

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Question 1	I. Does the State preclude solutions that are not web based but are delivered to the user through the Internet (or a private network) and can run inside of a browser using thin client technology such as Windows Terminal Services or Citrix; is it the State’s intention to preclude this type of solution?
Answer 1	No, refer to Section 1.0 entitled “Introduction”, “ a web-based or web-enabled solution is strongly preferred so that end users require only a browser to access the SVRS”. Refer to Topic 2 – Software Architecture “The State prefers a Web-based system, with a browser as the principal user interface mechanism.”
Question 2	Does the State require that any such solution provide a migration path away from using Terminal Services or Citrix?
Answer 2	No. See Section 1.0, which states as follows: “Vendors that offer a client server solution are encouraged to offer a schedule, indicating when the Vendor will convert to a platform that does not require some form of middleware to operate the system.”
Question 3	On page 5 section 1.0 – Introduction – The last line of the first paragraph states that “Vendors that offer a client server solution are encouraged to offer a schedule, indicating when the Vendor will convert to a platform that does not require some form of middleware to operate the system.” Question: What type/kind of middleware is being referred to here?
Answer 3	The term “middleware” includes any additional software components needed to be installed from the desktop and function outside the browser environment.
Question 4	Is it the State’s intention to preclude a vendor from proposing a hosted solution that may provide the State with higher availability, greater security, and reduced costs for ongoing maintenance and support? Refer to Appendix A 8.5 (e), p. 53
Answer 4	Yes. The State is not interested in solutions that are hosted by anyone other than the State.
Question 5	Should the vendor propose a system with storage capacity for five million voter records, or should the vendor simply indicate that the system is scalable to accommodate that many records in the future? In order for vendors to present consistent proposals, please specify how many voter records the initial system should be sized to accommodate. Refer to Appendix C, Req XIII.2.
Answer 5	The State is interested in reviewing scalable solutions. Vendor’s written report should indicate a baseline of one million voter records and the increased hardware and software needs to increase the SVRS to five million voter records.

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Question 6	It appears that the State wishes to procure an off-the-shelf solution and then modify it to meet the specific requirements. Would the State entertain a proposal for a custom built solution, developed to meet the requirements contained in the RFP and then the State would own the code outright.
Answer 6	Refer to Section 4.14, Section 5.2 and Appendix C. Section 5.2 amended by Addendum #2 which states “in order for a Proposal to be considered acceptable, seventy (70) percent of the Priority 1 items must be marked with a ‘Y.’” A ‘Y’ mark opposite a requirement indicates the “Vendor can demo at the oral presentation.” Table 3.0-1 indicates that Vendor Presentations are scheduled to begin July 15, 2004.
Question 7	If a Vendor plans to propose a new release of their solution which is currently in development and unable to fully demonstrate that release as of July 15 but can demonstrate an existing release (the Vendor would therefore not be able to answer “Y” to 80% of the State’s Priority 1 requirements for the new release), will the State relax this requirement so that the Vendor can bid the next release of its solution?
Answer 7	Refer to Addendum #2, modification to Section 5.2; Minimum Qualification and Appendix B 1.0; Compliance with System Requirements; reduction of minimum qualification to seventy (70) percent. Refer to Appendix C “Vendor response: Y = Can Demo at Oral Presentation.” Refer to Section 5.2 whereby “The State reserves the right to reduce the minimum qualification percentage as necessary to ensure that not less than three vendors will be further evaluated.”
Question 8	Does the State intend to host the on-line services for voters (checking status, party, polling place) on State web servers that query to the SVRS?
Answer 8	Yes. The State does intend to host the on-line services on a State web server. Refer to Appendix A, Section 7.2, Hardware acquisition, “The State plans to purchase its own hardware, relying on Vendor recommendations.” For security reasons, the State anticipates not having an active connection between the SVRS database and the public interface.
Question 9	Is the vendor required to specify the hardware and software required to support this capability?
Answer 9	Yes. Refer to Appendix F 1.0, Activities/Deliverables/Milestones Pricing Worksheet, Table F 1.0-1, Section Pre-Configuration/Design Phase, Item ‘Specifications of Various Technical Environments (Hardware and Software).’
Question 10	If the vendor is required, please indicate the service level (amount of usage) the vendor should plan for.

