

STATE OF COLORADO
Department of State
Civic Center Plaza
1700 Broadway, Suite 350
Denver, CO 80290



Gigi Dennis
Secretary of State

William A. Hobbs
Deputy Secretary of State

Written Responses to Vendor questions for RFP # DOS-HAVA-0003

May 1st, 2006

The Colorado Department of State (DOS) has received the following questions from interested vendors regarding RFP #DOS-HAVA-0003. Per Section 2.5 of the RFP, all questions received on or before 2:30 PM Mountain Time, April 24, 2006, are responded to in this document.

Questions were provided in various formats. DOS did not change the text provided in the vendor's questions, but did make some changes to formatting. DOS has placed the questions in the table below in order to standardize the presentation and response format for all the questions.

The **LOCATION** column refers to the specific location, if applicable, in the RFP that relates to the question. There are two types of Location values in the table and the table is sorted in Location order. Location types are:

- General – the question doesn't apply to a specific location in the RFP.
- Section – the question refers to a specific Section designation found in RFP Document 1.

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	General	<p>A lengthy question but here goes: with CO's obvious migration toward vote centers, we ask a question about the type of system CO desires and/or needs.</p> <p>Is it a top down system, a bottom up design, or a something in between?</p> <p>A local instance of the database resident in each county would afford some additional fail safe functionality should connectivity to true central database be interrupted. This is especially true during early voting and vote center deployment periods. However, it is our belief that CO has always favored a top down, truly centralized approach, whereby all counties use the same application to manage registrants, day in and day out.</p> <p>With all this said, we ask the question, what type of data model or generally accepted HAVA system architecture does Colorado prefer?</p>	<p>DOS prefers a top-down design for the statewide voter registration system. However, DOS would consider a bottom-up approach provided it meets the requirements of this RFP.</p>

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
2	General	How many counties have t-1 access dedicated for the SCORE project?	<p>Network connectivity will be coordinated in the project plan. DOS plans to use the Colorado Multi-Use Network described in Section 3.3.</p> <p>It was determined that most counties would utilize a DSL or better connection. These network configurations will be re-assessed once the bandwidth needs are known for the awarded solution.</p> <p>Obtaining network connectivity is the responsibility of DOS.</p>
3	General	How many DOS personnel will be actively available to the Project Team?	<p>The DOS anticipates that the following state- and county-provided resources will be utilized on this project:</p> <p>DOS Project Director DOS Project Technical Engineer Contract Project Manager Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Project Manager and staff State Elections subject matter experts County Elections subject matter experts</p> <p>Respondents are encouraged to structure their proposal concerning appropriate DOS staffing needs based on prior experience in HAVA projects. As requested in Section 5.5.10, respondents shall indicate any DOS or county personnel requirements by skill type or business area.</p>

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
4	General	It seems like a very short turn around for Questions? Can this date be extended?	DOS will not extend the due date for questions.
5	General	On the last go around I know Votec took a very hard stand with the SOS regarding converting data from their system. What is the current relationship between the SOS and Votec? Does the state anticipate the same level of hostility from Votec?	DOS contracted with Votec during the prior contract to provide conversion support for the VEMACS database. DOS has no knowledge of Votec's position regarding this RFP or project. The State and the awarded vendor will work with current county election system vendors in Colorado as needed during the course of the project to ensure a good working relationship.
6	General	Regarding recycled work product from the initial SCORE procurement: are there products, either hard or soft, that the DOS intends to recycle for use in the successor SCORE project. Anything from computer hardware, local county IT site surveys, data conversion tools, etc.. Please elaborate.	At this time, DOS does not anticipate leveraging any work product from the prior SCORE project.
7	General	Will there be a full-time Project Manager from the State on the Project?	Yes
8	General	Would the State of Colorado consider an interim voter registration system that integrates the State's existing county election management systems to accomplish HAVA voter registration compliance, but utilizes those systems' election management functions?	This RFP is targeting a long term HAVA compliant system. Also see Question #1.

