Request for Proposals #17-008

Vendor Questions and Answers

1. The RFP states that each of the three volumes are to include a wet signature in blue ink. For the Technical Proposal and cost proposals, this signature will appear on the respective cover pages. For the Administrative Response, is a separate signature required in addition to the requirement forms? If not, do all forms need a wet signature in the Original?

   Reference: Main RFP, Section 5.11 Proposal Submission

   > **Response #1: Yes, the Administrative, Technical and Cost proposals need a wet signature. Refer to 5.11 Proposal Submission (1) regarding the signature related to the Administrative proposal.**

2. Can the County either provide a Word copy of this form, or allow the Vendor to recreate it in Word format?

   We have hundreds of active public sector contracts at any given time, and do not disclose client contact information or broad client lists for reasons of confidentiality or compliance with contractual terms. Will the county accept an example list of ongoing public sector contracts in California that have similar systems integration work?

   Reference: Required Forms, Exhibit 3

   > **Response #2: Yes. We will be e-mailing this form.**

3. If our corporation is not required to submit SEC 10-K, please verify that the most recent 3 years of audited financial statements with management discussion and notes are sufficient. In addition, please confirm that audited financial statements prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) are acceptable to the County as evidence of financial stability.

   Reference: Main RFP, Section 5.8.5.3, Page 27

   > **Response #3: Refer to 5.8.5.3 Proposers' Financial Capability (Section B.3) for all of requirements the County requires for this RFP.**

4. As part of the VSAP solicitation scope, Prime Contractor Services includes integration of the overall VSAP Solution which consists of components that are being acquired and/or developed outside of this VSAP solicitation. Will the County be providing information on those components to assist Prime Contractors with determining the integration effort and implementation timeline? For example, the implementation of the ePollbooks are outside of the Prime Contractor scope but ePollbook information is needed to better understand integration requirements (e.g., for implementing the Ballot Activation Mechanism).

   Reference: Page 3, Section 1.1.1 Description of Work

> **Response #4: The Software Solution Design Document is the best source for understanding the various components of the solution and how they are intended to be integrated. With regard to the ePollbook solution, the County is developing requirements for the solution and preparing for a solicitation. These requirements will include the ability to support the printing of the Ballot Activation Mechanism.**

5. Will the County continue to use its current Election Help Desk COTS solution, including knowledge base and enhance them to meet the new VSAP solution?

   Reference: Appendix A-SOW, Section 3.19 Provide Help Desk Services, Page 135

   > **Response #6: At this time, the County intends to continue using its AskEd Election Help Desk solution. Yes, it will be enhanced with new/additional scripts to support Help Desk services for the new VSAP voting solution.**

6. The directions for responding to the SOW indicate the vendors should respond in the blue boxes following each deliverable. Will it be acceptable to complete Yes, Yes with modifications, or No question within the blue box, and then insert our narrative description immediately below the blue box? Inserting narrative in a text box with a blue background will be more difficult to read. In addition, narrative and tables that exceed 1 page will either be truncated or continuation blue boxes will need to be added for multi-page narratives or tables, and the vendor cannot insert a landscape page for wide format graphics or tables. The ability to put narrative outside the blue box (prior to the next numbered SOW section) will provide much greater flexibility in creating a detailed response, reduce the overall file size, and will be easier for evaluators to read and comprehend our response.

   Reference: Section C – SOW

   > **Response #7: Yes, Proposers may mark "Yes", "Yes, with modifications" or "No" within the blue box and explain their approach immediately below the blue box.**

7. At the beginning of this section, it is mentioned that the scope of training, material preparation is limited to BMD, BMG and ISB. While discussing the Help desk in following paragraph, it referred to 'VSAP related issues'. Please confirm that the VSAP related issues that Level-1 Help desk need to be trained are limited to same modules as BMD, BMG and ISB. Other modules such as ePollBook, ECBMS and Tally systems are out of scope.

   Reference: Appendix A-SOW, Section 13.17 – Training and Knowledge Transfer

   > **Response #7: That is correct. The scope of Level-1 Help Desk training will be limited to the training pertinent to the in-scope components.**

8. Could you point us to the location where the specification of ECBMS output interfaces (Application Configuration, Ballot Definition, and Ballot Layout) exists in the knowledge repository?