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Answer 10	New Hampshire has no basis for defining these requirements. Vendor should document assumptions used in Proposal.
Question 11	Please clarify whether the vendor should specify the required hardware and software for the system to function on redundant servers in two different locations on the NH network, or whether the vendor should simply indicate if its system has this capability. Refer to Appendix C, Req IX.2
Answer 11	Both. The State intends to maintain a failover server at a remote location within the NHSun infrastructure, utilizing periodic transactional log shipping.
Question 12	Please clarify how the state intends to perform load testing using real or sample data during the ten calendar day evaluation period. Given that a system provided for evaluation would not be comparable in size to the system proposed, what is the intention of load testing?
Answer 12	Refer to Section 4.14: "Load testing using real or sample data is anticipated." The State expects the system provided by the Vendor will be sized and loaded with real or sample data comparable to the current amount of data as referred to in Appendix H 1.0 Town/City/Place Table. The State's intention is to ensure that the proposed Vendor solution will satisfy the items listed in Appendix C, Section VIII, Items 1, 2 and 3 and has the "Ability to provide indicated response times for the following functions" identified in Appendix C, Section VIII, 6.
Question 13	Please clarify how the State plans to conduct testing using data from the State's existing data set, given that each vendor's SVRS will have its own unique database layout.
Answer 13	The State expects the system provided by the Vendor will be sized and loaded with real or sample data comparable to the current amount of data as referred to in Appendix H 1.0 Town/City/Place Table.
Question 14	Are we required to provide services to convert data for the purposes of that test? Refer to Section 6.10.1.2.1, p. 33.
Answer 14	Vendors are not required to provide data conversion services.
Question 15	For purposes of preparing our costs, can the State clarify at what point the State would assume responsibility for help desk support?
Answer 15	Please define "help desk support." Refer to Section 6.11.2, "The Secretary of State will be responsible for providing direct end-user support." Refer to Appendix A, Section 7.2, Training and Help Desk. Vendor will provide help desk support only to State staff.
Question 16	What level of annual support do you require; just software, or software and end-users, or software, end-users, and infrastructure (data center)?

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Answer 16	The State anticipates only requiring software support for its own in-house staff. Note; Vendors are invited to provide pricing for end-user support as an optional service. Refer to Table F 1.0-1.
Question 17	Does this clause mean that the State can terminate the contract without providing the vendor an opportunity to resolve the problem? Does this mean that the State expects reimbursement of all project costs up to the point of termination? Refer to Section 6.19, p. 42.
Answer 17	In Section 6.11.2, the Vendor has 15 business days to correct a Deficiency. After that, the State can terminate the contract and expect reimbursement as stated in 6.19.
Question 18	Please clarify the number of jurisdictions that will use the SVRS. Is it 236 towns and cities or 236 towns and cities + 75 village districts? Refer to Appendix A 2.0, p. 43.
Answer 18	Refer to Appendix A 2.0 and Addendum #2, Item V, which describes HAVA requirements for a centralized voter registration list. Under federal law, the primary users are expected to be 234 towns and cities, 2 unincorporated places organized for voting purposes, 89 village districts and the Department of State Election Division that must be able to carry out federal and state elections utilizing a statewide voter registration system. The 89 village districts will have the option to become primary users; hence, they must also be treated as primary users in the planning process. In addition, there are 3 unincorporated districts with separate checklists. There is no obligation on the part of the State to provide PCs, printers and Internet connections to other unincorporated districts, village districts and supervisors of the checklist.
Question 19	The table shows only 232 jurisdictions. Can the State provide details on the remaining 4? Refer to Appendix H 1.0, p. 108.
Answer 19	Candia: 2,493; Effingham: 733; Haverhill: 2,074; and Madbury: 999.

