



★ VIRGINIA ★  
DEPARTMENT *of* ELECTIONS

Request for Information (RFI) No. ELECT-200629-SVRS

## **Options & Cost Estimates to Replace VERIS**

STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM (SVRS)

## Introduction

The 2019 session of the Virginia General Assembly in [House Bill \(HB\) 1700](#) directed ELECT to develop a draft RFP for potential replacement of VERIS and to submit it to both the House and Senate Appropriations committees. The 2020 session of the General Assembly in [HB29](#) directed ELECT to release an RFI to seek information on replacement of VERIS and report on the options and potential costs.

The RFI issued by the Virginia Department of Elections (ELECT) was not a solicitation for competitive procurement, but simply a fact-gathering process to replace its current voter registration system (VERIS) with a modern, robust system, elicited non-binding estimates of cost, and evaluate current market information regarding existing voter registration and election management systems; no contract award was generated from an RFI.

In an effort to ensure that ELECT's future Request for Proposal (RFP) promotes a maximum response, the Request for Information (RFI) was issued to solicit vendor solutions for voter registration and election management systems.

## Background

The Virginia State Board of Elections (SBE) was created in 1946 as a nonpolitical agency responsible for ensuring uniformity, fairness, accuracy and purity in all elections in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Department of Elections (ELECT) was formed in 2014 to conduct the SBE's administrative and programmatic operations and other duties consistent with its delegated authority. ELECT is authorized to establish and maintain a statewide voter registration and election management system for all eligible Virginia residents. The current system, VERIS, has been in operation since 2007 and is nearing the end of its life cycle.

- ***Draft RFP Process***

The [draft RFP](#) was envisioned to be used as an assessment for rebuilding or replacing the existing VERIS solution. The assessment included the evaluation of the existing VERIS functionality, operability and the technical architecture and platform, which was gathered through locality site visits and staff interviews, ELECT staff interview sessions, and surveys of locality registrars and electoral board members. The assessment produced around 625+ system requirements to support the draft RFP findings.

Ultimately, the assessment concluded that the replacement of VERIS was more cost effective than continuing to maintain the current system. The decision to replace VERIS was based on several factors, including but not limited to:

- The current technology framework is quickly reaching end-of-support and end-of-life.
- During critical times (i.e. elections) VERIS workload demands can cause performance degradation.

- Current technical architecture and platform hinders the opportunity to improve or enhance VERIS, efficiently and cost-effectively.

- ***RFI and Vendor Demonstrations***

The purpose and intent of the RFI was to gather information and view demonstrations of state-of-the-art voter registration and election management systems currently in use within the United States that are stable, accurate, secure and highly functional. While the draft RFP process initially produced 625+ requirements, general recommended guidelines published by Virginia Information Technologies Agency (VITA) make it clear that the RFI cannot be used to select, rank or compare, or develop requirements around one particular supplier or solution. Additionally, the RFI process is to be used as a research tool of products in the marketplace and is not a method of procurement; however, all information gathered and documented, except for the non-binding cost estimates, become public information and subject to public inspection, including this document. Such information, in a protest of award or decision to award resulting from the future RFP, must be provided to any offer or who requests it (Code of Virginia § 2.2-4360). Any violation of procurement law or misuse of the information gathered as a result of the RFI could lead to a finding that the award decision was arbitrary or capricious, thus resulting in the award being canceled or revised to comply with law, or, if the award had already been made it could be declared void. A valid protest could lead to a long delay in replacing VERIS, especially if the RFP was ordered to be revised and the requirements resolicited.

The above mentioned factors were considered, as well as the timeline for the RFI announcement, vendor responses, demonstrations, and ELECT review to meet the October 1 budget request deadline. As a result, the RFI team provided a detailed system overview and pared down the draft RFP requirements to 160 generic or aggregated categories to provide a clear description of the system needs, in accordance with VITA guidelines. Although use of an RFI is an acceptable tool for market research, it does not allow for sufficient detail to be included, such as risk factors, terms and conditions, and other requirements, whereby a potential supplier can offer an all-inclusive and realistic cost estimate, as would be expected in a competitive solicitation.

Information provided by vendors in response to the RFI and answers to follow-up questions submitted by ELECT, are not considered binding for any future contract. However, information provided by vendors in response to the RFI will become the property of ELECT and will be used to draft ELECT's statement of needs and requirements for the future RFP, which will solicit competitive offers that meet or exceed the needs of the Commonwealth and its localities. In this regard, vendors were not to submit any information that may be considered trade secrets or proprietary information, as responses to the RFI will eventually become public information, as previously noted.

## Vendor Non-Binding Cost Estimate and Criteria Justification

During the RFI process, vendors were requested to submit a non-binding cost estimate with their RFI response, based on the 'current' functionality in their voter registration and election management systems exhibited during the vendor demonstration. While vendors provided non-binding cost estimates, such estimates did not account for several cost factors, such as licensing and insurance, as well as Virginia specific requirements in their entirety, due to the reduced set of requirements outlined by the RFI process. To further expand upon the risk elements surrounding the vendor provided cost estimate, the RFI team used the information gathered during the RFI process and performed further research for comparison to other states' voter registration and election management systems, in order to identify criteria used to mitigate risk and unexamined costs, such as Legislative changes, to the cost estimate provided by the vendor. Vendor estimates and contingencies also consider each individual vendor's market presence, as well as the degree to which each vendor's solution requires initial configuration and customization to meet ELECT's business needs. A detailed justification is included for each vendor to support the criteria and the applied contingency used to establish a more thorough and complete cost estimation for the requested budget submission on October 1.