    Reference: 2.2.3

    > **Response #8: They are specified in the Software Solution Design Document.**

9. Is access to IP on a rolling basis per cleared individual? Or is access to IP only provided once entire Prime Contractor and its subcontractor partners identified as needing access to IP are cleared?

    Reference: Addendum 1

    > **Response #9: Access is provided on a rolling basis per cleared individual.**

10. If IP is provided on a rolling basis, how does the cleared individual get access to IP from the County?

    Reference: Addendum 1

    > **Response #10: Individuals who have completed requirements for accessing County IP should provide an email address to the County. That email address will be used to set up the login to the IP Library, and to notify the individual when the login is available.**

11. Will the County accept alternative bids as compliant bids?

    Reference: Technical Proposal (Part 2), Section C.
    Cost Proposal (Part 3)

    > **Response #11: The RR/CC understands that the VSAP program is ambitious and complex. The requirements in the RFP present the ideal solution as envisioned by the RR/CC. The RR/CC is aware that there may be trade-offs necessary to implement the VSAP solution and preference will be given to proposals that come closest to meeting the requirements in the RFP and present the best value and lowest risk solution to the County. Those requirements include the ability to meet the specified timeline, and especially the March 2020 election rollout, as well as the overall adaptability and scalability of the system, in addition to cost. RR/CC is open to alternate bids and will consider evaluating them.**
    >
    > **The evaluation will occur in compliance with Section ~~1.1~~ 6.1 Selection Process as outlined on RFP Phase 2:**

> "The County retains the right to select a Proposal other than the Proposal receiving the highest number of points if County determines, in its sole discretion, another Proposal is the most overall qualified, cost-effective, responsive and responsible and is in the best interests of the County."

12. It is stated here that County intends to retain the Contractor to provide M&S and the County will pay an annual fee for such services. However, the cost proposal template tab 3 (Deliverable Payment Tables) does not have placeholders for deliverables 5.2 through 5.6, nor a placeholder for an annual figure. Please clarify whether the cost proposal for the M&S mandatory 5-year term should be consistent with the format for tab 6 (Optional M&S) or an annual fee per year.

Reference: Appendix A-SOW, Section 5.2 and RFP Phase 2 Cost Proposal Response Template

> **Response #12: The County will issue an addendum that includes an updated Cost Proposal Response Template. See the Deliverables Payment Tables Worksheet in the revised Cost Proposal Response Template, which includes two (2) M&S tables: 1) a table for the recurring deliverables and associated annual costs over the five-year period and 2) a table for the one-time deliverables and associated costs to be delivered within the same period. The annual M&S cost will be the sum of the fixed fees associated with all the annual, recurring deliverables for that year plus any fixed fees associated with the one-time deliverables to be completed in that year.**

13. 6.5 Cost Proposal Evaluation Criteria (30%) states:

Please confirm that the Cost Proposal Evaluation Points is 3,000 and not 300. Otherwise, The Cost Proposal Evaluation % will not be 30% based on the Max. Allowable Points for the Technical Proposal Evaluation in Table 6 under 6.4 Technical Proposal Evaluation and Criteria (70%).

Please confirm what constitutes the Proposer's Cost Proposal Price – it is not clear on the Cost Workbook if its referring to "Total Cost Summary Table – Implementation" or combining "Total Cost Summary Table – Implementation", "Total Cost Summary Table - M&S", and Total Optional M&S Summary Table" totals.

Please confirm if the "Ballot Marking Device Cost Summary Table" should be part of the total Cost Summary Tab.

