

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions

1. Will the RFI responses be made available? How can we get access to them?
RFI responses are confidential throughout the RFP process. Portions of the RFI responses (not covered by specific confidentiality agreements) will be available for open records requests after the RFP process is complete.
2. The SEB has requested that the Support phase begin July 1, 2005. Since Support covers Level 1 and Level 2 Service Desk does this mean that the SEB wants to have a location implemented by July 1, 2005? If not, can you provide the scope of Support work that SEB would like vendors to perform from July 1, 2005 until the first location is implemented?
Yes. The SEB anticipates that there may be users live as of July 2005 and will require support. The vendor's implementation plan will determine the depth of support during roll-out. Further, the SEB anticipates that there will be users involved in data conversion activities as of July 2005 and will require support.
3. Are the 1,000 SVRS users named or concurrent? If named, what is the number of concurrent users (i.e. logged into and working on the application at the same time) that we should use to size the database and infrastructure components?
Considering the nature of statewide voter registration and elections, named users and concurrent users are considered the same thing. Our definition of "users" includes those who enter, update, or validate any SVRS information. As stated in Appendix C Section C1.0, "The SEB considers it highly desirable to have enterprise-wide license for SVRS". During an election period, all 1000 users could be using the system simultaneously. Further, public read-only access to SVRS information is not included in this count.
4. Does the user count of 1,000 include potential election day access to SVRS from Polling Places.
Yes. These users are intended to be included in the total user estimation. As stated in Appendix C Section C1.0, "The SEB considers it highly desirable to have enterprise-wide license for SVRS". The location of the 1,000 users should not be fixed.
5. Does the State want us to provide retail pricing for the infrastructure components or is a detailed bill of materials enough due to the State's ability to get favorable pricing?
Pricing for the infrastructure components is not required as the SEB will be purchasing hardware through another procurement. A detailed list of materials is sufficient.
6. Does the state require a separate user acceptance testing environment to test the SVRS?
The SEB expects the vendor to provide a testing plan in their response, including necessary testing environments.
7. Should we include hardware such as switches, firewalls, routers, etc. in our proposal to the state or will the SVRS system be using what the state provides or already has in place?
Pricing is not required as the SEB will be purchasing hardware through another procurement. A detailed list of materials is sufficient.
8. Does SEB have a preference on the database platform for the solution, e.g. Oracle or MS SQL Server or IBM DB2?
No.

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions

9. Does the state want the system to have its own backup server with tape drive, or will they be expecting to use the existing backups that are currently in place at the DET?
The State and DET will be taking responsibility for performing backups. As part of each vendor's technology approach, please provide your specifications for backing up the system (i.e. tape, mirroring, RAID, etc.). See Appendix A §A2.3 question 22 and §A2.4 questions 41-45.
10. On page B-21 (***Appendix B §B5.0***) – Voter Access to Voter Information: Does state expects a voter to validate name and address and make updates online on the system directly or just a view only validation and then request changes by mail or walk-in?
The SEB expects a voter to have the ability to view certain fields within their voter record to validate the correctness of the information. A voter cannot update his/her voter record over the Internet.
11. Does the SEB intend to grant the 5% preference to “CERTIFIED Minority Business Enterprises” for this RFP? (RFP Cover Sheet)
As stated on the cover sheet, “a 5% preference may be granted to CERTIFIED Minority Business Enterprises.”
12. Definitions of Acceptance, Final Acceptance and Warranty Acceptance: We assume that the SEB will work with the vendor to define objective and measurable acceptance criteria for each deliverable and that these criteria will be used as the basis for acceptance. Please confirm. (1.4, p. 7 8 and 9)
The SEB will determine appropriate acceptance criteria for individual deliverables.
- 13.
- a. As part of this proposal ... The vendor is responsible for the successful delivery of a fully functional SVRS.” Given the roles and responsibilities of the SEB, local election officials, DET, and other state resources in the delivery of SVRS (“Out-of-Scope Products and Services” identified in Section 2.2 and state responsibilities identified in Section 3.2.8), please confirm that this statement is meant to apply to the vendor’s responsibility to deliver the “In-Scope Products and Services” as identified in Section 2.2 of the RFP. (2.3.2, p. 16)
Yes, the vendor is responsible for all “in-scope products and services”. The vendor is responsible for all functionality and services requested in the RFP except for the items listed in §2.2 under “Out of Scope Products and Services”.
- b. Please provide further information on the source data for collection and entry of the approximately 1 million potential voters who are not registered. In designing the process for adding these voters to the SVRS, what method or methods will be used to identify the voters:
- formal registration activity (e.g., voter must fill out an application)
 - lists of voters participating in past elections
 - lists of voters kept in paper (non-electronic) formats
 - other means
 - combination of the above

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions

The source data for collection and entry of the approximate 1 million, currently unregistered voters will be the EB-131 Application for Voter Registration form. While municipalities have lists (including computerized lists) of voters who have participated in past elections, the names on those lists do not represent registered voters. The current EB-131 form is included in the RFP Appendix M.