On the following pages, the information collected from all six (6) vendors that participated in the ELECT RFI process is presented, to include:

- Vendor non-binding cost estimate for the initial contract period (2 years)
- Maintenance and support costs for the vendor provided solution, for the initial implementation, along with an estimate for years 3-5
- Criteria used to mitigate risks and to apply additional contingency percentages to the vendor estimate
- Justification to support the additional contingency applied to each vendor cost estimate

## Vendor A

Details for **Vendor A** have been captured and the cost estimate for the initial contract period (2 years) has been identified in the following two tables:

**Table 1: Vendor A – Initial Contract Cost Estimate** includes the initial non-binding cost estimate, along with the criteria and contingency applied, reflecting the percentage of the anticipated costs for implementing the voter registration and election management system.

**Table 2: Vendor A – Criteria Justification** provides the details surrounding the criteria and the applied contingencies used to generate the cost estimate for the initial contract period.

*Table 1: Vendor A – Initial Contract Estimate*

Initial Vendor Estimate	\$6,000,000.00	Initial Spend - Yr 1	Yr 2	Initial Contract Period
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>	<b>\$1,050,000.00</b>	\$20,220,000.00	\$8,430,000.00	<b>\$28,650,000.00</b>
<b>SVRS Solution</b>				
Initial Configuration = 20%	\$1,200,000.00			
Initial Customization = 25%	\$1,500,000.00			
Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&O = 15%	\$900,000.00			
Resources = 20%	\$1,200,000.00			
Data Cleanup / Conversion = 40%	\$2,400,000.00			
VERIS Transition = \$	\$600,000.00			
Risk (unknowns) = 15%	\$900,000.00			
Change Requests (New and Enh) = 20%	\$1,200,000.00			
Licensing Cost = 3%	\$180,000.00			
IV&V = 10%	\$600,000.00			
Escrow = 1%	\$60,000.00			
Insurance = 5%	\$300,000.00			
<b>SVRS Infrastructure</b>				
Hybrid Deployment (CapEx/OpEx) = 50%	\$3,000,000.00			
VITA Oversight = 3%	\$180,000.00			
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>				
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>	<b>\$1,050,000.00</b>	<b>3-5Yr (per yr)</b>		
		<b>\$7,770,000.00</b>		
<b>SVRS Solution</b>				
Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&O = 10%	\$600,000.00			
Resources = 10%	\$600,000.00			
Risk (unknowns) = 15%	\$900,000.00			
Change Requests (New and Enh) = 15%	\$900,000.00			
Annual Pricing Inflation (CPI-U) = 1% - 3%	\$180,000.00			
Escrow = 1%	\$60,000.00			
Insurance = 5%	\$300,000.00			
Excessive downtime = 5%	\$300,000.00			
<b>SVRS Infrastructure</b>				
Hybrid Deployment (CapEx/OpEx) = 45%	\$2,700,000.00			
VITA Oversight = 3%	\$180,000.00			

Table 2: Vendor A – Criteria Justification

Criteria	Justification
<p><b>Initial Configuration = 20%</b></p>	<p>The out-of-the-box configuration of the system was included in the non-binding cost estimate provided by the vendor; however, this does not include additional configuration that may be necessary for the system to meet specific Virginia requirements that were excluded or generalized in the RFI requirements, and for changes, such as new Legislation, occurring subsequent to the draft RFP.</p> <p>At least three (3) modules were identified as either not being included in the original cost estimate or would require more extensive configuration, than other system functions.</p> <p>The contingency applied has taken into consideration the vendor’s recent market presence with newly implemented functionality and their experience in configuring and deploying election systems.</p>
<p><b>Initial Customization = 25%</b></p>	<p>Initial customization was included in the non-binding cost estimates; however, as the necessary additional configuration is completed, the user experience and interface will need to be customized to support the Commonwealth and localities.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, at least three (3) modules were identified as either not being included in the original cost estimate or would require configuration, as well as additional customization.</p>
<p><b>Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&amp;O = 15%</b></p>	<p>For modules that were not included in the non-binding cost estimate, contingency has been added, along with the maintenance and operation costs to support the additional modules. During the vendor demonstrations, at least three modules were identified as add-on modules for this vendor.</p> <p>Additionally, during design and/or implementation, Legislation may introduce the need for additional or new modules, which would also include or increase the maintenance and operations costs.</p>
<p><b>Resources = 20%</b></p>	<p>As the new voter registration and election management system is being implemented, VERIS must remain operational. To ensure that both solutions are supported, additional resources will be necessary. Based on the solution readiness, to include the additional module functionality, and the vendor election experience, the resource contingency was kept minimal, as the need for a large number of additional resources should be reduced.</p>
<p><b>Data Cleanup / Conversion = 40%</b></p>	<p>Upon vendor selection, analysis will be performed to determine the accuracy and cleanliness of the data to support data conversion for the new voter registration and election management system. While data conversion is included with the non-binding cost estimate, the data cleanup is not included.</p> <p>This area presents an unknown level of effort involving the vendor</p>

