Campaign Finance Reporting System- Addendum 1

Issuing Agency:	State Board of Elections
Solicitation Description:	The North Carolina State Board of Elections (SBE) seeks proposals from vendors for a modernized campaign finance reporting system that is secure, cloud-based, and improves the user experience. The modernized system shall ensure prompt access to data and make it easier for the public to search, understand, and track reported political spending over elections, election cycles, and calendar years.
Date:	June 2, 2026
Purchasing Agent:	Lisa Berot-Marlowe

FAILURE TO RETURN THIS ADDENDUM MAY SUBJECT YOUR RESPONSE TO REJECTION.

1. The Solicitation is hereby modified as follows:

Modification #	Solicitation Section	Current Solicitation Language	Updated Solicitation Language
1	2.1 Introduction	The SBE seeks a solution that offers step-by-step filing of statements, certifications, and disclosure reports that: prevents incomplete submissions, reduces user error, and guides users towards compliance.	The SBE seeks a commercial off the shelf solution that offers step-by-step filing of statements, certifications, and disclosure reports that: prevents incomplete submissions, reduces user error, and guides users towards compliance.

2. The following are questions received about the Solicitation and the State's response to those questions:

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
1	2.2, 2.3	How many total users (treasurers, assistant treasurers, county admins, SBE staff) are expected to access the system at full rollout, broken down by role type?	The total number of active users depends on the season. We anticipate at least 120 admin users. We currently have approximately 1,850 active committees registered with the State Board Elections (SBE).
2	2.2	Does the system need to track and enforce treasurer training certification status as a gate on filing eligibility per N.C.G.S. 163-278.7(f) and 163-278.9(j), or is certification tracking managed in a separate system?	Certification tracking takes place in a separate system. The proposed solution should also incorporate this data that would, ideally, be uploaded from a report generated from the separate LMS.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
3	2.3	Approximately how many paper disclosure reports are filed with SBE annually that would need to be digitized and ingested into the new system?	Report volume differs widely in even years and odd years and cannot be predicted. For example, in 2024 SBE scanned approximately 5,200 reports. In 2025 SBE scanned approximately 1,800 reports.
4	2.3	Will the new system be required to process and digitize paper reports at the point of intake, or will paper reports be manually keyed by SBE staff into the system?	The new system will be required to process and digitize paper reports at the point of intake.
5	2.3	What is the estimated peak concurrent user volume during high-activity filing periods such as quarterly deadlines and election cycles?	SBE currently has approximately 1,850 active committees registered with the State Board. All committees file semiannual reports in odd-numbered years.
6	3.2.2	The RFP classifies data as Restricted (Medium Risk). Is any data within the system classified as Highly Restricted (High Risk), such as Social Security Numbers or personal financial data of filers?	There is Highly Restricted data within the system. It is personal financial data of filers.
7	3.3.3	Can the state provide the specific IAM protocols and IdP documentation referenced at the linked NC DHIT resource prior to offer submission, so vendors can architect the identity federation correctly?	SBE prefers the use of local logins managed by the vendor's IAM solution. The solution should not be integrated with SBE's IAM systems.
8	3.3.3	Will .gov-authenticated users (SBE staff, county admins) and public filers (treasurers, committees) authenticate through the same identity system, or are these two separate authentication pathways?	See response to question 7. There is no preference on the vendors IAM architecture so long as there is role-based authentication in place
9	3.3.3	Does the state's existing IAM infrastructure support SAML 2.0 and/or OAuth 2.0/OpenID Connect for external application federation?	See response to question 7, this should not be integrated into SBE's IAM. The preference is for a hosted IAM provided by the vendor.
10	3.3.4	Does the SEIMS (Statewide Elections Information Management System) currently expose a documented REST or SOAP API for integration, and if so, can API documentation be provided to vendors?	Not currently.
11	3.3.5	What are the state's specific RPO and RTO targets for this system?	2-4 hours during mission critical events such as reporting and elections. 12-24 hours during standard operations