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Question 20	Please provide further information on the requirement that the SVRS “must be able to export files in standard formats to these systems.” Is it the State’s intention that jurisdictions continue to use the election management functions of their current systems? If so, can the State define which specific functions will continue to reside in the current systems (e.g., election setup, petitions, poll book printing, voter history), which will reside in the SVRS, and which will need to be stored in both locations. For estimating purposes, should the vendor assume a single standard format for exchanging data between systems, or should there be a specific format for each local vendor? Is it the State’s intention that jurisdictions will be able to decide whether to continue using their existing election management software or adopt the election management features of the SVRS? For estimating ongoing support costs, how many jurisdictions should the vendor assume will continue to use their existing election management functionality? Refer to Appendix A 7.2, p. 50
Answer 20	Refer to Appendix C, Section I, D 6 for a list of standard formats for exporting data. Towns/Cities/Unincorporated Places will not be permitted to use their existing voter registration systems for official voter registration functions.
Question 21	For estimating purposes, how many specific data exports “to external systems that would generate ballots in multiple formats...” should the vendor estimate and price? Would a single, XML format that could be utilized by any voting system vendor be acceptable? Refer to Appendix A 5.1 (r), p. 45
Answer 21	The Vendor must propose the following export formats: fixed width, comma and tab delimited ASCII, and XML.
Question 22	Please clarify the State’s requirement with regard to the automated process to enable local officials to register as users and obtain appropriate access to the SVRS. Is it intended that users with update authority to the SVRS use this process to register? Refer to Appendix A 5.1 (v), p. 45
Answer 22	The State seeks creative proposals to balance centralized security with efficiency of user administration.
Question 23	Please define “extensive classroom training.” How many days of classroom training does the State consider reasonable?
Answer 23	Refer to Appendix A, Section 7.2, Paragraph Training; the text reads ‘However, it is expected that intuitive screens and menus and on-line help capacity will avert the need for “extensive classroom training.”’ The State considers three to four hours of classroom training reasonable. Refer to Appendix A 7.2, p. 49

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Question 24	Please provide further information on the ways in which city charters in thirteen (13) cities may provide for “certain diversity in procedures and responsibilities from those that would apply under state law.” Please provide specific examples. Refer to Appendix A 8.1, p. 51
Answer 24	Examples include differences in recount procedures, roles of supervisors of the checklist, and provisions for recalls. It is the State’s expectation that these procedural variations will have little or no impact on the SVRS.
Question 25	Please provide further information on how the system would in the future need to integrate with ePayment. For what purposes would ePayment be used? Refer to Appendix A 11.0, p. 54
Answer 25	SVRS does not require any ePayment mechanism. Cities/Towns will rely on existing mechanisms. However, if the law is changed to enable the state to receive payments for data, ePayment would be used to provide for financial transactions over the web in exchange for the state delivering information such as checklist data.
Question 26	<p>I. The requirement to have a completed voter registration system implementation for “at least one government client comparable in size and complexity to the State of New Hampshire” would preclude bidding by any vendor that has not implemented a statewide system, given that statewide systems are far more complex than local systems. Is this the State’s intention? Refer to Appendix B 2.0, p. 63.</p> <p>II. The State of NH desires that the vendor demonstrate a Voter Registration System with similar complexities as being sought by the current RFP. Since most of the systems that are being built in other States are going to be HAVA compliant by Q4/2004 or Q1/2005, will the State of NH consider Vendors who would have such a system installation currently underway but not yet complete? Or is the State of NH requiring the vendor to demonstrate a completed system for a voting population of 400,000 voters? In this case, can the vendor demonstrate this system at a county level or must the demonstration be of a statewide voter registration system?</p>