Criteria	Justification
	<p>defining the data conversion needs, as well as the level of detail around the data cleanup, especially in reference to Virginia specific challenges and nuances. Data conversion and migration will occur, but can offer challenges that could translate into higher costs, even with the experience the vendor provides. The two main challenges to take into consideration when converting the historic data are 1) completeness and accuracy and 2) subject matter expert (SME) resources.</p>
<p><b>VERIS Transition = \$600,000.00</b></p>	<p>VERIS will run in parallel to the new voter registration and election management system for 2-3 elections; therefore, an estimated cost is being included for the VERIS transition. The estimated cost is based on current election information.</p>
<p><b>Risk (unknowns) = 15%</b></p>	<p>The RFI process gathered the facts about the solution, to include estimated cost and other information, regarding a new deployment for a voter registration and election management system from potential vendors. As with any new solution, there are unknowns that will be encountered throughout the various stages of the project. A standard risk contingency has been applied to support the unknowns that may arise.</p> <p>The vendor is currently upgrading modules to newer technology and working through roadmap items, which are both at varying percentages of completeness. The risk contingency is taking into consideration the module updates and future timetable to completion.</p>
<p><b>Change Requests (New/Enh) = 20%</b></p>	<p>During the design and/or implementation of the new voter registration and election management system, changes and enhancements may be introduced through additional Legislation or Commonwealth requirements.</p>
<p><b>Licensing Cost = 3%</b></p>	<p>Licensing costs were not clearly identified in the vendor provided non-binding cost estimate; therefore, additional contingency has been included to cover the licensing costs.</p>
<p><b>IV&amp;V = 10%</b></p>	<p>Based on Commonwealth of Virginia requirements, high-risk and complexity projects require that an IV&amp;V be performed by a third-party vendor in the first 6 months; annual IV&amp;V if the project exceeds 12 months.</p>
<p><b>Escrow = 1%</b></p>	<p>VITA, in its mandated contractual terms and conditions, requires the contractor to provide a Source Code Escrow Agreement for the software and all future released versions. Such an agreement assures release of the source code to ELECT, should the contractor fail to carry out its support and maintenance, contract default, bankruptcy, etc.</p>

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>Insurance = 5%</b>	In addition to the standard insurance requirements included in the Commonwealth's terms and conditions, VITA requires the contractor to provide Errors and Omissions Insurance coverage to protect ELECT from project risk and impact on continuity of business needs. The amount of such coverage is on a per occurrence basis and the limit of specified coverage is to be determined by ELECT, based on risk assessment.
<b>Hybrid Deployment = 50%</b>	ELECT has indicated a desire for a cloud-based solution. Depending on the cloud service provider (CSP) utilized, the service model and deployment model chosen, additional CapEx and OpEx may be necessary to fully support the voter registration and election management system in the Commonwealth.
<b>VITA Oversight = 3%</b>	Based on Commonwealth of Virginia requirements, high-risk and complexity projects require a higher degree of VITA oversight for project accountability, to include: monthly detailed project status reporting, issue management tracking, and change control identification and scoring.



---

## *Vendor B*

---

Details for Vendor B have been captured, however it was determined that the solution did not align with the ELECT requirements, and the majority of the functionality did not exist in the vendor's solution and demonstration. In addition, the response to the RFI was incomplete; therefore, the solution was not considered in the cost estimation.

## Vendor C

Details for **Vendor C** have been captured and the cost estimate for the initial contract period (2 years) has been identified in the following two tables:

**Table 3: Vendor C – Initial Contract Cost Estimate** includes the initial non-binding cost estimate, along with the criteria and contingency applied, reflecting the percentage of the anticipated costs for implementing the voter registration and election management system.

**Table 4: Vendor C – Criteria Justification** provides the details surrounding the criteria and the applied contingencies used to generate the cost estimate for the initial contract period.

*Table 3: Vendor C – Initial Contract Estimate*

Initial Vendor Estimate	\$3,000,000.00	Initial Spend - Yr 1	Yr 2	Initial Contract Period
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>	<b>\$3,000,000.00</b>	\$15,510,000.00	\$8,490,000.00	<b>\$24,000,000.00</b>
<b>SVRS Solution</b>				
Initial Configuration = 65%	\$1,950,000.00			
Initial Customization = 75%	\$2,250,000.00			
Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&O = 40%	\$1,200,000.00			
Resources = 40%	\$1,200,000.00			
Data Cleanup / Conversion = 50%	\$1,500,000.00			
VERIS Transition = \$	\$600,000.00			
Risk (unknowns) = 25%	\$750,000.00			
Change Requests (New and Enh) = 25%	\$750,000.00			
Licensing Cost = 3%	\$90,000.00			
IV&V = 10%	\$450,000.00			
Escrow = 1%	\$30,000.00			
Insurance = 5%	\$150,000.00			
<b>SVRS Infrastructure</b>				
Hybrid Deployment (CapEx/OpEx) = 50%	\$1,500,000.00			
VITA Oversight = 3%	\$90,000.00			
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>				
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>	<b>\$3,000,000.00</b>	<b>3-5Yr (per yr)</b>		
		<b>\$6,570,000.00</b>		
<b>SVRS Solution</b>				
Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&O = 15%	\$450,000.00			
Resources = 10%	\$300,000.00			
Risk (unknowns) = 15%	\$450,000.00			
Change Requests (New and Enh) = 15%	\$450,000.00			
Annual Pricing Inflation (CPI-U) = 1% - 3%	\$90,000.00			
Escrow = 1%	\$90,000.00			
Insurance = 5%	\$150,000.00			
Excessive downtime = 5%	\$150,000.00			
<b>SVRS Infrastructure</b>				
Hybrid Deployment (CapEx/OpEx) = 45%	\$1,350,000.00			
VITA Oversight = 3%	\$90,000.00			

