

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 4

1. Section 1.1 Overview states a requirement to validate the data to the extent possible using interfaces to other state data maintained by other state agencies. Other parts of the RFP mention other systems, such as the DMV system but do not indicate where the required validation or validations are to take place. Please clarify what is to be validated, what data will be used for the validation and what systems host that data.

As stated by HAVA, “The computerized list shall be coordinated with other agency databases within the State.” and “The chief State election official and the official responsible for the State motor vehicle authority of a State shall enter into an agreement to match information in the database of the statewide voter registration system with information in the database of the motor vehicle authority to the extent required to enable each such official to verify the accuracy of the information provided on applications for voter registration.”

The SEB anticipates sharing/matching/validating information with other state agencies including but not limited to the following fields: name, address, date of birth, social security number, drivers license number. The information will be used to attempt to match identities between state agency data (e.g., DMV) and voter data, and allow local clerks to make a determination on whether or not they would like to update the record for their voters. It is not anticipated that information from outside agencies will be used to automatically update a voter’s record without human intervention.

The SEB has deliberately not been prescriptive in how this shared/matched/validated information should be shared above and beyond the use of the State’s Enterprise Services Bus. We expect the vendor to use their experience to provide the SEB with best practices in this area.

2. Section 3.1.3 states that information from Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is not used to modify voter records. What is DMV information used for? Is there an integration requirement for the DMV system, to share information between the Voter Registration System and DMV? If so, what information is to be shared?

See answer to question 1 above.

3. Appendix A, Section 3.3. on Data Conversion – Election Administration mentions two systems that must have data converted into the new Voter Registration System. Do the requirements for data conversion from SWEBIS 2 and the Access database to the SVRS mean that these two systems will then be retired or eliminated? Or do they also have other information that will be retained in production in those systems?

The systems will be eliminated.

4. Appendix B 3.3 includes information for address and location (GIS) information. The RFP also discusses the GIS systems in Wisconsin. Is an interface going to be required from the Voter Registration System to other GIS or location/address systems in the State or outside the State? If so, please clarify the requirements and provide information on the other systems.

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 4

No such requirements were articulated in the RFP.

5. Appendix B 3.4 states: Describe the process for integration (e.g., via mainframe flat-file) with other state agency files or data base management systems (refer to §3.2.5 for background discussion on integration with other state agencies), including:
- A. Division of Motor Vehicles?
 - B. Department of Health and Family Services?
 - C. Department of Corrections?
 - D. USPS National Change of Address system (optional)?

Please define your preferred integration process for each system listed.

As stated in the answer to question 1 above, “The SEB has deliberately not been prescriptive in how this shared/matched/validated information should be shared above and beyond the use of the State’s Enterprise Services Bus. We expect the vendor to use their experience to provide the SEB with best practices in this area.”

Also please indicate whether the integration is one way only from the Voter Registration to these systems or two-way with updated information from these systems required to update the Voter Registration system.

As stated in Appendix B Section 3.5 Question 29,

“29. List briefly the tools and capabilities of the proposed system to facilitate the following:

a data extraction for batch exports to other applications;

b importing batch files for updates to internal files...”

the vendor must account for two-way integration.

Also, please identify what data is to be shared among these systems.

As stated in the RFP Section 3.2.5 Other State Agencies,

- *DMV – DMV will enter into an agreement with the SEB for driver’s license, Social Security Number, and address verification.*

Wisconsin is not a National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) state; thus voter registration cannot be accomplished through the driver’s licensing process. By law, adding records to the SVRS requires the voter to complete and sign a registration form. Therefore, data that is available from other state agencies (e.g., DMV) cannot be used to automatically register a voter or update active voter records (e.g., change of address). Additionally, addresses used by DMV are not required to be the voter’s residence for voting purposes.

- *DHFS – DHFS will provide vital statistics on deaths. Death notice data available from the DHFS must not automatically update any voter registration record in the SVRS.*

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 4

- ***DOC/DOJ – DOC/DOJ will provide voter eligibility status for individuals who have been convicted of a felony and have lost their voting rights and for individuals who have satisfied their sentence and have regained their voting rights. DOC/DOJ's felony status information of individuals must not automatically update any voter registration record in the SVRS.***

6. Appendix B 3.5 on Modifications and Interfacing with Other Applications has a listing of questions concerning interfaces or modifications to other applications. Please clarify the requirements for applications interfaces and modifications to other systems. Also, please expand on your requirement for real-time access to internal files from external applications.

