

RFP 14-13
Addendum 3

Washington Office of the Secretary of State Elections Division
Elections Business Analysis and Business Requirements – RFP 14-13
Q&A, Continued

Q27: The Minimum Qualifications section states that the consultant must have 5 years of experience with elections technology and processes. Normally the business analyst is not the subject matter expert, but rather an expert in eliciting requirements from the product owner and subject matter experts. The business analyst is an expert communicator who translates business knowledge into definitive requirements which can be easily understood by cross-functional teams. Would you consider removing the elections technology requirement or amending it to be broader e.g. “State government technology and processes”?

A27: No, OSOS is not considering removing the elections technology experience requirement or amending it to be broader.

Q28: If the product of this RFP is used to define the requirements of an RFP for a new system or systems for the state of Washington, is there a timeline for implementing the new system or systems? Possibly for the 2016 federal election cycle?

A28: Please see Section 1.2 Objective, final bullet. One of the expected deliverables is intended to include an estimation of timeline and cost for a replacement system. This information will assist the OSOS in determining an implementation timeline and go-live date.

Q29: A requirement identified to be included in the cover letter is to provide the Washington Uniform Business Identifier Number. We will register, but I am concerned that the registration may not be processed in time for our response – hence, a WA UBIN would not be available to include in our response. Is this a hard requirement or can it be provided at a later date?

A29: Our Friday (11/14/2014) Corporations filing queues contained an earliest date unprocessed of 11/5/2014. We generally process Corporation filings within 12 business days. If your UBI has not been obtained by your RFP response date, please include in your cover letter the date that you filed.

Q30: The tender asks for the consultant to identify former State employees. One of our team members is a former Washington State County employee. Does the employee need to be specifically identified in the letter of transmittal?

A30: No, bidders are not required to include details on former county employees.

Q31: List of Items, Schedule of Requirements, Scope of Work, Terms of Reference, Bill of Materials required.

A31: Please see RFP 14-13 and related documentation at: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/office/procurements.aspx>

Q32: Soft Copy of the Tender Document through email.

A32: Please see RFP 14-13 and related documentation at: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/office/procurements.aspx>

Q33: Names of countries that will be eligible to participate in this tender.

RFP 14-13
Addendum 3

A33: All countries are eligible.

Q34: Information about the Tendering Procedure and Guidelines

A34: Please see RFP 14-13 and related documentation at: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/office/procurements.aspx>

Q35: Estimated Budget for this Purchase

A35: Please see RFP 14-13 and related documentation at: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/office/procurements.aspx>

Q36: Any Extension of Bidding Deadline?

A36: Please see RFP 14-13 and related documentation at: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/office/procurements.aspx>

Q36: Any Addendum or Pre Bid meeting Minutes?

A36: Please see RFP 14-13 and related documentation at: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/office/procurements.aspx>

Q37: Is there a process by which we can be on a list of pre-approved vendors?

A37: There is no requirement to be preapproved for bidding on this particular project since it is established as an RFP. It is open for bidding to any vendor who meets the qualifications prescribed within the RFP itself. If you would like to become a pre-approved state vendor as it pertains to other project work, you will need to work with DES directly.

Q38: Your current scoring algorithm for cost proposals seems to enable one bidder to provide a very low cost quote, in order to not only get the full 25 points, but also cause other bidders to get a very low score on more reasonable and feasible cost proposals. How will your scoring method prevent this scenario from requiring the award to be made to a bidder who is willing to take a large loss on the contract, with the resulting risk that the awardee may not be able or motivated to complete the project with the quality required?

A38: OSOS has structured scoring such that of 100 total possible points, there are 45 points possible for the bidder's technical proposal and 30 points possible for the bidder's management proposal. We believe that our scoring plan will isolate the most qualified vendors with the most well planned approach *and* appropriately valued bids to move forward to the next round: vendor presentations/interviews. The award is not made based solely on the OSOS review of proposals, but rather based upon the written proposal and vendor presentations/interviews.