Table 4: Vendor C – Criteria Justification

Criteria	Justification
<p><b>Initial Configuration = 65%</b></p>	<p>The out-of-the-box configuration of the system was included in the non-binding cost estimate provided by the vendor; however, this does not include additional configuration that will be necessary for the system to meet specific Virginia requirements that were excluded or generalized in the RFI requirements, and for changes subsequent to the draft RFP.</p> <p>At least three (3) modules and at least ten (10) system functions were identified as not being included in the original cost estimate, all of which would require more extensive configuration than other system functions to support the modernization of the solution. The contingency applied has taken into consideration the additional configuration, vendor’s current market presence, level of experience, and the outdated solution that would require time and effort to retrofit.</p>
<p><b>Initial Customization = 75%</b></p>	<p>Initial customization was included in the non-binding cost estimates; however, as the necessary additional configuration is completed, the user experience and interface will need to be customized considerably to support the Commonwealth and localities’ requirements and system goals.</p> <p>Currently, the vendor is converting to a browser-based solution that is planned for release in 2021; quarterly releases are addressing compatibility with browsers and other ancillary items. Future product versions will be run on a continuous delivery cycle, which is likely to require considerable customization for Virginia at both the state and locality level.</p>
<p><b>Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&amp;O = 40%</b></p>	<p>For modules that were not included in the non-binding cost estimate, contingency has been added, along with the maintenance and operation costs to support the additional modules. During the vendor demonstrations, at least three (3) modules were identified as add-on modules, and approximately ten (10) system functions would require additional configuration for this vendor.</p> <p>Additionally, during design and/or implementation, Legislation may introduce the need for new modules, which would include or increase the maintenance and operations costs, as well.</p>
<p><b>Resources = 40%</b></p>	<p>As the new voter registration and election management system is being implemented, VERIS must remain operational. To ensure that both solutions are supported, additional resources will be necessary. Based on the current technology upgrades and solution readiness, the resource contingency was applied to support the potential level of effort in meeting Virginia requirements.</p>

Criteria	Justification
<p><b>Data Cleanup / Conversion = 50%</b></p>	<p>Upon vendor selection, analysis will be performed to determine the accuracy and cleanliness of the data to support data conversion for the new voter registration and election management system. While data conversion is included with the non-binding cost estimate, the data cleanup is not included.</p> <p>This area presents an unknown level of effort involving the vendor defining the data conversion needs, as well as the level of detail around the data cleanup, especially in reference to Virginia specific needs and nuances. Data conversion and migration will occur, but can offer challenges that could translate into higher costs, and takes into account the experience the vendor provides. The two main challenges to take into consideration when converting the historic data taken into consideration are 1) completeness and accuracy and 2) subject matter expert (SME) resources.</p>
<p><b>VERIS Transition = \$600,000.00</b></p>	<p>VERIS will run in parallel to the new voter registration and election management system for 2-3 elections; therefore, an estimated cost is being included for the VERIS transition. The estimated cost is based on current election information.</p>
<p><b>Risk (unknowns) = 25%</b></p>	<p>The RFI process gathered the facts about the solution, to include estimated cost and other information, regarding a new deployment for a voter registration and election management system from potential vendors. As with any new solution, there are unknowns that will be encountered throughout the various stages of the project. A risk contingency has been applied to support the unknowns that may arise.</p> <p>The vendor is currently converting to a browser-based solution; quarterly updates are being made to the current solution, with a continuous delivery cycle when the browser-based solution is complete. The risk contingency is taking into consideration the current system and future timetable for modernization for Virginia, at both the state and locality level.</p>
<p><b>Change Requests (New/Enh) = 25%</b></p>	<p>During the design and implementation of the new voter registration and election management system, changes and enhancements may be introduced through additional Legislation or Commonwealth requirements.</p>
<p><b>Licensing Cost = 3%</b></p>	<p>Licensing costs were not clearly identified in the vendor provided non-binding cost estimate; therefore, additional contingency has been included to cover the licensing costs.</p>
<p><b>IV&amp;V = 10%</b></p>	<p>Based on Commonwealth of Virginia requirements, high-risk and complexity projects require that an IV&amp;V be performed by a third-party vendor in the first 6 months; annual IV&amp;V if the project</p>

Criteria	Justification
	exceeds 12 months.
<b>Escrow = 1%</b>	VITA, in its mandated contractual terms and conditions, requires the contractor to provide a Source Code Escrow Agreement for the software and all future released versions. Such an agreement assures release of the source code to ELECT, should the contractor fail to carry out its support and maintenance, contract default, bankruptcy, etc.
<b>Insurance = 5%</b>	In addition to the standard insurance requirements included in the Commonwealth's terms and conditions, VITA requires the contractor to provide Errors and Omissions Insurance coverage to protect ELECT from project risk and impact on continuity of business needs. The amount of such coverage is on a per occurrence basis and the limit of specified coverage is to be determined by ELECT, based on risk assessment.
<b>Hybrid Deployment = 50%</b>	ELECT has indicated a desire for a cloud-based solution. Depending on the cloud service provider (CSP) utilized, the service model and deployment model chosen, additional CapEx and OpEx may be necessary to fully support the voter registration and election management system in the Commonwealth.
<b>VITA Oversight = 3%</b>	Based on Commonwealth of Virginia requirements, high-risk and complexity projects require a higher degree of VITA oversight for project accountability, to include: monthly detailed project status reporting, issue management tracking, and change control identification and scoring.