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
9	Section 1	<p>Please define how the State of Colorado defines COTS software.</p> <p>Are there specific criteria that must be met to qualify as COTS?</p>	<p>The common definition of COTS is commercial off-the-shelf product. A COTS product can be used “as-is”, designed for easy installation, with existing market exposure. The state expects the “as-is” product will be modified to the minimum required to comply with Colorado laws, rules and conditions.</p> <p>The state has extended the meaning to limit the product sought in this RFP to be a product in which the system has been used in at least two other states.</p>
10	Section 1.3.2	<p>Paragraph 1.3.2 requires "security clearance background checks." "Background checks" are typically found in commercial practices for potential employees; security clearance is typically related to work involving government information of national importance.</p> <p>Please clarify the State's expectations for a "security clearance background check" for resources assigned to this project.</p>	<p><u>The following language is contained in the State of Colorado contract:</u></p> <p><u>Requirement to Obtain Security Clearance Background Checks on Employees and Subcontractors.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The vendor awarded this RFP (“awarded vendor”) performing services under a contract likely will gain access to certain personally identifiable information deemed confidential, (e.g., Social Security Numbers). 2. The awarded vendor (with regards to employees and subcontractors who will work on the project and who will gain access to certain personally identifiable information deemed confidential) will be required to agree in the formal contract: 1) to provide copies of all evidence of security clearance background checks

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
			<p>on its employees and subcontractors; 2) to provide copies of all evidence of security clearance background checks for additional or replacement employees; and 3) to provide copies of all evidence of security clearance background checks for additional or replacement subcontractors. In lieu of the foregoing requirements of this Section, State will agree to accept a written attestation or certification by the awarded vendor that security clearance background checks have been performed and that all applicable employees and subcontractors have been cleared. Nothing contained herein requires the selected vendor to disclose federal security clearance information.</p> <p>3. The awarded vendor will be required in the contract to submit required evidence of security clearance background checks within seven (7) business days. The seven (7) business-day period commences the day following the triggering event (i.e., execution of a Contract by State or the awarded vendor's addition or replacement of employees and subcontractors on the project). State will agree to review the sufficiency of the security clearance background checks within three (3) business days, commencing from the date of State's receipt of the security clearance background check information from the awarded vendor. In the event State does not accept the sufficiency of any security clearance background check, the awarded vendor will agree that such employee or subcontractor shall not be eligible to</p>

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
			<p>perform the services contemplated for inclusion in the Contract.</p> <p>4. Any employee or subcontractor of the awarded vendor, who will gain access to certain personally identifiable information deemed confidential and who has been convicted within the last five (5) years of certain felonies, shall not be authorized to perform any work under the Contract. The enumerated felonies follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Theft b. Robbery c. Burglary d. Fraud e. Forgery f. Embezzlement g. Computer Crime h. Other white-collar or government operations crimes i. Unlawful possession of controlled or dangerous weapons j. Assault offenses k. Any offense involving use of a firearm or dangerous weapon <p>5. If during the awarded vendor's performance of the Contract, an employee or a subcontractor, who will gain access to certain personally identifiable information deemed confidential, is convicted of any of the above enumerated felony offenses or any other offense</p>

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
			<p>of moral turpitude, awarded vendor will be required to report the final conviction to State. The awarded vendor will be required to provide this report within forty-eight (48) hours of the date of the final conviction. At the written request of State, the awarded vendor will be required to immediately remove the convicted employee or subcontractor.</p> <p>The cost for a Colorado resident background check is approximately \$7 per check. These background checks are available on the Colorado Public Safety website. The results of the requests are real time. For non-Colorado residents, there are private services or possibly State government services that can be used to acquire a background check. The DOS does not have cost information for the non-Colorado background checks nor the time requirement to acquire.</p>
11	Section 1.3.2	<p>Paragraph 1.3.2 states that the state shall "...review the sufficiency of the security clearance background checks...." and should the State reject it, the employee will not be allowed to perform services on the contract.</p> <p>If the rejection is a matter of insufficient information, will the Vendor be given the opportunity to cure the security clearance background check to provide sufficient information to allow the employee to perform services on the contract?</p>	Yes