> **Response #13: The maximum number of possible points in the cost category equals 3,000. The formula shown in Section 6.5 of the RFP Phase 2 should be: (Lowest Cost Proposal Price divided by Proposer's Cost Proposal Price) x 3,000**
>
> **The County will issue an addendum that includes an updated Cost Proposal**

> **Response Template. See the Total Cost Summary Worksheet for the Proposer's Total Cost Proposal Price.**
>
> **The Ballot Marking Device Cost Summary Table should not be part of the Total Cost Summary Worksheet. See the BMD Production Worksheet in the revised Cost Proposal Response Template for clarification.**

14. Please describe how multiple completion dates and payments should be provided for recurring deliverables.

    Reference: Reference: 3. Deliverables Payment Tables

    > **Response #14: The County will issue an addendum that includes an updated Cost Proposal Response Template. See the Deliverables Payment Tables Worksheet in the revised Cost Proposal Response Template for clarification.**

15. The BMG software must be able to interoperate with multiple versions of the BMD Application Layer. Why must the BMG interoperate with multiple versions of the BMD Application Layer? Won't all BMDs be operating the same version?

    Reference: Appendix A, page 66, Section 2.2.3 BMD Manager2000

    > **Response #15: All of the BMDs used in one election will have the same operating system, but not all BMDs may be needed for all elections. The BMG must be able to install system images and configure BMDs that are at various revision levels.**

16. These sections state that the "County intends to maintain ownership and governance (directly, or through a separate entity) of the software development environment." Does the County envision the Prime Vendor, or their subcontractors, providing a role in the support and ongoing maintenance of these software components during the post-warranty period?

    Reference: Appendix A, page 43, Section 2.2.1.4.1.3 Establishing the Development Environment (BMD); Appendix A, page 62, Section 2.2.2.1.3 Establishing the Development Environment (ISB); Appendix A, page 70, Section 2.2.3.1.3 Establishing the Development Environment (BMG)

    > **Response #16: Yes, the County envisions that either the Prime Contractor or its subcontractor(s) provides a role in the support and ongoing maintenance during the post-warranty period.**

17. Should the description read "The contractor shall deliver an Enterprise Software Architecture Document as described in Section 2.1.2?"

    Reference: Appendix A, page 25, Section 2.1.2 Enterprise Software Architecture Document The Contractor shall deliver a Design and Development Plan as described in Section 2.1.2.

    > **Response #17: Yes, the description in the deliverable table on page 25 of Appendix A should read: "The Contractor shall deliver an Enterprise Software Architecture Document as described in Section 2.1.2."**

18. On page 7, Figure 2, Overview Diagram with Overlay for Contractor Build & Acquire, includes a red line to visually identify Prime Contractor responsibilities. Light blue boxes are also used to indicate components that are in VSAP scope. To reconfirm our understanding of the scope, please confirm that the light blue boxes outside of the red line are NOT in the Prime Contractor scope. For example, the light blue box labeled "Print QR code with ballot style" (presumably representing the Ballot Activation Mechanism, BAM) is NOT in scope for the Prime Contractor.

    Reference: Appendix A – Statement of Work

    > **Response #18: Correct. The light blue boxes outside of the areas delineated by the red lines are not in the Prime Contractor scope.**

19. On page 7, Figure 2, This requirement states that "SME24 (5) - The BMD unit cost to LA County should not exceed $2000." Please confirm that this is still a valid requirement.
    If it is, then can we assume that the cost of Non-recurring Engineering (NRE), Tooling, Cases and Cart is not included in this constraint?

    If it is, then please also provide the volume tier (> 5K, >10K etc.) at which you are looking to achieve this price point. *Reference:* REQ-456

    > **Response #19: Proposers should disregard Requirement "SME24 (5) The BMD unit cost to LA County should not exceed $2000." Vendors are not expected to comply with this requirement.**

20. This requirement states that "SME24 (6) - Rollout cost for the new voting system should not exceed $70M."

    Please confirm that this is still a valid requirement.

    If it is, then please map Deliverables/tasks listed in the Appendix-A Statement of Work to 'Rollout'. Reference: Appendix A – Statement of Work

    > **Response #20: Proposers should disregard Requirement SME24 (6) - Rollout cost for the new voting system should not exceed $70M." Vendors are not**

> **expected to comply with this requirement.**

21. We would like to have the opportunity to review the existing LAC BMD prototype in person. Please let us know when and where this request can be accommodated for our team to come and review the existing prototypes?