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Answer 26	The State does not require a Vendor to have implemented a statewide system. Refer to Appendix B 2.0; it is incumbent upon the Vendor to demonstrate how they have implemented a voter registration system in at least “one government client comparable in size and complexity to the State of New Hampshire within the last five years.” For the purpose of the experience requirement, the meaning of “completed” shall include having a voter registration system operational in one or more jurisdictions having at least 400,000 registered voters in a single common database. The term “operational” does not imply that the warranty period must have begun for the services provided. The “specific project proposed software version and functionality” refers to the voter registration system implemented in another jurisdiction, not necessarily the SVRS.
Question 27	Please clarify the need to track the name of the state that issued the drivers license. Are there registered voters in New Hampshire that hold out-of-state drivers licenses? Refer to Appendix C, Req I.A.4
Answer 27	Yes. State law, RSA 654:12,II(b)(1) provides that a photo driver's license issued by any state or the federal government can be used for establishing identity.
Question 28	Are these twenty (20) reports in addition to the one hundred (100) custom reports specified in Requirement VI.D.5? Refer to Appendix C, Req XI.8.
Answer 28	The twenty (20) administrative reports are in addition to the one hundred (100) custom reports. Appendix XI, 8 states “the vendor shall propose methods to provide online search of the data for look up of individual records and shall include the cost of twenty custom reports to be available online to certain administrative user roles.” Appendix VI, D 5 states the following requirement: “Provide interactive and batch mode standard pre-defined reports and up to 100 custom reports. Refer to Appendix C, XVII for a brief list of example of reports.
Question 29	Does the Vendor participate in building the one hundred (100) custom reports.
Answer 29	Yes. At the State’s discretion, the Vendor must participate in configuring up to one hundred (100) custom reports. For the purposes of this requirement, the same information provided in a different format constitutes a different report.
Question 30	Given the wording in Para 6.13.3, Project Workspace and Office Equipment, the State is requiring all work to be done on site. Will the State provide the office space and the development environment?
Answer 30	The State is not requiring “all work” to be accomplished on site. Refer to Section 6.13.3 c). To the extent the Vendor requires local NH office space for this project, the State will provide it.

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Question 31	Refer to Section B 2.0 on page 63. Can the vendor implementation service experience be filled by the subcontractor rather than the Prime Contractor?
Answer 31	Refer to Appendix E 1.1 and Addendum #2, VI. The experience requirement can be satisfied by the experience of a Vendor's sub-contractor. However, the Vendor shall be solely responsible for the performance of the subcontractor. Refer to 1.0 Introduction; "The Vendor shall remain wholly responsible for performance of the entire Contract regardless of whether a subcontractor is used."
Question 32	Please elaborate on the GIS features that the state expects as part of that requirement?
Answer 32	GIS is a standard feature for voter registration systems. ESRI is the State standard. Specifications for the ESRI project (.prj) files for the New Hampshire Geographically Referenced Analysis and Information Transfer System (NH GRANIT) can be found on the following web page: <a href="http://www.granit.sr.unh.edu/cgi-bin/load_file?PATH=/data/projection.html">http://www.granit.sr.unh.edu/cgi-bin/load_file?PATH=/data/projection.html</a>
Question 33	Is the state expecting the vendor to define the voter registration process for the state?
Answer 33	The general framework of the voter registration process is established by law and is fairly straightforward. The requirements set forth in Appendix C identify the requirements necessary to satisfy New Hampshire law. The Statewide voter registration database task force minutes dated January 14, 2004, on the HAVA web site ( <a href="http://www.sos.nh.gov/HAVA/index.htm">http://www.sos.nh.gov/HAVA/index.htm</a> ) have identified the elements of the current process. It is expected that the Vendor will describe the processes an end user will follow to enter and maintain voter registration data using the proposed system. The State is willing to consider suggestions for modifications to the current voter registration process. The State anticipates that JAD sessions will define and finalize these processes.
Question 34	Does the State desire to obtain source code for packaged software products or is escrow of the source code sufficient?
Answer 34	Refer to Appendix F, Table F 1.0-1; the State is interested in pricing for: a) a perpetual use Software License with maintenance, support and escrow of the source code; and b) the transfer of source code and documentation for State use only. The State anticipates choosing only one of these options. Proposals will be considered whether Vendor prices alternative a, b, or both.