The questions are meant to get an overview of your overall capabilities for modifications and interfacing. As stated in Appendix B Section 3.5 Question 29,

“29. List briefly the tools and capabilities of the proposed system to facilitate the following:

- c data extraction for batch exports to other applications;***
- d importing batch files for updates to internal files;***
- e real time access to internal files from external applications.”,***

the SEB wants to know what your capabilities are, and what, if any, limitations exist within your interfacing architecture. For example, you can create and extract a file, but you can only do it with the following fields; Name, Address, DOB, Voter ID.

The requirement for “real-time access” is meant for the SEB to learn more about how external applications, like a GIS system or external report writer, access your internal database schema.

7. In Appendix A, in the section Overview of SEB Technology, the RFP states that it is not anticipated that the SVRS will interface with SWEBIS 1, SWEBIS 2 and the Access Database but that data must be converted from SWEBIS 2 and the Access Database into the SVRS during implementation. If the SVRS does not interface with the SWEBIS and Access database applications, how will the data that is converted during implementation remain up to date?

Once the data is initially converted from SWEBIS 2 and the Access database into the SVRS, the SVRS will own the data and any changes to it.

8. The RFP mentions that representatives from several municipalities were present during vendor demonstrations in the study. What did these demonstrations consist of?

Please see the RFP §3.2.1 to understand the purpose and content of the study.

9. Has the SVRS Standards committee established any technology standards? If so, please provide them.

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 4

As stated in RFP §3.2.8, the Standards Committee, as part of the project, will define the standards. At this point, the SVRS Standards Committee has not established any technology standards. The technical requirements in Appendix A state very clearly DET's preferred architecture components.

10. “The vendor will work with DET to establish the interfaces between the SVRS software and the other state agency (e.g. DMV) databases.” Please clarify with respect to the interfaces what tasks the vendor will perform and should price in the proposal and what tasks the DET will perform.

The vendor should define and price the activities that will be required to take a file of one to many transactions, as defined in the RFP Section 3.2.5 Other State Agencies and Data Integration, and import the information into the SVRS. How the vendor's SVRS integrates this information into the SVRS should also be described. In addition, as stated in the RFP Section 3.2.5, “The vendor will be asked to respond to questions related to integrating with other state agencies in Appendix B §B3.4. In their response, vendors must submit their recommendations for best practices based on their experience.”

The SEB and DET will be responsible for getting the transactions from the Other State Agencies to a staging area for import into the SVRS using the ESB.

In addition, see Question 1 above for further clarification.

11. Will all of the 1000 projected users require read/write access to the new voter registration system, or does the State anticipate that some users will access the system in a read-only mode? If some users will access the system in read-only mode, approximately how many of the users will access in this mode versus read-write?

Our definition of “users” includes those who enter, update, or validate any SVRS information. As stated in Appendix C §C1.0, “The SEB considers it highly desirable to have an enterprise-wide license for SVRS.” During an election period, all 1,000 users could be using the system simultaneously. Further, public read-only access to SVRS information is not included in this count.

12. “The Contractor must include time in their work plans for Standards Committee review and decision-making relative to reports, data standards, and standard screens.” Given the deadlines required by HAVA and this RFP, and the substantial penalties faced by the vendor for not meeting deadlines, it is critical that reviews and decisions be completed timely by both the vendor and SEB. Does SEB commit to a timeframe within which they will complete these types of reviews and decisions? What timeframe may the vendor rely upon for these?

As stated in the RFP Section 8.2.1, “The SEB shall complete Acceptance testing within thirty (30) days of receipt of such notification.” Bear in mind that this is a contractual Term and Condition meant to imply a boundary and not a pre-defined time duration. The SEB expects the vendor to provide a detailed workplan which not only identifies tasks and activities, but also quantifies dependencies and durations. If the vendor feels

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 4

that there are activities which must be addressed within the 30 day acceptance period, and these requirements are reasonable and signed off by the SEB, they should be noted in the vendor's response.

13. “Provide a copy of each sub-contractor agreement.” As a practice, we do not negotiate subcontracts with teaming partners on a project until after we have been awarded the work. As an alternative, is it acceptable for us to submit a copy of our standard subcontract terms and conditions, which would be used as the basis for all our subcontract agreements?

It is acceptable to provide your standard subcontract terms and conditions. However, keep in mind that we will be evaluating the proven success of the vendor and their subcontractors. Please see RFP §7.3.4 for requirements pertaining to vendor and subcontractor relationships.

14. What operational tools does DET use to monitor and manage the current operations environment (e.g. HP OpenView, UniCenter, etc)? Please confirm whether these same tools would be used by DET to monitor and manage the SVRS environment or identify the tools DET would use.