- c. If different jurisdictions will use different means to identify the voters for whom data population is required, can you give us an idea or which jurisdictions will use which methods, or alternatively how many jurisdictions will use each method and how many voters will be identified through each method? (2.3.2, p. 17, A 3.0, A-12)

While there may be different methods for obtaining voter registration forms (EB-131), all currently unregistered voters will have to complete an EB-131.

As reflected in questions 58 -64 of Appendix A, Section A3.3, the SEB is asking for the vendor to provide its approach in determining these methods describe above. As part of the vendor's software implementation costs, as defined in Appendix C, Section C3.0, each vendor shall provide a cost for the data population strategy for the collection of voter registration information in those municipalities where no voter registration information exists. In the vendor's response to Appendix C, Section C9.0, the vendor is requested to provide an approach and cost for the vendor to collect and enter the voter registration information into the SVRS application. The vendor's response to Appendix A §A3.3 must include their method for gathering the voter information and their method for data entry of the information into the SVRS.

14. The DOC/DOJ provides two types of information—on convicted felons and on released felons. Does the SEB anticipate both types of information being provided in a single file or format, or should vendors plan for two separate interfaces? (3.2.5, p. 25)
The vendor should plan for two separate events, the loss of voting privileges and the restoration of voting privileges. The number of interfaces is dependent on the vendor's proposed technology solution for handling the two separate transactions.
15. Does the SEB want to disable signatures for all jurisdictions on a blanket basis, or would the SEB permit a jurisdiction that wishes to use the SVRS to capture and store signatures to do so? (3.2.6, p. 25)
The SEB does not want imaging functionality enabled at any site at this time. Imaging functionality is not required by state statute at this time. Furthermore, as state statutes require the retention of original forms, there is no operational benefit to electronically store signatures or forms. Please see RFP §3.2.6.
16. Our assumption is that if the SEB does not want to use imaging to allow capture and storage of signature images, that no other imaging (e.g., voter registration document, other correspondence or documentation) is required. Is this assumption correct? (3.2.6, p. 25)
Yes. However, the scanning of forms (e.g., for voter participation) may be presented as a viable solution for mass data entry.
17. Will the SEB consider relaxing its requirement that the entire response be provided in a single Microsoft Word document? A typical voter registration proposal, with the necessary

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions

graphical elements (such as the Appendix of screen shots), will produce a Microsoft Word document of several megabytes, which is more subject to file corruption and may be difficult for the SEB to work with. As an alternative, may we suggest separate documents for Vendor Background, Technical Proposal, Business Requirements, and the required appendices? (4.3, p. 29)

Yes, vendors may submit their RFP responses in logical groupings, if necessary.

18. Would the SEB accept documents submitted in PDF format rather than Microsoft Word? (4.3, p. 29)

No. The SEB requires vendor responses in MS Word so that certain sections may be pulled into analytical and evaluation tools. The paper RFP response will be considered the legal document that will be used by the SEB if the vendor is concerned that the SEB will take the Word document and make changes to it.

19. When utilizing the table and worksheet templates provided in Appendices A, B, C, and I, is the vendor permitted to include these in its own document with headers, footers, etc. while retaining the SEB's format for the table and worksheet templates? (4.3, 7.4, 7.5)

Yes, provided that the formatting and structure of the tables/worksheets are maintained.

20. We assume that submitting our proposal in 3-ring binders meets the SEB definition of "bound securely." Is this assumption correct? (4.4, p. 30)

Yes, provided the binder can securely bind the response.

21. The RFP lists five types of documentation to be provided by the vendor. Is it intended that these be five distinct documents, or would fewer documents be acceptable if they address all of the areas required? (8.2.36, p. 50)

The vendor may determine the number of documents.

22. How many SEB personnel will be available full-time during implementation to deliver the training required to the counties and municipalities? This information is necessary for planning the implementation schedule. (A 3.0, p. A-12)

The SEB expects each vendor's implementation plan and approach to identify SEB personnel staffing requirements.

23. The RFP states that the SEB will produce a data extract that meets vendor requirements. A key function of a voter registration system is automatic district assignment based upon the voter address. It appears that this type of "address library" or "street file" is lacking in most of the data to be provided by the SEB. We assume that as part of our data conversion plan, we should budget time to build the street file via other means. Is this correct? If not, can you provide additional information on the data to be provided by SEB to build the street file? (A 3.3, p. A-19)

If the vendor's SVRS requires any data that is not contained within the municipal systems, the vendor should budget time to create it.