## Vendor D

Details for **Vendor D** have been captured and the cost estimate for the initial contract period (2 years) has been identified in the following two tables:

**Table 5: Vendor D – Initial Contract Cost Estimate** includes the initial non-binding cost estimate, along with the criteria and contingency applied, reflecting the percentage of the anticipated costs for implementing the voter registration and election management system.

**Table 6: Vendor D – Criteria Justification** provides the details surrounding the criteria and the applied contingencies used to generate the cost estimate for the initial contract period.

*Table 5: Vendor D – Initial Contract Estimate*

Initial Vendor Estimate	\$4,000,000.00	Initial Spend - Yr 1	Yr 2	Initial Contract Period
Maintenance & Support	\$1,500,000.00	\$17,320,000.00	\$8,620,000.00	\$25,940,000.00
<b>SVRS Solution</b>				
Initial Configuration = 45%	\$1,800,000.00			
Initial Customization = 45%	\$1,800,000.00			
Add-on Modules/Road map + M&O = 40%	\$1,600,000.00			
Resources = 40%	\$1,600,000.00			
Data Cleanup / Conversion = 50%	\$2,000,000.00			
VERIS Transition = \$	\$600,000.00			
Risk (unknowns) = 25%	\$1,000,000.00			
Change Requests (New and Enh) = 20%	\$800,000.00			
Licensing Cost = 3%	\$120,000.00			
IV&V = 10%	\$400,000.00			
Escrow = 1%	\$40,000.00			
Insurance = 5%	\$200,000.00			
<b>SVRS Infrastructure</b>				
Hybrid Deployment (CapEx/OpEx) = 50%	\$2,000,000.00			
VITA Oversight = 3%	\$120,000.00			
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>				
	\$1,050,000.00	<b>3-5Yr (per yr)</b>		
		\$5,730,000.00		
<b>SVRS Solution</b>				
Add-on Modules/Road map + M&O = 15%	\$600,000.00			
Resources = 10%	\$400,000.00			
Risk (unknowns) = 15%	\$600,000.00			
Change Requests (New and Enh) = 15%	\$600,000.00			
Annual Pricing Inflation (CPI-U) = 1% - 3%	\$120,000.00			
Escrow = 1%	\$40,000.00			
Insurance = 5%	\$200,000.00			
Excessive downtime = 5%	\$200,000.00			
<b>SVRS Infrastructure</b>				
Hybrid Deployment (CapEx/OpEx) = 45%	\$1,800,000.00			
VITA Oversight = 3%	\$120,000.00			

Table 6: Vendor D – Criteria Justification

Criteria	Justification
<p><b>Initial Configuration = 45%</b></p>	<p>The out-of-the-box configuration of the system was included in the non-binding cost estimate provided by the vendor; however, this does not include additional configuration that may be necessary for the system to meet specific Virginia requirements that were excluded or generalized in the RFI requirements, and for changes subsequent to the draft RFP.</p> <p>At least three (3) modules and at least six (6) system functions currently on the roadmap, were identified as not being included in the original cost estimate, all of which would require more extensive configuration than other system functions.</p> <p>The contingency applied has taken into consideration the additional configuration, vendor’s limited market presence offering newer technology and a flexible solution, as well as their knowledge and understanding in election systems.</p>
<p><b>Initial Customization = 45%</b></p>	<p>Initial customization was included in the non-binding cost estimates; however, as the necessary additional configuration is completed, the user experience and interface will need to be customized to support the Commonwealth and localities’ requirements and system goals.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, at least three (3) modules and approximately six (6) system functions were identified as either not being included in the original cost estimate or would require configuration, as well as additional customization.</p>
<p><b>Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&amp;O = 40%</b></p>	<p>For modules that were not included in the non-binding cost estimate, contingency has been added, along with the maintenance and operation costs to support the additional modules. During the vendor demonstrations, at least three (3) modules were identified as add-on modules, and approximately six (6) system functions would require additional configuration for this vendor.</p> <p>Additionally, during design and/or implementation, Legislation may introduce the need for new modules, which would include or increase the maintenance and operations costs, as well.</p>
<p><b>Resources = 40%</b></p>	<p>As the new voter registration and election management system is being implemented, VERIS must remain operational. To ensure that both solutions are supported, additional resources will be necessary. Based on the current roadmap items and solution readiness, the resource contingency was applied to support the potential level of effort in meeting Virginia requirements.</p>
<p><b>Data Cleanup / Conversion = 50%</b></p>	<p>Upon vendor selection, analysis will be performed to determine the accuracy and cleanliness of the data to support data conversion for the new voter registration and election management system. While</p>