> **Response #21: A tour and BMD demonstration will be held at the RR/CC in Norwalk on February 13, 2018. Details are forthcoming to Prime Vendors via e-mail.**

22. Will we have access to the view the current LA County RR/CC warehouse?

> **Response #22: A tour and BMD demonstration will be held at the RR/CC in Norwalk on February 13, 2018. Details are forthcoming to Prime Vendors via e-mail.**

23. How quickly can we obtain access to one of the working engineering pilot units/prototypes?

> **Response #23: A tour and BMD demonstration will be held at the RR/CC in Norwalk on February 13, 2018. Details are forthcoming to Prime Vendors via e-mail.**

24. Statement of Work includes deliverables defined by the County. We may need to include additional deliverables and split the deliverables defined by the County to support our solution approach. Would this be ok for LA County and be treated as compliant response.

    Reference: Appendix A – Statement of Work.

> **Response #24: The RR/CC understands that the VSAP program is ambitious and complex. The requirements in the RFP present the ideal solution as envisioned by the RR/CC. The RR/CC is aware that there may be trade-offs necessary to implement the VSAP solution and preference will be given to proposals that come closest to meeting the requirements in the RFP and present the best value and lowest risk solution to the County. Those requirements include the ability to meet the specified timeline, and especially the March 2020 election rollout, as well as the overall adaptability and scalability of the system, in addition to cost. RR/CC is open to alternate bids and will consider evaluating them. The evaluation will occur in compliance with Section 6.1 Selection Process as outlined on RFP Phase 2:**
>
> **"The County retains the right to select a Proposal other than the Proposal receiving the highest number of points if County determines, in its sole discretion, another Proposal is the most overall qualified, cost-effective, responsive and responsible and is in the best interests of the County."**

25. Cambridge Consultants indicated that PCBs in the ACS and BCS may need to be reworked. What board layout program was used to develop these PCBs?

> **Response #25: The package Cambridge Consultants used was Mentor Graphics Expedition VX.**

26. We are seeking clarification on County response to Question #11: Please confirm the reference in the response is to Section 6.1, not Section 1.1, regarding Selection Process.

    Also, the "RFP Phase 2 Cost Proposal Response Template.xlsx" tab "0. Proposer Instructions" states the following: *The Proposer must submit one Cost Proposal for evaluation by the County and mark it as such. The Proposer may also submit an alternative Cost Proposal, however the County may not consider the associated costs, at its discretion. If the Proposer intends to submit an alternative Cost Proposal, it must clearly mark it as such. Would the RR/CC kindly consider re-phrasing this instruction to align with the Question #11 response, as follows: The Proposer must submit one Cost Proposal for evaluation by the County (and mark it as such) and/or the Proposer may also submit an alternative Cost Proposal, ~~however the County may not consider the associated costs, at its discretion~~. If the Proposer intends to submit an alternative Cost Proposal, it must clearly mark it as such.*

> **Response #26: The reference should be Section 6.1, not 1.1. After careful consideration, we have made the decision to leave the other language unchanged. The intent of the language is to notify vendors that they can submit more than one proposal, if a vendor's sole proposal is an alternative proposal, please submit and mark as such.**

27. The Sample Contract (RFP Appendix C) references Exhibit O, Glossary and Acronyms, but no such exhibit is attached to the contract (or even referenced in the exhibit list). There is an Appendix P to the RFP which is called "Glossary and Acronyms" but it is missing many of the capitalized terms used in the contract. Can the County please provide Exhibit O to the contract, as referenced in Section 1.2 of the Contract?

    Reference: Appendix C-Sample Contract, Section 1.2 (Definitions)

> **Response #27: See Appendix P for the Glossary and Acronyms. Section 1.2 refers to Exhibit O – this is an oversight. There is no Exhibit O. Proposers can send a list of the terms directly to County if further definitions are necessary.**

28. The Sample Contract (RFP Appendix C) Section 8.20.4 makes reference to Exhibit P (Information Security and Privacy Requirements). Those don't appear to be attached. Please provide these.

    Reference: Appendix C-Sample Contract, Section 8.20 (Force Majeure)

    > **Response #28: See attached Exhibit P.**

29. So as not to divulge competitive differentiators, would the County consider allotting each Prime-led team a window of time to ask questions privately at the voluntary VSAP Tour on Tuesday, February 13, 2018?

