase VII) all hardware and licenses, including third-party licenses, will transfer to SOS without additional transfer fees and without need for the SOS to purchase new licenses.
14	Section VI, Requirement T1.1	Would the bidder's solution need to be tied to the active directory of the users PC?	Yes.
15	Section VI, Requirement T3.6	Will SOS provide a full specification of all hardware currently housed in the data center to ensure that this requirement can be met?	No. The "physical facilities" to which Requirement T3.6 refers include the floor space, climate control, power supply, network, backup, and security. Brands and model numbers for relevant facilities are provided in the SOS Infrastructure Overview document in the Bidder's Library.
16	Section VI, Requirement T4.7 (regarding document attachments to voter record)	What is the standard type and size of these documents or is this at the bidder's discretion to define?	The documents will typically be letters or memos to or from voters. The letters/memos will be text; few if any images are anticipated in these documents.
17	Attachment 1 – Statement of Work, Paragraph 13(b)	Would the state be willing to consider changing the withhold amount of 20% to 10%?	No.
18	Section VII.B – distribution of costs across deliverables	Would SOS be willing to negotiate the percentages for deliverables upon contract award to come to a more equitable distribution of payments?	No.

#	RFP REFERENCE	BIDDER QUESTION	STATE RESPONSE
19	Section IV.B.5(d)	Will the SOS provide direction on its intended implementation timeline?	No. SOS expects each bidder to propose a timeline based on the RFP requirements, bidder's proposed solution, and the various conditions and constraints cited in the RFP.
20	Section IV, Item 6 – County Support	Please provide an estimate of how much (Megs/Gigs) of audit information will be expected from the county EMSs for a one-year period.	The requested estimate is not readily available, nor should it be necessary. The "audit information" referenced in Section IV consists of a few data elements on each transmitted record that would be required for audit trail purposes (e.g., a date stamp and user ID). For additional information, see the answer to question 25 regarding average number of voter record transactions received per time period.
21	Section VI, Requirement S2.27	Is it the intent of this requirement to set the comment/note record size to a minimum of 1,024 characters?	Yes. The intent of this requirement is that any system-imposed limitation on number of characters in a single comment or note must be at least 1,024 characters.
22	Section IV.B, Section VII, Attachment 1 Exhibit 2 (relation of EMS remediation to the Statement of Work)	Is it the intention of SOS to enter into a contract to remediate the California County EMS systems once a VoteCal vendor has been selected and specific interface requirements defined, to ensure remediation aligns with the project implementation schedule?	Yes. SOS will contract with EMSs for EMS remediation necessary to interface with the VoteCal system. Remediation of EMSs is not the VoteCal Contractor's responsibility, although the Contractor and EMS vendors will need to work in close coordination to ensure project success.
23	Section VII.B.1 – VoteCal System Schedule of Deliverable Payments	The table lists the deliverables and payment percentages. The text for the Design Phase states that this phase is 18% of the total, but the percentages only add up to 17.1%. Which value should be increased?	The correct total for the Design phase is 17.1% of the total contract amount. The outstanding 0.9% is the total for Phase 0 (Ongoing Process Tasks and Deliverables); the text description for Phase 0 describes the monthly payments of prorated portions of this 0.9%.

#	RFP REFERENCE	BIDDER QUESTION	STATE RESPONSE
24	Section III, Table III.1 - Calvoter System Problems and Issues	What is the acceptable frequency for data synchronization between county and state systems?	SOS has defined maximum duration of data asynchrony for two types of processes. Section VI defines a maximum duration of 10 seconds between receipt of county data on a voter and completion of creation/update of a voter record - including ID verification and notification to county - (see Requirement T4.11). List Maintenance processes for a newly created or updated record are to be completed by the start of the business day following receipt of the record (see Requirements T4.9 and T4.10).

#	RFP REFERENCE	BIDDER QUESTION	STATE RESPONSE																		
25	Section III, Table III.1 - Calvoter System Problems and Issues	What will be the approximate volume of data (number of voter records per day) that will be synchronized between county and state system?	<p>In 2008, best estimate was 15,409 records per day, based on SOS's response to the 2008 Elections Assistance Commission's Election Day Survey. Numbers for a two year period are as follows:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Registrations by mail</td> <td>3,484,326</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Individual Registrations received in office</td> <td>1,545,907</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Registrations from DMV</td> <td>1,592,764</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Registrations from other NVRA sources</td> <td>316,746</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Registrations from Advocacy Groups</td> <td>90,924</td> </tr> <tr> <td>From all other sources</td> <td>982,236</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total for 2007-2008 Reporting Period</td> <td>8,012,903</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated business days</td> <td>520</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated daily average</td> <td>15,409</td> </tr> </table> <p>However, the actual number of electronic transactions between VoteCal and the county EMSs will likely depend upon the final VoteCal implementation. (Note: Bidders may view the full California response to the 2008 EAC Election Day Survey on the SOS website at: http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/nvra/ca-biennial-report-to-eac.htm)</p>	Registrations by mail	3,484,326	Individual Registrations received in office	1,545,907	Registrations from DMV	1,592,764	Registrations from other NVRA sources	316,746	Registrations from Advocacy Groups	90,924	From all other sources	982,236	Total for 2007-2008 Reporting Period	8,012,903	Estimated business days	520	Estimated daily average	15,409
Registrations by mail	3,484,326																				
Individual Registrations received in office	1,545,907																				
Registrations from DMV	1,592,764																				
Registrations from other NVRA sources	316,746																				
Registrations from Advocacy Groups	90,924																				
From all other sources	982,236																				
Total for 2007-2008 Reporting Period	8,012,903																				
Estimated business days	520																				
Estimated daily average	15,409																				

#	RFP REFERENCE	BIDDER QUESTION	STATE RESPONSE
26	Bidder's Library	In the Bidders Library, The following document returns an error, the page you are looking for cannot be found. " <i>Data standards tables (supplement to Calvoter and Calvalidator Data Standards)</i> " for requirements: " <i>VI.D, Table VI.1 - Mandatory VoteCal System Requirements, Functionality Reference, and Requirement Response Form, Requirement S2.13, Requirement S2.14, Requirement S2.15, Requirement S2.17</i> " Can the State please provide a current link to this document?	Yes, the Bidder's Library link for this document is now functioning correctly. SOS is grateful to bidders for calling this error to our attention.
27	Section II, Section V, Section VII, Attachment 1 – Statement of Work	Does the RFP apply all of the following – a performance bond, letter of credit, <i>and</i> invoice withhold?	No, a <i>performance</i> bond is not required for this RFP; however, a <i>protest</i> bond <i>is</i> required <i>if</i> the Bidder chooses to protest. The Letter of Credit and the 20% withhold are required. See information about: the protest bond (in the RFP Section II.E.2; the Letter of Credit Intent in Section V.A.13; the Letter of Credit in Section V.C.3.1 (; and, the withhold information in Section VII.B and Attachment 1 paragraphs 2(a) and 13(b). \
28	Attachment 1, paragraph 13(c)	Will SOS consider removing the provisions for Liquidated Damages?	No.