If, as part of your response, you consider it important to call out monitoring tools, please indicate the tools that you recommend.

15. Do you require the phases listed to be the actual project phases or can we suggest additional phases to better align with our proposed solution, provided that those phases include the specified tasks?

If the vendor is referring to the phases as defined in the RFP §1.9 Contract Term, then the answer is NO, they cannot be changed. There are contractual obligations around the terms used and the timeframes requested.

If the vendor is referring to the phases listed in Appendix A §A3.1 question 49, then the answer is YES. As stated in the RFP §2.3.2, “During implementation phase, the following functions will be performed. The vendor should assume that this is not an all-inclusive list. The SEB expects the vendor to use best practices to identify additional areas that are required for a successful SVRS implementation. Within these functions, the vendor will be responsible for the following activities.”

16. “Explain your application uptime commitment/guarantee (total service availability) and how it is accomplished.” Per Section 2.2, Overview of In-Scope and Out-of-Scope Products and Services, the vendor will not be responsible for the SVRS data center hardware or system software, connectivity, system administration, system performance, backup and recovery, failover/availability management, or disaster recovery. In light of that, it would not be possible for the vendor to commit to or guarantee uptime/availability of SVRS. Please clarify the commitment SEB is asking the vendor to make.

The vendor must provide an Installation Specification and Installation Certification in Appendix A §A3.1 question 49. In Appendix A §A5.2 question 96, the SEB is asking the vendor to define the architectural designs that they have incorporated into the

Statewide Voter Registration System
RFP – EB-SVRS1
Vendor Questions 4

application to ensure availability. An example of this would be the ability to use data mirroring for real-time backup, instead of requiring the system to be made unavailable for a period of time for system backups. Given these requirements, the vendor must specify their uptime/availability guarantee.

17. How many political units (e.g. districts, school districts, fire districts, and single member districts) at the municipality level? We need this information to assist in pricing the GIS component.

There are 1,850 municipalities, approximately 450 school districts, and approximately 10,000 wards. There are approximately 564 state level offices, plus each municipality has a variety of local offices. There are also special districts (e.g., sanitary districts) per municipality that will need to be considered on a case by case basis.

18. Although the state has stated that imaging is optional, do we include scanner costs for imaging within the RFP? If so, will that require that every municipality be furnished with some sort of scanner? And, depending on that answer, will the state expect to be doing batch or single scanning?

Vendors should not include costs for imaging/scanning equipment. However, the SEB has requested that each vendor provide their capabilities around batch scanning, as requested in Appendix B §B3.2 question 17.

19. Please provide U.S. Bank in Madison, Wisconsin Escrow agent's contact information. If the vendor already uses an escrow agent, can Wisconsin be added to that agreement to minimize its cost?

Vendors may contact Joe Veliz at U.S. Bank in Madison, Wisconsin at (608) 252-7634 for escrow information. As stated in Appendix C §C11.0, "The SEB highly prefers use of the U.S. Bank in Madison, Wisconsin."

20. Under required transition activities, "Policy and Legislative Compliance" is listed. Please provide further information on the SEB's expectation for vendor involvement in this area. Will SEB resources also be assigned to this area? (A 3.0, p. A-13)

The SEB Project Director is responsible for facilitating policy and legislative compliance. The SEB Project Director will welcome input and expertise from the vendor throughout the implementation.

21. In the overview section it is stipulated that the vendor have experience in a statewide or large county (over 1 million population) voter registration system. It is mandatory in Section 7.2 Vendor Reference Sheet that at least one reference be over 1 million population in which a VRS has been implemented and in production. Is the 1 million population mandatory or if there's a reference with 850K vs 1 Million based on latest census data or two large counties that together make up 1.5M be acceptable references?

Statewide Voter Registration System

RFP – EB-SVRS1

Vendor Questions 4

The 1 million population requirement is for a single county. If a vendor can not provide a reference from a state or large county, then the RFP response is considered incomplete and will be disqualified. The RFP has been amended to include a country with over 1 million population as well.

22. In the Support section of the RFP: Question #85 (Page A-25) the state is asking the vendor to “Explain the service boundary between your company and the SEB (i.e. Service Level Agreement Mediation Point).” Could you possibly clarify this requirement for us?

The SEB is referring to the specific points in the vendors service level agreement where they identify how disputes are mediated when points of the service level agreement are not met.

23. Would the state consider an extension of the deadline for submission of the proposal?

Yes, see the addendum posted on VendorNet at <http://vendornet.state.wi.us>. We are extending the deadline until 3:00 PM Central Time, June 8, 2004.