Criteria	Justification
	<p>data conversion is included with the non-binding cost estimate, the data cleanup is not included. The vendor will utilize their previous experience to analyze Virginia specific challenges and nuances, to further define the data conversion needs, as well as the level of detail around the data cleanup.</p> <p>This area presents an unknown level of effort involving the vendor defining the data conversion needs, as well as the level of detail around the data cleanup, especially in reference to Virginia specific needs and nuances. Data conversion and migration will occur, but can offer challenges that could translate into higher costs, and takes into account the experience the vendor provides. The two main challenges to take into consideration when converting the historic data are 1) completeness and accuracy and 2) subject matter expert (SME) resources.</p>
<p><b>VERIS Transition = \$600,000.00</b></p>	<p>VERIS will run in parallel to the new voter registration and election management system for 2-3 elections; therefore, an estimated cost is being included for the VERIS transition. The estimated cost is based on current election information.</p>
<p><b>Risk (unknowns) = 25%</b></p>	<p>The RFI process gathered the facts about the solution, to include estimated cost and other information, regarding a new deployment for a voter registration and election management system from potential vendors. As with any new solution, there are unknowns that will be encountered throughout the various stages of the project. A risk contingency has been applied in the estimation to support the unknowns that may arise. The risk contingency takes into consideration the current system and the timetable for adding the three (3) new modules, as well as the increased configuration and customization for the system functions, which were identified during the demonstration.</p>
<p><b>Change Requests (New/Enh) = 20%</b></p>	<p>During the design and implementation of the new voter registration and election management system, changes and enhancements may be introduced through additional legislation or Commonwealth requirements.</p>
<p><b>Licensing Cost = 3%</b></p>	<p>Licensing costs were not clearly identified in the vendor provided non-binding cost estimate; therefore, additional contingency has been included to cover the licensing costs.</p>
<p><b>IV&amp;V = 10%</b></p>	<p>Based on Commonwealth of Virginia requirements, high-risk and complexity projects require that an IV&amp;V be performed by a third-party vendor in the first 6 months; annual IV&amp;V if the project exceeds 12 months.</p>



Criteria	Justification
<b>Escrow = 1%</b>	VITA, in its mandated contractual terms and conditions, requires the contractor to provide a Source Code Escrow Agreement for the software and all future released versions. Such an agreement assures release of the source code to ELECT, should the contractor fail to carry out its support and maintenance, contract default, bankruptcy, etc.
<b>Insurance = 5%</b>	In addition to the standard insurance requirements included in the Commonwealth's terms and conditions, VITA requires the contractor to provide Errors and Omissions Insurance coverage to protect ELECT from project risk and impact on continuity of business needs. The amount of such coverage is on a per occurrence basis and the limit of specified coverage is to be determined by ELECT, based on risk assessment.
<b>Hybrid Deployment = 50%</b>	ELECT has indicated a desire for a cloud-based solution. Depending on the cloud service provider (CSP) utilized, the service model and deployment model chosen, additional CapEx and OpEx may be necessary to fully support the voter registration and election management system in the Commonwealth.
<b>VITA Oversight = 3%</b>	Based on Commonwealth of Virginia requirements, high-risk and complexity projects require a higher degree of VITA oversight for project accountability, to include: monthly detailed project status reporting, issue management tracking, and change control identification and scoring.

## Vendor E

Details for **Vendor E** have been captured and the cost estimate for the initial contract period (2 years) has been identified in the following two tables:

**Table 7: Vendor E – Initial Contract Cost Estimate** includes the initial non-binding cost estimate, along with the criteria and contingency applied, reflecting the percentage of the anticipated costs for implementing the voter registration and election management system.

**Table 8: Vendor E – Criteria Justification** provides the details surrounding the criteria and the applied contingencies used to generate the cost estimate for the initial contract period.

*Table 7: Vendor E – Initial Contract Estimate*

Initial Vendor Estimate	\$8,000,000.00	Initial Spend - Yr 1		Yr 2	Initial Contract Period
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>	<b>\$1,500,000.00</b>	\$24,760,000.00	\$11,340,000.00		<b>\$36,100,000.00</b>
<b>SVRS Solution</b>					
Initial Configuration = 15%	\$1,200,000.00				
Initial Customization = 15%	\$1,200,000.00				
Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&O = 15%	\$1,200,000.00				
Resources = 20%	\$1,600,000.00				
Data Cleanup / Conversion = 30%	\$2,400,000.00				
VERIS Transition = \$	\$600,000.00				
Risk (unknowns) = 15%	\$1,200,000.00				
Change Requests (New and Enh) = 20%	\$1,600,000.00				
Licensing Cost = 3%	\$240,000.00				
IV&V = 10%	\$800,000.00				
Escrow = 1%	\$80,000.00				
Insurance = 5%	\$400,000.00				
<b>SVRS Infrastructure</b>					
Hybrid Deployment (CapEx/OpEx) = 50%	\$4,000,000.00				
VITA Oversight = 3%	\$240,000.00				
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>					
<b>Maintenance &amp; Support</b>	<b>\$1,500,000.00</b>	<b>3-5Yr (per yr)</b>			
<b>SVRS Solution</b>					
Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&O = 10%	\$800,000.00				
Resources = 10%	\$800,000.00				
Risk (unknowns) = 15%	\$1,200,000.00				
Change Requests (New and Enh) = 15%	\$1,200,000.00				
Annual Pricing Inflation (CPI-U) = 1% - 3%	\$240,000.00				
Escrow = 1%	\$80,000.00				
Insurance = 5%	\$400,000.00				
Excessive downtime = 5%	\$400,000.00				
<b>SVRS Infrastructure</b>					
Hybrid Deployment (CapEx/OpEx) = 45%	\$3,600,000.00				
VITA Oversight = 3%	\$240,000.00				
		<b>\$10,460,000.00</b>			