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
12	Section 2.1	<p>Paragraph 2.1 states that the DOS is not bound by the State's procurement rules and may deviate from them.</p> <p>Are there any known deviations at this time?</p> <p>Will future deviations be posted to the Web site?</p>	<p>No, there are no known deviations at this time.</p> <p>The Secretary of State does not anticipate deviating from the State's procurement rules. If the Secretary of State exercises its rights under 24-2-102 (4), C.R.S., notice will be provided as deemed reasonable and appropriate based on the deviation and the parties affected.</p>
13	Section 2.8	<p>Paragraph 2.8 (and other paragraphs) require the State of Colorado RFP Cover Sheet.</p> <p>This document is not included with the RFP sections posted on the Web site. Is this document required? If so, please post to the Web site.</p>	<p>The DOS HAVA Team apologizes for this oversight. The RFP Cover Sheet document has been posted to the web site http://www.sos.state.co.us/pubs/info_center/statewide_voter_reg_proposal.html</p>
14	Section 2.29.2 & 2.29.3	<p>Paragraph 2.29.2 and 2.29.3 incorrectly references paragraph 2.30.1.x, should be 2.29.1.x.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>The DOS HAVA Team apologizes for this typo; the references have been corrected in Mod #02.</p> <p>This modification has been posted to the web site.</p>

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
15	Section 3.2	<p>On page 23 of the RFP, you mention the need for more than 5500 users to logon to the system on the election day, could you elaborate on this requirement.</p> <p>Are you expecting the vendor to size the hardware to support 5500 users?</p> <p>Please explain the process in the election centers?</p>	<p>As more and more Colorado counties embrace the Vote Center model, it is expected that the number of online users could approach 5,500 on election day. The number was derived from using established numbers in Larimer County and projecting the ratios statewide.</p> <p>About two-thirds (2/3) of these users will be recording voter activity and voter credit, not full system capabilities. The other one-third (1/3) will need full system access.</p> <p>The system must be architected to handle this need.</p> <p>Please refer to the following web site for background information on vote centers.</p> <p>http://www.co.larimer.co.us/elections/votecenters_tab.htm</p> <p>Do not contact Larimer County for any issues regarding this RFP.</p>

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
16	Section 4	<p>According to the first paragraph on page 26, Section 4, Statement of Work, “Vendor’s proposals must address each of the areas identified with sufficient detail to allow the DOS and the RFP evaluation team to fully evaluate the proposed approaches and solutions.”</p> <p>Does the State want us to provide a response to each of the Section 4 requirements? If so, where should we provide these responses and are there any page limitations?</p> <p>Section 5 outlines the vendor’s response format and identifies response sections and page limits. However, the RFP does not specify where vendors should provide responses to the Section 4 requirements or any page limitations to Section 4 requirement responses.</p> <p>Please elaborate.</p>	<p>Section 4 defines DOS’ expectations for the project. This information should be used by the vendor to formulate a solution that meets the needs of DOS.</p> <p>Section 5 provides the instructions and limitations for the vendor proposals.</p>
17	Section 4.8	<p>Section 4.8 describes that the system may run in parallel for a period of time.</p> <p>Does the state expect this in each county or only in early adopting (e.g. pilot) counties.</p> <p>Would the vendor have any responsibility to manage or otherwise support any parallel activities?</p>	<p>Depending on risks, running parallel during implementation will be determined on a case by case basis for each county. The State would rely on the vendor’s past experience and their reasoning (risk management) for their approach.</p> <p>The vendor will not have any responsibility for the legacy system during any parallel period.</p>

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
18	Section 4.17	<p>Section 4.17 makes reference to the fact that acceptance testing is the states responsibility.</p> <p>It further discusses regression testing. Does the state also have the responsibility for the necessary regression testing?</p>	The vendor is responsible for regression test activities.
19	Section 4.18	<p>Paragraph 4.18, second paragraph states "Not later than every six (6) months thereafter..."</p> <p>Does this statement mean that a new deposit will be made to the escrow account at least every six months regardless of the whether there is any new code to escrow?</p>	Second paragraph of Section 4.18 refers to "..., all revisions, corrections, changes, modifications, and enhancements made to the Escrowed Material."
20	Section 4.20	How many users will be trained concurrently on the system?	<p>The RFP request the vendors to supply a training plan. It is up to the vendor to decide on the number of "concurrent" users being trained. A total of approximately 500 users need to be trained statewide.</p> <p>Each county must have multiple training opportunities such that some staff may be able to handle normal office activities while the other staff is in training.</p>

