

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 3

5/21/04

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Appendix A, Sect. A2.3, Security and Data Integrity, p. A-4 | Does the SEB/DET currently, or anticipate supporting PKI encryption technology? Do they currently have access to a PKI server? <i>The SEB and DET have not defined a specific encryption technology to be proposed. It is up to the vendor to identify and prepare their recommended encryption technology and any required hardware, software and costs.</i> |
| 2 | Appendix A, Sect. A3.3, Data population Strategy & Conversion, Municipal Legacy Systems, p. A-18 | A number of County and Municipality databases / systems are undefined or “Other” and there is a discrepancy between the 350 municipalities with current VRS’ and the 253 reported. a) Is there further definition available for the 97 systems that are not documented, as well as btheir respective records counts? b) What are the assumptions regarding these systems relating to items in question a)? <i>The other counties have not responded to surveys. The type of system that they have is not known. The vendor should use their experience to define a workplan that incorporates their knowledge of data conversion and properly uses assumptions to determine the scope and effort.</i> |
| 3 | Appendix A, Sect. A3.3, Data population Strategy & Conversion, Data Conversion – Voter Registration Data, p. A-19 | RFP --“The SEB expects the vendor to provide a field-by-field conversion specification, that provides the logic required to migrate data from the legacy system to the target SVRS. The specification will also describe how data should be formatted (e.g., Street vs. St.). The SEB will be responsible for providing an extract file that meets the vendor’s specifications.” a) Does this mean that the vendor will supply the data mappings for each legacy application? b) Will the SEB provide all software and scripts required to perform the data extraction process from the legacy applications? <i>As stated in Appendix A A3.3 Data Population Strategy and Conversion, “The SEB expects the vendor to provide a field-by-field conversion specification, that provides the logic required to migrate data from the legacy system to the target SVRS. The specification will also describe how data should be formatted (e.g., Street vs. St.). The SEB will be responsible for providing an extract file that meets the vendor’s specifications. The vendor is responsible for converting the extract into the SVRS.”</i> a) <i>The vendor is responsible for “providing a field-by-field conversion specification”. The SEB is then responsible for “for providing an extract file that meets the vendor’s specifications”. Therefore, the vendor is designing the extract from a required field perspective, and the SEB is building the files.</i> b) <i>The SEB will develop the scripts to the specifications provided by the vendor and required by the SVRS.</i> |
| 4 | Sect. A3.3, Data population Strategy & Conversion, Data Population & Conversion Requirements #59, p. A-20 | When will the voter registration data (Voter Registration Applications) from non-VRS counties and municipalities be available for Data Population? e.g. Election time, Pre-SVRS go Live, Specific time (Nov. 2004), etc.? <i>The vendor’s data population strategy must specify the timetable for data collection and specify the vendor’s approach for data entry (e.g. manual data entry, data entry tools).</i> |
| 5 | Appendix A, Sect. A6.2 Data Entry for | For data conversion and data population, are there specific state limitations regarding the movement of voter registration information or Forms? e.g. movement of signed voter’s |