24. Please provide information on how the SEB will manage the data extract collection process in order to meet the deadlines of the project schedule.

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions

- a. In particular, how will the final data extracts be gathered in a timely manner from those counties/municipalities going live on the new SVRS during a particular week?
The project schedule and deadlines for data extract collection are to be defined by the vendor.
- b. How long a time does the SEB anticipate will be necessary between the final extract and go-live?
The project schedule and deadlines for data extract collection are to be defined by the vendor.
- c. Will the county/municipality be responsible for keying the backlog of applications and other requests that accrue between final extract and go-live? (A 3.3, p. A-19).
Counties and municipalities will be responsible for entering any backlog of applications, though these requests should be insignificant as Wisconsin is not an NVRA state.
25. Question 13 refers to “functions described above.” It is unclear what functions are being referred to. Please clarify. (B3.2, p. B-5)
“Functions describe above” refers to the SEB’s desired SVRS system functionality outlined in Section “B2.0 Background”.
26. Question 19b: Please provide information about how the “Federal Geographic Data Committee Address Content Standard” is utilized in Wisconsin. (B3.3, p. B-5)
How these standards are used in Wisconsin is not relevant to the RFP. The SEB is asking the vendors to describe how their SVRS uses these standards. If the SVRS does not use these standards, the SEB expects the vendor to state that.
27. Question 19c: Please provide information about how the “Geospatial One Stop Government Unit Boundary Standard” is utilized in Wisconsin. (B3.3, p. B-6)
How these standards are used in Wisconsin is not relevant to the RFP. The SEB is asking the vendors to describe how their SVRS uses these standards. If the SVRS does not use these standards, the SEB expects the vendor to state that.
28. Question 23: Please provide information about how “Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS)” are utilized in Wisconsin. (B3.3, p. B-6)
How these standards are used in Wisconsin is not relevant to the RFP. The SEB is asking the vendors to describe how their SVRS uses these standards. If the SVRS does not use these standards, the SEB expects the vendor to state that.
29. Requirement 101: Does this question refer to the use of an *external* report writer such as Crystal Reports? How should a vendor respond if it provides a built-in report writer capability for this functionality? (B4.0, p. B-16)
The question does not differentiate between internal or external report writers. If a vendor’s proposed system provides a built-in report writing tool, please respond to the requirement with a “Y” and discuss the capabilities of the report writer in the comments section.
30. Requirement 203: Please provide further information on this requirement. Our assumption is that a former resident would appear in the SVRS as a cancelled record; otherwise there would be no way to know it was a former resident. Is it sufficient that, if a former resident shows up at the

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions

polling place, the system track that they voted, perhaps using a special code such as “Voted-Former Resident”? (B5.1, p. B-29)

Regarding former residents, State Statutes (s. 6.18) state the following. “If ineligible to qualify as an elector in the state to which the elector has moved, any former qualified Wisconsin elector may vote an absentee ballot in the ward of the elector’s prior residence in any presidential election occurring within 24 months after leaving Wisconsin by requesting an application form and returning it, properly executed, to the municipal clerk of the elector’s prior Wisconsin residence. When requesting an application form for an absentee ballot, the applicant shall specify the applicant’s eligibility for only the presidential ballot.”

The vendor should describe how their SVRS addresses this requirement. The SEB has no preferred approach.

31. For purposes of estimating the export file for the ballot creation software, should we assume a unique file for each vendor (ES&S and Findlar/GBS) or may we assume a standard (perhaps XML) file that each vendor would be required by the SEB to use? (The latter method is the trend we are seeing in other states.) (B8.0, p. B-49)

Vendors should outline their export file assumptions.

32. The RFP states that some municipalities may choose to have live access to the SVRS on election day at poll locations. Are these users included in the 1,000 total users specified in the RFP? If not, how many users should the vendor assume in calculating the cost of providing this access? (B8.0, p. B-49)

These users are intended to be included in the total user estimation of 1,000. As stated in Appendix C Section C1.0, “The SEB considers it highly desirable to have enterprise-wide license for SVRS”. The location of the 1,000 users should not be fixed.

33. Would the users at poll locations required read/write access to the SVRS or would read-only access be sufficient? (B8.0, p. B-49)

Authorized users should be able to both read and update voter registration records at the polling place. The SEB does not expect the 1,000 users to be updating voter information at the poll location at this time. However, the SEB does not want this to be a limitation in the vendor’s response to technical or business requirements.

34. Requirements 546 and 549: Please define “whole vote” and “scattering votes.” (B11.3, p. B-74)
A “whole vote” is a legal term for any vote cast for any candidate. “Scattering votes” are aggregated votes cast for write-in candidates.