    > **Response #29: County must make every effort to ensure equal treatment of all potential bidders and ensure fair and equitable treatment is applied throughout the process. This creates an even playing field for all involved. As such, we're unable to accommodate requests for Primes to address County privately during the tour on Tuesday, February 13, 2018.**

30. As a Prime, we have not yet finalized the subcontractors who will be on our team. For reasons of privacy, will the County consider conducting the voluntary VSAP Tour on Tuesday, February 13, 2018 separately for each Prime-led team?

    > **Response #30: County must make every effort to ensure equal treatment of all potential bidders and ensure fair and equitable treatment is applied throughout the process. This creates an even playing field for all involved. As such, we're unable to accommodate requests for Primes to address County privately during the tour on Tuesday, February 13, 2018.**

31. Regarding next weeks tour/meeting, will it be possible to do the following:

    • Vote a ballot according to the process
    • Take pictures and videos
    • Remove the printer/scanner cover to see the internal mechanics

    > **Response #31: Participants will be allowed to take pictures/videos during the tour event on February 13, 2018 in so long as these activities do not impact the event's agenda nor distract from the intended purpose of the event. Pictures/videos are already available via the Confluence site and the VSAP website here http://vsap.lavote.net/newsroom/**
    >
    > **The rest of the presentation will be comprehensive enough to cover all other points raised. Thank you.**

32. Is there is a specification available which defines the "Made in America" or "Assembled in America" requirement being mandating for the project? Can you provide?

> **Response #32: The production BMD software, including the Application Layers and Board Support Packages (OS and firmware) of both the ACS and BCS components, must be developed and loaded onto production BMDs within the continental United States. Our preference is that final assembly of the hardware take place within the continental United States as well, but we are open to alternative proposals. Any proposal for final assembly of hardware outside of the continental United States must be accompanied in the proposal with explanations for the following:**
>
> • **How you will ensure, without the benefit of loading production BMD software, that the BMD hardware will be of sufficient quality prior to shipping from final assembly**
>
> • **How will warranty claims, repairs, and replacements be handled; in particular where will those services take place and how does that location impact the speed and quality of those services, keeping in mind that production software cannot be taken or loaded outside of the continental United States**
>
> • **How your proposed final assembly location ensures a living wage and fair labor conditions for its employees**
>
> • **How will security checks of employees be handled at the proposed final assembly location**

33. Please provide an estimate of the number of County personnel anticipated to be trained on the BMD, BMG, and ISB. Please provide broken out by:

County Operations

County Technical Staff

County Training Staff

Reference: Appendix A-SOW, Section 3.17 (Knowledge Transfer & Training Plan)

> **Response #33:**
>
> • **County Operations: 180 (including line and supervisory staff)**
>
> • **County Technical Staff: 55 (including technical and supervisory staff)**
>
> • **County Training Staff: 115 (including training and supervisory staff)**

34. How do you envision the actual files produced by the ECBMS (BDF, EAP, ABDF, etc.) getting to the ISB pre-processor and BMG for deployment to BMDs? For example, is the ECBMS connected to the Internet with an API where these clients can pull the files directly? Or is it intended that the files will need to be moved over a physical storage medium?

> **Response #34: These files will be signed then stored securely on a server share within LA County's network/firewall. The ISB pre-processor/BMG will run inside of LA County's network/firewall and have access to download these files from the specified share location.**

35. How does the County intend for voters to discover the ISB Search Interface and HTML5 App?

> **Response #35: The link to the ISB will be advertised on the Department's website and other various media platforms.**

36. Who can access the IP to review the design info?

    a. Materials vendors

        i. US citizens?

        ii. Non US citizens?

        iii. Background checks required?

    b. Flex/Smartmatic process engineers

        i. US citizens?

        ii. Non US citizens?

        iii. Background checks required?

    c. Are we allowed to use LA County's name when materials vendors ask? Often, if we don't provide this info, we will receive a no bid or just "book" pricing which is not as favorable as if they know who their end customer is.

    d. Can we only share partially a piece of information of the IP to a provider? Meaning can we share via email but not from the actually official IP documents?