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Question 35	In Topic 9, and elsewhere, the State indicates that there should not be additional software license fees solely related to non-production environments. We assume this applies only to the vendor's SVRS software, and not to supporting software (OS, database) over which the vendor has no licensing control. Is this assumption correct? Refer to Appendix D 2.0, p. 70
Answer 35	Yes. The State will procure any additional licenses required for supporting software. However, the Vendor should indicate what software is required to support SVRS.
Question 36	Can a vendor propose a COTS product but not provide the perpetual use license?
Answer 36	No. Refer to Section 6.15.1.1; The State is interested in obtaining the cost of a perpetual, non-exclusive, non-transferable, and irrevocable license to the SVRS software and its associated documentation.
Question 37	Will the state consider a maintenance agreement with a COTS vendor?
Answer 37	Yes.
Question 38	Can the vendor put the source code in escrow instead of providing it to the state?
Answer 38	If the State elects Option 1 instead of Option 2 as detailed in Appendix F 1.0; Table F 1.0-1, then the answer is yes.
Question 39	If the COTS product uses another COTS product to meet certain functionality, does the state expect the source code/escrow for all products?
Answer 39	Yes, to the extent the other COTS product is not in common use, and/or the other COTS product's source code is modified for the SVRS.
Question 40	If the state accepts a particular product, does it expect the vendor to make modifications based on the state's detailed requirements?
Answer 40	The question is unclear. The State does not anticipate accepting any product that does not meet the State's detailed requirements. The State would require a COTS system to be modified to meet the State's detailed requirements.
Question 41	Does the State have a preference between obtaining a license for the software vs. obtaining the source code?

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Answer 41	The State prefers the most cost effective option. Although Vendors may elect to provide pricing for either option, were two options to be similarly cost effective, the State has a mild preference for a licensing proposal at this time. Refer to Appendix A 8.3, Critical Economic Issues and Appendix G 4.0, 2., Conditional Nature of Contract.
Question 42	Why is the State looking for Documentation for “source and object code”, before and after customization? (as listed on page 8, section 2.4.1, under Written deliverables) Generally vendors document a User Manual, Systems Operation/Administrator Manual, Technical Reference, Installation notes, and Release notes etc but do not document the source code as a deliverable.
Answer 42	The initial source and object code documentation is an important part of understanding the base-line operation of the software and an important key to the State’s continuing the project if the Vendor goes away. The customized source and object code documentation would identify any modifications made to the original code.
Question 43	What are examples and standards for source code documentation. Is in-line documentation sufficient?
Answer 43	No. In-line documentation is helpful but State still requires full documentation. The State must be able to understand the documentation.
Question 44	Please clarify the date on which the requirements of the RFP must be fully implemented. In Section 1.2, the date is November 30, 2005. In Section 6.2, the date is October 31, 2005. Refer to Section 1.2, p. 6; 6.2, p. 29.
Answer 44	Addendum #1 indicates the implementation date is October 31, 2005.
Question 45	The one (1) year implementation timeline is pretty aggressive considering the functionality, complexity, and requirements of the system. Is the state flexible on this?
Answer 45	Given the HAVA deadline, the State is unlikely to extend the one (1) year timeline.
Question 46	On page 52, section A 8.3 – Critical Scheduling Issues – How did the State arrive at the time estimate of 12 months to fully implement the system?
Answer 46	The State relied on federal law, which requires implementation in 2006, the state and local election calendar, and the experience of other jurisdictions.
Question 47	Was this statement of work prepared by the State, a Contractor or a combination of both?