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
21	Section 4.20	<p>This section of the RFP indicates that the vendor train all "users, DOS and county staff" prior to each county implementation.</p> <p>Would this include "Election Day Users" or only the typical county staff for the regional based training.</p> <p>Could the state provide a breakdown of the expected end user to be trained.</p>	<p>This would NOT include Election Day workers.</p> <p>See Question #20.</p> <p>Examples of the users to be trained include, but are not limited to:</p> <p>Voter Application Data Entry staff Voter Record Processor Voter Record Administrator Address and Districting staff Absentee Data Entry Clerk Ballot Clerk Petition Clerk Polling Place Clerk Supply Clerk Election Judge Election Site Administrator Election Clerk Election Supervisor Help Desk staff System Administrator</p>
22	Section 4.21	Are the data conversion programs used by the Vendor to be turned over to the county after legacy data is validated and verified as accurate?	All source code developed by the vendor for this project will become the property of DOS.
23	Section 4.21	Can the state please elaborate on the expected scope of the data cleansing?	It is expected that the vendor will provide ALL necessary reports and information identifying data issues. The counties will be responsible for correcting their data in the existing legacy systems prior to conversion.

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
24	Section 4.21	<p>Can the state please expand upon the expected scope of the synchronization between source and target?</p> <p>Are you expecting all 64 systems to be sync ' d for some period of time?</p> <p>How long do you expect to sync the systems?</p>	<p>The “synchronization” refers to the point in time where the new solution is implemented and the county starts using it as the official system. At this point, it must be proven that all the data in both systems match (apart from known and mutually agreeable exceptions).</p> <p>The synchronization of data will be determined by the implementation strategy of the vendor.</p>
25	Section 4.21	<p>Paragraph 4.21 states the Vendor is responsible for all aspects of the file conversion, which includes "...obtaining permission and access to extract the data...".</p> <p>This data involves legacy systems that are typically 3rd party systems licensed by counties for voter registration functions. If the 3rd parties are not cooperative with the Vendor, it is impossible to price the conversion costs.</p> <p>Can we assume that the Vendor will have "table level access" to legacy system databases?</p> <p>Can Vendors also assume the counties are responsible for securing permission from the legacy system vendors?</p>	<p>DOS is encouraging the vendors to seek their own relationships with the Colorado legacy system vendors.</p> <p>It cannot be assumed that the awarded vendor will have “table level access” to the legacy databases. This permission must be obtained independently of DOS and the counties.</p>
26	Section 4.21	<p>This section of the RFP discusses data cleansing activities and that the vendor is to assist the counties in the data cleansing activities.</p> <p>Can the state provide more detail as to the expectations of the vendor relative to data cleansing.</p>	See Question #23

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
27	Section 4.21	What data extract formats are available from each of the five VR System currently implemented in the state of Colorado?	See Question #6
28	Section 4.21	Which counties maintain voter image data (signature, registration card, etc.)? What percent of the Colorado voters does this include?	For your project approach, assume all Colorado counties will have image data to convert. This applies to 100% of the voters in the systems.
29	Section 4.21	Does each county have a technical contact which may be utilized in the data extraction phase of the contract?	Not all counties have “technical” expertise on staff. However, county staff familiar with the administration of elections and voter registration information will be identified as part of the project to be the single point of contact for that county.
30	Section 4.23	Paragraph 4.23 states "The Vendor is responsible for all implementation activities at the DOS and all Colorado county clerk offices". County practices vary and may have different implementation needs. Can Vendors assume a standard set of implementation activities to be agreed to by the counties, and then any subsequent deviations from the standard activities will be borne by the individual counties?	The vendor should rely on their past state implementation experience. A common set of procedures would be acceptable, provided there is gap analysis and a bridge back to the county’s legacy processes.

#	LOCATION	QUESTION	ANSWER
31	Section 5.5.3	<p>Section 5.5.3 (Relevant Business Experience) of the RFP states that the prospective vendor MUST provide evidence of at least two statewide voter registration implementations that are HAVA compliant.</p> <p>Other than direct HAVA experience, what evidence can a prospective vendor provide to demonstrate its ability to meet the demands and requirements of the Statewide Voter Registration System?</p>	There is no substitution for this requirement. Proposals not meeting this requirement may be determined “non-responsive” by the evaluation team and excluded from further consideration.
32	Section 5.5.3	Would the State of Colorado consider a vendor with 1 successful statewide voter registration system experience?	The first paragraph in Section 5.5.3 is a mandatory requirement. Proposals not meeting this requirement may be determined “non-responsive” by the evaluation team and excluded from further consideration.
33	Section 7.13 Appendix M	Is there any mechanism in place to collect any additional data not included in the DMV voter record that are necessary fields in our OTS Voter Registration System?	Yes, DOS can re-engage with the DMV to address needed modifications to this interface.