Table 8: Vendor E – Criteria Justification

Criteria	Justification
<p><b>Initial Configuration = 15%</b></p>	<p>The out-of-the-box configuration of the system was included in the non-binding cost estimate provided by the vendor; however, this does not include additional configuration that may be necessary for the system to meet specific Virginia requirements that were excluded or generalized in the RFI requirements, and for changes such as new Legislation, occurring subsequent to the draft RFP. The vendor identified several roadmap items that were either not included in the original cost estimate or would require more extensive configuration than other system functions. The contingency applied has taken into consideration the vendor’s recent market presence with newly implemented functionality, roadmap items, and their experience in configuring and deploying election systems.</p>
<p><b>Initial Customization = 15%</b></p>	<p>Initial customization was included in the non-binding cost estimates; however, as the necessary additional configuration is completed, the user experience and interface will need to be customized to support the Commonwealth and localities. As previously mentioned, the vendor identified roadmap items that were not included in the original cost estimate or would require configuration, as well as additional customization.</p>
<p><b>Add-on Modules/Roadmap + M&amp;O = 15%</b></p>	<p>For modules that were not included in the non-binding cost estimate, contingency has been added, along with the maintenance and operation costs to support the additional modules. During the demonstrations, the vendor identified roadmap items currently being addressed, as well as add-on functionality that may be desired by ELECT. Additionally, during design and/or implementation, Legislation may introduce the need for additional functionality or new modules, which would also include or increase the maintenance and operations costs.</p>
<p><b>Resources = 20%</b></p>	<p>As the new voter registration and election management system is being implemented, VERIS must remain operational. To ensure that both solutions are supported, additional resources will be necessary. Based on the solution readiness, to include the additional functionality and the vendor election experience, the resource contingency was kept minimal, as the need for a large number of additional resources should be reduced.</p>
<p><b>Data Cleanup / Conversion = 30%</b></p>	<p>Upon vendor selection, analysis will be performed to determine the accuracy and cleanliness of the data to support data conversion for the new voter registration and election management system. While</p>

Criteria	Justification
	<p>data conversion is included with the non-binding cost estimate, the data cleanup is not included.</p> <p>This area presents an unknown level of effort involving the vendor defining the data conversion needs, as well as the level of detail around the data cleanup, especially in reference to Virginia specific needs and nuances. Data conversion and migration will occur, but can offer challenges that could translate into higher costs, even with the experience the vendor provides.</p>
<p><b>VERIS Transition = \$600,000.00</b></p>	<p>VERIS will run in parallel to the new voter registration and election management system for 2-3 elections; therefore, an estimated cost is being included for the VERIS transition. The estimated cost is based on current election information.</p>
<p><b>Risk (unknowns) = 15%</b></p>	<p>The RFI process gathered the facts about the solution, to include estimated cost and other information, regarding a new deployment for a voter registration and election management system from potential vendors. As with any new solution, there are unknowns that will be encountered throughout the various stages of the project. A standard risk contingency has been applied in the estimation to support the unknowns that may arise.</p> <p>The vendor is currently upgrading modules with key functionality and working through planned roadmap items, which are both at varying percentages of completeness. The risk contingency is taking into consideration the module updates and future timetable to completion.</p>
<p><b>Change Requests (New/Enh) = 20%</b></p>	<p>During the design and implementation of the new voter registration and election management system, changes and enhancements may be introduced through additional Legislation or Commonwealth requirements.</p>
<p><b>Licensing Cost = 3%</b></p>	<p>Licensing costs were not clearly identified in the vendor provided non-binding cost estimate; therefore, additional contingency has been included to cover the licensing costs.</p>
<p><b>IV&amp;V = 10%</b></p>	<p>Based on Commonwealth of Virginia requirements, high-risk and complexity projects require that an IV&amp;V be performed by a third-party vendor in the first 6 months; annual IV&amp;V if the project exceeds 12 months.</p>
<p><b>Escrow = 1%</b></p>	<p>VITA, in its mandated contractual terms and conditions, requires the contractor to provide a Source Code Escrow Agreement for the software and all future released versions. Such an agreement assures release of the source code to ELECT, should the contractor fail to carry out its support and maintenance, contract default,</p>

Criteria	Justification
	bankruptcy, etc.
<b>Insurance = 5%</b>	In addition to the standard insurance requirements included in the Commonwealth's terms and conditions, VITA requires the contractor to provide Errors and Omissions Insurance coverage to protect ELECT from project risk and impact on continuity of business needs. The amount of such coverage is on a per occurrence basis and the limit of specified coverage is to be determined by ELECT, based on risk assessment.
<b>Hybrid Deployment = 50%</b>	ELECT has indicated a desire for a cloud-based solution. Depending on the cloud service provider (CSP) utilized, the service model and deployment model chosen, additional CapEx and OpEx may be necessary to fully support the voter registration and election management system in the Commonwealth.
<b>VITA Oversight = 3%</b>	Based on Commonwealth of Virginia requirements, high-risk and complexity projects require a higher degree of VITA oversight for project accountability, to include: monthly detailed project status reporting, issue management tracking, and change control identification and scoring.