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Answer 47	It was prepared by the State with close attention to work done in other states.
Question 48	On page 52, section A 8.3 – Critical Economic Issues – The first paragraph reads “Funding for the SVRS project is adequate to cover the implementation costs, but not necessarily all of the ongoing costs of program maintenance and support.” How did the State arrive at a projected “implementation cost”?
Answer 48	The State used rough estimates of the cost of implementing and maintaining comparable systems in other states.
Question 49	Is there any restriction on availability of matching funds?
Answer 49	The State has sufficient funding to complete this project. Refer to Appendix A 8.3, Critical Economic Issues and Appendix G 4.0, 2., Conditional Nature of Contract, “The State shall not expend any monies in the election fund unless the balance in the fund following such expenditures shall be at least 20 times the estimated annual cost of maintaining the programs established to comply with the Help America Vote Act of 2002.”
Question 50	On page 31, section 6.9.1 – Written deliverables review – Is there a limit to the number of times a particular written deliverable will be reviewed (assuming it’s not accepted for the first time), with each review cycle being 5 or 10 business days (depending on length)?
Answer 50	No.
Question 51	Refer to Appendix A 5.1 entitled “The goals of this project are to:” bullet a). Please clarify how the State will make the determination of how the new SVRS “meets or exceeds” current town/city system capabilities. Has the State compiled a definitive list of these capabilities that can be supplied to bidders?
Answer 51	The RFP contains the list of requirements that will achieve the goal referenced in Appendix A 5.1. The state has relied on an extensive planning process. Refer to Appendix A 2.0 entitled “Background.” Current voter registration capabilities of the towns and cities have been recorded in meeting minutes that can be found on the NH Secretary of State’s HAVA website at <a href="http://www.sos.nh.gov/HAVA/index.htm">http://www.sos.nh.gov/HAVA/index.htm</a> .
Question 52	Refer to Section 2.2 entitled “Services” bullet c) “Requirements validation.” Should the vendor assume that the requirements listed in Appendix C are the ONLY requirements that apply to the system since there’s no Requirements Analysis listed as a service?

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Answer 52	The requirements identified in the RFP are the only requirements that must be satisfied with Vendors' proposals.
Question 53	Refer to Section 6.10.1.1 entitled "Time Allocated to Testing Activities." How did the State arrive at the 4:1 ratio of Development/configuration time vs. testing/training time?
Answer 53	The 4:1 ratio is a rule of thumb gleaned from other state contracts. As indicated in Section 6.10.1.1, the 4:1 ratio is a starting point in negotiations that will be concluded with agreement in the contract.
Question 54	Refer to Section 6.10.1.2 entitled "State Testing" We are concerned that the acceptance testing/retesting is too subjective and not well defined. Will the State agree to a well defined exit criteria for acceptance testing?
Answer 54	The SVRS must satisfy the requirements to pass the acceptance test. The State is willing to consider further definition for acceptance criteria and anticipates that the successful Vendor will address this issue during contract negotiations.
Question 55	Refer to Section A 5.1 entitled "The goals of this project are to:" bullet s); "Enable immediate electronic access to the central SVRS by state and local election officials. Immediate access is interpreted to mean that the system operates in real time." Does the State mean "the system is available at ANY time" when it is referred to as real time? Real time would be construed as meaning the system's response time is finite and predictable, no matter what, regardless of hardware, load, network, users and other conditions.
Answer 55	Real time does not mean that the system is available during the times when the system is down for hardware or software maintenance. Real time refers to a legal requirement in HAVA. After an official in one town/city has entered a name and drivers license number and committed it to the database, an official in another town/city cannot enter the same data without seeing a "duplicate entered" prompt.
Question 56	Refer to Section A 5.1 entitled "The goals of this project are to:" bullet x); "Include the usual and customary functionality of a voter registration system." What functionality is considered by NH as "usual and customary"?
Answer 56	"Usual and customary" refers to the core capability of the majority of voter registration systems servicing U.S. jurisdictions with over 400,000 registered voters, including districting and redistricting.