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 3

5/21/04

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | Municipalities Currently Without Voter Registration, p. A-26 | applications to vendor's facility for input, digital transmission, etc. <i>Security, whether certified or bonded, must be maintained for all non-public information, such as driver's license number.</i> |
| 6 | RFP, Sect. 8.2.1 Acceptance/ Standard of Performance, p. 43 | Please confirm that the SEB review period for non-software deliverables (e.g. project plan, design specifications, acceptance test cases) will be 30 days. a) Does this infer that all non-software deliverables will take 30 days before they are approved and the follow-on tasks can be started? A 30-day delay for all non-software deliverables will impact the ability to complete the project as desired. b) Should the project plan reflect a 30 day review period for all non-software deliverables as a dependency for the start of follow-on tasks? c) As an alternative, can the vendor assume that activities in the plan can proceed without receiving final acceptance from SEB? <i>The statement reads "within 30 days", and the SEB expects the vendor to both 1) plan for some time for the SEB to review the deliverables, and 2) also to use the appropriate project management techniques to ensure that the SEB is aware of activities and deadlines contingent upon the deliverable sign-off.</i> |
| 7 | RFP, Sect. 3.25 Other State Agencies and Data Integration, p. 25 | The RFP says "The State anticipates using the SEB to facilitate the integration between the SVRS and other state agencies." Please confirm that the only requested interfaces are for the following four state agencies: DMV, DHFS, and DOC/DOJ. <i>Yes, and more specifically, it is only for the transactions outlined in 3.2.5 Other State Agencies and Data Integration.</i> In section B.3.4, the questions also mention an optional interface to USPS National Change of Address System. What is the requirement for this? Should this be included in the base price or be priced as an optional interface? <i>This is an optional interface and should therefore be excluded from the base price.</i> |
| 8 | Appendix A, A3.1 Implementation, Project Management Methodology and Tools, p. A-14 | a) Should the Microsoft Project work plan only include those tasks within the scope of work for vendor personnel? Please clarify the scope of activities to be included within the work plan. b) If SEB/DET tasks are to be included in the vendor's work plan (such as hardware and software procurement or the installation of hardware) can the vendor just include a duration for the task? <i>As stated in Appendix A, A3.0 Implementation Plan</i> <i>"The vendor must provide a comprehensive implementation plan that describes an organizational structure and clearly articulates the roles and responsibilities for vendor personnel as well as DET and SEB personnel. The plan must define deadlines and milestones that accommodate the calendar of Election events provided in Appendix J. The plan must incorporate the SEB's anticipated project team is discussed in §3.2.8.</i> <i>The vendor is responsible for the successful delivery of a fully functional SVRS."</i> Our recommendation would be that only those SEB/DET tasks that are on the critical path of the work plan be included. <i>The level of detail that the vendor provides in their response to this RFP is up to the vendor. The State will score this portion of the RFP Response based on the criteria that has been defined in Appendix A, A3.0 Implementation Plan</i> |
| 9 | Appendix A, Sect. A3.0 | a) Is a SVRS Pilot test desired or is it anticipated that the only testing completed by the SEB (and/or local entities) will be during the final 30-day user acceptance testing? |

Statewide Voter Registration System

RFP – EB-SVRS1

Vendor Questions 3

5/21/04

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | Implementation Plan, p. A-12 | <p>b) If a Pilot test is desired, what would the scope of the pilot be (e.g. number of counties, items to be tested, duration of test)?</p> <p>c) If a Pilot test is desired, what would the involvement of the State and local jurisdictions be during the pilot test?</p> <p>d) What resources would the State be comfortable providing to support this?</p> <p>e) Would the SEB perform training of pilot test participants?</p> <p><i>The vendor should use their experience to develop the workplan, resources required, and any specific tasks that they feel are necessary “for the successful delivery of a fully functional SVRS.”</i></p> |
| 10 | Appendix A, Sect. A3.0 Implementation Plan, p. A-12 | <p>a) What is the preferred approach for testing new / modified business processes? Is the expectation that these will be tested during the Acceptance Testing Phase by the SEB?</p> <p><i>The vendor should use their experience to develop the workplan, resources required, and any specific tasks that they feel are necessary “for the successful delivery of a fully functional SVRS.”</i></p> <p>b) Will the SEB develop the test cases for testing the business processes?</p> <p><i>The vendor will be responsible for the unit and system testing of their application. The vendor should use their experience to develop the workplan, resources required, and any specific tasks that they feel are necessary for user acceptance testing. The vendor will work with the SEB to define the User Acceptance Test.</i></p> <p>c) Will the vendor be expected to provide initial training and materials for the integration of the business processes with the SVRS system or will this be the responsibility of the SEB Transition Team?</p> <p><i>As stated in §2.3.6 Performance Documentation, the vendor is requested to provide 10 copies of the original User Training Documentation. Any changes to the documentation due to customizations and modifications of the Contract will be required as well.</i></p> |
| 11 | Appendix A, Sect. A3.2 Project Organizational Structure and Key Personnel, p. A-16 | <p>Please clarify who the State defines as “Key Personnel” from the vendor’s team?</p> <p><i>See the RFP Section 1.4 Definitions</i></p> <p><i>“Key Personnel – Vendor and subcontractor personnel who are named to the Wisconsin project in the vendor’s response §A3.2 or who are subsequently added to the project pursuant to Contract Terms and Conditions §8.2.28.”</i></p> |
| 12 | Appendix A, Sect. A5.0 Maintenance and Support, p. A-23 | <p>a) Does the DET or SEB have an existing tool for tracking issues that are called into the vendors’ Level 1 Support desk or should the vendor provide a tool (and configuration effort) within their costs?</p> <p><i>We expect the vendor to use their experience to provide the SEB with best practices in this area.</i></p> <p>b) Will the DET or SEB provide a toll-free line for users to call or should the vendor make these arrangements and include costs within their proposal?</p> <p><i>The vendor should include all costs it feels are needed to provide level 1 and level 2 support.</i></p> <p>c) Should the vendor provide for all expenses associated with pagers and/or mobile phones necessary to provide level 1 and level 2 support?</p> <p><i>The vendor should include all costs it feels are needed to provide level 1 and level 2 support.</i></p> |
| 13 | RFP, Sect. 7.3.4 Question 18, p. 40 | <p>The RFP requires that a separate Vendor Profile be completed for each participating vendor or subcontractor, “complete a separate Vendor Profile, Implementation History, and Vendor Resource response for each participating sub-contracted vendor.” Due to the potential for multiple subcontractors potentially required, this may result in several Vendor Profiles submitted and result in a fragmented response (some questions require joint responses, for instance). For ease of submittal and review, would the state accept a</p> |