---

## *Vendor F*

---

Details for Vendor F have been captured, however it was determined that the solution did not align with the ELECT requirements, and the majority of the functionality did not exist in the vendor's solution and demonstration. In addition, the response to the RFI was incomplete; therefore, the solution was not considered in the cost estimation.

## Final Proposed Cost Estimate with Supporting Comparative Analysis

The non-binding estimated cost range for the initial 2-year contract is between \$20,000,000 and **\$29,000,000** (rounded to a whole number) for the replacement of VERIS, and was calculated on a median value using four (4) of the six (6) vendors who responded to the Department of Elections issued RFI.

Chapter 1289, item 83, L1 of the 2020 General Assembly session states,

*“It is the intent of the General Assembly that federal awards from the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) under P.L. 116-93 be used to replace the Virginia Election and Registration Information System (VERIS) by July 1, 2022. Out of the amounts included in this item, \$10,175,711 in the second year from nongeneral fund HAVA grants is provided to the Department of Elections.”*

The HAVA funds in the amount of \$10,175,711 require the Commonwealth to match funds in the amount of 20% (\$2,035,142) for a total appropriation of 12,210,835 already allocated to replace VERIS. Therefore, if approved, ELECT would require an additional \$16,789,065 appropriation over the next two fiscal years in order to complete the replacement of VERIS.

Two (2) of the responding vendors provided incomplete information and, therefore, were not considered in the estimate. Each of the four (4) initial non-binding estimates of cost were adjusted for system requirements related to the current vendor solutions, configuration and customization needs, new functionality and other factors. The methodology for adjustments utilized criterion and various percentages to account for these necessary factors, as responding vendors could not accurately provide estimations in their individual RFI responses, due to a more generalized RFI requirements description. Although links were provided in the RFI to the previously prepared draft RFP and Virginia-specific requirements, it appeared that respondents to the RFI did not research the links. In all likelihood, there was insufficient time available for them to conduct thorough research, determine a realistic cost estimate, and prepare to submit their responses to the RFI by the due date.

Research regarding the costs incurred by other states in replacing their voter registration systems was conducted to provide an industry benchmark comparison for the RFI findings. The Commonwealth of Virginia currently has **5,825,332** registered voters, 95 counties along with 38 independent cities that are considered county-equivalents, and supports a centralized system.

Table 9 below, examines six (6) different states that recently completed the implementation of a voter registration and election management system. While the state comparative analysis presented is not a 1:1 comparison, due to the overall number of registered voters and county size differential, it was utilized to confirm cost alignment with recent alike procurements. The analysis gives a grounded perspective to the cost estimate provided to complete the VERIS replacement.

*Table 9: Six (6) State Comparative Analysis*

States	Registered Voters	Timeline	System Attributes	Overall Cost
California	25,167,218	2006-2017	Centralized System (58 Counties)	\$98,200,000

States	Registered Voters	Timeline	System Attributes	Overall Cost
Delaware	695,014	2018-2019	Centralized System (3 Counties)	\$18,300,000
Georgia	7,060,000	2019-present	Centralized System (159 Counties)	\$107,000,000
Rhode Island	781,478	2019-present	Centralized System (5 Counties)	\$520,000 - \$1,550,000
South Carolina	3,538,580	2019-present	Centralized System (45 Counties)	\$51,000,000
Washington State	4,841,431	2018-2020	Centralized System (39 Counties)	\$16,000,000

During the previous administration, a costing exercise was conducted by the Department of Elections to determine an approximation of the funds needed to replace VERIS. The costs represented in Table 10 below, include the final figures determined during the exercise for replacement, maintenance, and operations over a **2-year period**. Maintenance and support costs, shown in italics, are system costs not calculated as part of the original costing exercise. Such costs include: software licensing, vendor support, IV&V, escrow and insurance costs. In addition, there was no risk contingency applied for the unknowns that could be encountered throughout the various stages of the project. Using a 2% per-year average for inflation, these costs in 2021 would be estimated at **\$29,296,642.79**.

*Table 10: Previous Administration Cost Estimation for Replacing VERIS*

Criteria for VERIS Replacement	Component Cost
Total 2-year VITA Cost (Initial Contract)	\$3,425,200
Software Cost Estimate	\$12,000,000
Change Requests	\$186,446.25
eVA orders	\$989,332.50
VERIS Renewal Tasks (one-time renewal cost)	\$780,768.42
VERIS Renewal – 24 months	\$1,056,587.28
VERIS Transition team Staffing and VITA	\$2,721,622.40
VERIS Renewal Key Tasks (optional/variable)	\$1,275,280.0
Known Annual Costs	\$4,099,635.57
<i>Software licensing</i>	--



Criteria for VERIS Replacement	Component Cost
<i>Vendor Support</i>	--
<i>IV+V</i>	--
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$26,534,872</b>

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the RFI provided considerable insight into potential industry solutions, and satisfied concerns as to the availability of competition to ensure that a high quality solution can be contracted at a fair and reasonable price. The overall result provided market research and a generalized cost-estimate in comparison to the future competitive procurement, the Request for Proposal (RFP), wherein a complete statement of needs, terms and conditions, and other information will provide for fair and open competition and cost proposals specifically aligned to all system requirements.