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Question 57	I. Will the state accept a compilation to satisfy the requirement for two years audited financial statement. Refer to Appendix E-1.1.2.  II. As a private firm we don't have audited financial statements; will compiled statements from our CPA serve the purpose along with contact information for the CPA?
Answer 57	Refer to Appendix E-1.1. "Firm" is the Vendor and any subcontractor(s) of Vendor. The state requires the firm's two most recent audited financial statements. A compilation does not customarily constitute audited financials. An opinion from a CPA of the firm's financials must accompany the audited statements.
Question 58	Are we scoring financials of subcontractors as if they were those of the Vendor? Will the score include the subs or just the prime?
Answer 58	Refer to 1.0 Introduction; "The Vendor shall remain wholly responsible for performance of the entire Contract regardless of whether a subcontractor is used." It is the Vendor's financials that are of greatest interest to the State. Subcontractor(s)' financials will not be part of the initial score although they may be used as a tie-breaker.
Question 59	What is the status of the State's project to convert data from the towns and cities.
Answer 59	The State has already begun and plans to complete the data conversion process. However, if the State is unable to complete data conversion on schedule, the State may contract with the Vendor to assist in completing the data conversion process. Refer to Section 1.3., entitled "Non-Exclusive Contract."
Question 60	How many versions exist of the different current municipal voter registration systems.
Answer 60	Although an exact number is unknown, the State is under the impression that there are no significantly different versions of each product being run at present. Refer to Appendix A, Table 13.0-2 entitled "Current Municipal Vendor Systems."
Question 61	Will optional items be included in scoring and evaluation?
Answer 61	Refer to Section 5.4.5, which reads as follows: "Vendors may elect to complete the optional narratives and make price proposals associated with these topics. The proposals and pricing relating to these Options will not be considered in determining which Vendor is selected to provide the SVRS unless the State determines that two or more proposals are essentially equal."

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**Department of State**  
**Statewide Voter Registration System**  
**SOS RFP 2005-001**

**Responses to Vendor Questions – 05/11/2004**

Number	Vendor Questions and State Responses
Question 62	Will the state have the responsibility to provide the data from various agencies like Vital Records and Motor Vehicle as per the timelines defined in the work breakdown in the format specified by the vendor?
Answer 62	The State will take responsibility for establishing Memoranda of Understanding and protocols for exchanging data with and from the various agencies identified in Appendix A, Table A 13.0-1. Should the State require additional time to provide the data, the Vendor will not be held responsible for modification of the timeline caused by this delay. The Vendor will be responsible for designing interfaces with SVRS using the data received from the various agencies.
Question 63	What is the current technology used by the Division of Vital Records to establish communications with the town and city clerks?
Answer 63	The Division of Vital Records is currently migrating from a client server system, to a web based .net technology product scheduled to be completed by the Fall of 2004. All end users will have an IBM compatible desktop system and Microsoft's XP operating system. One hundred forty-one (141) clerks currently have an Internet connection. By July 2005, 234 towns and cities will be connected to the Division of Vital Records through the Internet.
Question 64	Can we obtain the tables that we are required to fill out for the cost proposal (Appendix F) in an Excel spreadsheet or unprotected Word document format?
Answer 64	Appendix F, in an unprotected Word document, can be downloaded from the HAVA website: <a href="http://www.sos.nh.gov/HAVA/HAVA%20rfp.htm">http://www.sos.nh.gov/HAVA/HAVA%20rfp.htm</a>
Question 65	I. Are electronic signatures required?  II. For Topic 7 – NH Product Standards. We don't see any requirement for EDI and Electronic Signatures as part of this system; does NH believe that these technologies are needed in this system and if so, as part of what functionality?
Answer 65	Electronic signatures are not required. The State is interested in understanding the technology available in the Vendor's proposed SVRS. A Vendor may include them as part of a solution in its Proposal. The State does not necessarily anticipate incorporating these technologies during the initial configuration of the SVRS but may want to incorporate them at a later date. Refer to Appendix A 7.2 entitled "Communications."