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 3

5/21/04

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | consolidated Vendor Profile that provides each vendor's or service providers information in a single document? Yes |
| 14 | RFP, Sect. 2.2, p. 14; Sect. A.3.4, p. 55 | The RFP (a.3.4) asks the vendor to provide "Technical training in the SVRS to DET personnel to support the SVRS hardware." Yet Section 2.2 of the RFP states that hardware is out of scope of this procurement. What type of training relative to hardware is the SVRS vendor expected to provide? Should hardware training be provided by the hardware vendor? The vendor should provide training to DET sufficient to allow them to provide level 2 system support. The vendor is expected to train DET in the specific configurations and specifications of the infrastructure that are unique to the SVRS and where such knowledge is required to support the SVRS. |
| 15 | RFP, Sect. A3.4 Initial training, p. A-21 | What assumptions can be made as to current technical skill sets at DET and SEB. If a vendor is proposing a .Net or Java solution, for example, should we also be planning on providing a full complement of .net or Java administration, operations, security and development training or do we assume some level of existing knowledge? The vendor should provide training to DET sufficient to allow them to provide level 2 system support. The vendor is expected to train DET in the specific configurations and specifications of the infrastructure that are unique to the SVRS and where such knowledge is required to support the SVRS. As stated in Appendix A.4 Question 34, the SEB prefers tools supported by the State, i.e. Java, .Net, J2EE. |
| 16 | RFP, Sect. A3.4 Initial training, p. A-21 | What is the scope of anticipated training that will be required by the DET staff? The vendor should provide training to DET sufficient to allow them to provide level 2 system support. The vendor is expected to train DET in the specific configurations and specifications of the infrastructure that are unique to the SVRS and where such knowledge is required to support the SVRS. |
| 17 | RFP, Sect. 7.2, (3), p. 37; Appendix E, Vendor References | Can the State clarify the specific number of references required? In RFP Section 7.2, (3) references for the vendor are required with an additional (3) references for each subcontractor. In Appendix E, Vendor References, the request is made for references of "four (4) or more installations with requirements similar to those included in this solicitation document." A) Which number of references is the desired? 3, 4 or three for the prime vendor and three for each subcontractor (a total of 12 references for a prime contractor with three subcontractors, for example). B) What is meant by the following in Appendix E: "If vendor is proposing any arrangement involving a third party, the named references should also be involved in a similar arrangement." C) What is the definition of "installations with requirements similar to those included in this solicitation document"? Is the State seeking references for 4 voter registration system implementations of large jurisdictions? As stated in RFP 7.2.3, "Vendor Reference Sheet – Appendix E. The vendor must provide three (3) references, at least one of which must be a state or large (over 1 million population) county in which a voter registration system has been implemented and is in production. The SEB will determine which, if any, references to contact to assess the quality of work performed and personnel assigned to the project. The results of any references will be used in scoring the proposal in Phase 2 of evaluation (see §6.1). In the event that sub-contractors are included in your proposal, the vendor must provide three (3) references for each sub-contractor. The one reference required for the state or large county implementation may be a sub-contractor reference." Appendix E is a standard form used by the State of Wisconsin to document |

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 3

5/21/04

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | <i>vendor references. Any indication in Appendix E of the number and type of reference should be ignored when filling out the form. The vendor should follow the requirements as stated in the RFP.</i> |
| 18 | RFP, Sect. 4.3 Submitting the Proposal, p. 29 | Upon release of the State's answers to vendor questions, can the vendor have two weeks to incorporate the answers into our technical solution before proposals are due? <i>The RFP proposal due date is changed to Tuesday, June 8, 2004; 3:00 pm, Central Time.</i> |