> **Response # 36:**
>
> **1 (a & b): IP access is limited to only those individuals cleared via the established process (inclusive of a signed NDA).**
> **1 (c): Proposer's may inform material's vendors that the work being solicited is in response to a County solicitation.**
> **1(d): Please refer to response 1 (a&b).**
> **2. County will make a determination on a case-by-case basis for individuals granted IP access through the background clearance process and request to access the IP (or documents contained therein) overseas. Proposer will need to provide the individual's name, reason for the request, and the specific documentation being accessed in preparation for the County's determination.**
> **2(a): Please refer to response No. 2 above.**
>
> **We appreciate your interest. Thank you.**

37. Documentation says that pre-assemblies can be done overseas but final assembly must be done in the USA. How is pre-assembly is defined? Typically, at the end of the build project, there will be excess materials from leftover minimum order quantities we receive from suppliers.

    Will LA county want us to scrap and recycle or send the rest of it back to them (LA)?

> **Response #37: Refer to response in #32.**

38. In the SOW page 40 suggests that:

    The County seeks to capture the next version of the VSAP design into two new document formats:

    - Software Architecture Document, which captures the core architecture design
    - Software Specifications, capturing the detailed software specifications

    These two documents will replace the current SSDD and form the new basis for building and describing the software components.

    QUESTION:

    Though when examining Section 5.4.3 of the IP, it appears that there already are separate documents "Software Architecture Specification" and "BCS Software Design Description" + "BCS Software Detailed Design Description". How does the County view the relationship between the existing documents in Section 5.4.3, the SSDD documents in Section 8.1 and the requirements set forth in SOW Section 2.2.1.4.1.2?

Response #38:   Software Architecture Specification" and "BCS Software Design Description" + "BCS Software Detailed Design)

These documents focus on the BCS (the Ballot Control System) software, and largely describe what is, i.e. the current state of the BCS software. These documents will likely need to be updated, as needed, to comply with the requirements set forth in SOW Section 2.2.1.4.1.2.

SSDD

This document focuses on the voting application that runs on the ACS and describes what will be. The final ACS software solution will be designed in the scope of work and will be documented as per the requirements set forth in SOW Section 2.2.1.4.1.2.

The current SSDD combines architecture and detailed specifications, which makes it difficult to use and difficult to comprehend by people who are not developers. As such, the County seeks to resolve this by splitting it into 2 new document types to be developed by the Contractor: Software Architecture Document and Software Specifications (also referred to as Software Design Document). The Software Architecture Document is an architecture description, which captures the overall design. It is used to make sure that everyone understands the solution, the patterns and the architecture decisions that were made. To a certain degree, it describes the why and what of the solution. Since a lot of the architecture is already established, the County anticipates that the Software Architecture Document should not be a heavy lift to produce as it confirms, clarifies, and/or updates the architecture description that is currently in the SSDD. The Software Specifications (aka Software Design Document) captures the design at a greater level of detail and describes the how.

39. We understand that the application SW (software) must be developed in the US. Does this apply only to the election SW?

    Basically in order to have functioning HW (hardware), many other pieces of code must be produced: For example UEFI/BIOS/micro FW (firmware) for the ACS, FW for printer controller, FW for scanner image acquisition controller, as well as other FW to make some specific HW function, such as CPLD or FPGA and MCU (if needed). In addition, an operating system image must be created for the application SW in order to run.

    Most, if not all, of these FW, UEFI/BIOS, OS, etc., are either provided by a third party (i.e. Linux), or include vendor specific libraries, which makes it impossible to be fully developed in the US.

    How will these cases be evaluated? Can we assume that the restriction of "developed in the US" applies only to the election application SW?

    > **Response #39: Refer to response in #32. The software required to be developed and loaded in the continental United States is limited to the Application Layer, the ACS, and the BCS. Software associated with industrial off-the-shelf components (i.e., printer and scanner) sourced overseas is not required to be developed and loaded in the continental United States.**

40. Documentation says that pre-assemblies can be done overseas but final assembly must be done in the USA. How is pre-assembly is defined? Typically, at the end of the build project, there will be excess materials from leftover minimum order quantities we receive from suppliers.

    Will LA county want us to scrap and recycle or send the rest of it back to them (LA)?

    > **Response #40: See response to Question #32.**