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
12	3.3.6	Can the state provide a data dictionary, schema diagram, or record count estimates for the legacy system's database prior to offering submission to support migration estimation?	The legacy SQL database is broken into two, one for data which is about 30GB in size and the other which is for document images that are roughly 68GB in size. There are about 13,500 committees identified in the record set. There are no current data dictionaries/schema but the awarded vendor will be given access to the application, code and full database.
13	3.3.6	What is the approximate total volume of historical records (disclosure reports, filings, committee records) in the legacy system that must be migrated?	See response to question 37.
14	3.3.6	Are there known data quality issues in the legacy system, such as duplicate records, incomplete fields, or non-standardized formats, that vendors should account for in migration estimates?	Yes, there are known issues of duplicates, incomplete fields, and non-standardized formats of data.
15	3.4 Req. 4	What specific data elements will be publicly accessible for search and download? Will the public portal require bulk data export (e.g., full dataset downloads) or only record-level search and view?	Campaign finance disclosure information is generally public as required by law. Certain information may be restricted, confidential, or otherwise exempt from public disclosure. The solution must support role-based access controls and restriction of non-public information.
16	3.4 Req. 5	Please clarify the expected format for "full database backups" is the state expecting a traditional relational database dump, or will structured data exports (e.g., CSV, JSON via API) satisfy this requirement?	Structured data formats are acceptable.
17	3.4 Req. 5	How frequently does SBE anticipate requesting database backups, and what is the expected delivery timeframe once requested?	The vendor should maintain the backups for recovery purposes. SBE would only request backups should there be a termination of the contract or upon request for custom data analysis efforts.
18	3.5.1 spec 7	OWASP ASVS Level 3 is listed as preferred. Will the state accept Level 2 compliance for the initial launch with a documented roadmap to Level 3, or is Level 3 a hard requirement at go-live?	Level 2 will not disqualify a vendor but will be used in the evaluation.
19	3.5.1 spec 8	What specific regulations beyond NIST 800-53 and OWASP ASVS does SBE anticipate requiring compliance with?	Security compliance will be evaluated on a case-by-case scenario and vendors should supply all compliance methods in their response and SBE will use that in their evaluation criteria.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
20	3.5.2 spec 4	What is the state's change control process for in-scope modifications during development? Will changes require a formal change order, or is there a built-in flex allowance within the fixed contract price?	The State anticipates that minor clarifications and refinements to approved requirements may occur during implementation. Any change that materially affects scope, schedule, deliverables, or cost will require a formal change request and written approval by the State. The determination of whether a change is within scope will be made by the State based on the nature and impact of the requested change.
21	3.5.2 spec 7	What are the applicable retention periods for file storage under NC records management policy for campaign finance records specifically?	Disclosure reports filed with the State Board are subject to permanent (archival) retention.
22	3.5.2 spec 9	What are the law-based retention periods for audit logs and data access records under NC public records law for this system?	1 year at a minimum unless there is a litigation hold, in which case logs would need to be retained for the duration of the litigation period. See section 924.1-2 in the State Archive Records Retention Schedule for Information Technology here: https://archives.ncdcr.gov/information-technology/open
23	3.5.2 spec 11	Is integration with SEIMS or other voter registration/election management systems a required deliverable within the initial contract scope, or is it a future-state roadmap item?	No, it is not a required deliverable within the initial contract scope. See response to question 38.
24	3.5.2 spec 18	Does the state require direct database connectivity (ODBC/JDBC) to the system's data store for reporting, or will API-based data access and export satisfy this requirement?	API access will suffice if it satisfies all reporting needs. Should there be a need for additional functionality, SBE would expect the vendor to add that to the API as an enhancement or provide another means of connectivity such as an ODBC/JDBC.
25	3.5.3 spec 7	How many county administrators will require dedicated training environments, and should each county have isolated test data or can they share a sandboxed environment?	County administrators will require a dedicated training environment and they can share a sandbox.
26	3.5.3 spec 6	Is the 2-month pre-release training requirement applicable to both the pilot launch (January 2027) and full launch (July 2027), meaning training must begin by November 2026 for the pilot?	SBE is not requiring a 2-month pre-release training for the pilot. The response should describe whatever training will be available for the pilot. The full release will require the 2-month pre-release training.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
27	3.5.4 spec 9	The Critical SLA response time is 30 minutes. Does this apply 24x7x365, or only during defined business hours outside of campaign finance reporting periods?	The Critical SLA response 30 minute response time applies to defined business hours and campaign finance reporting periods.
28	3.5.4 spec 10	Can the state provide the specific campaign finance reporting period calendar (quarterly and semiannual deadlines, election cycles) so vendors can propose appropriate SLA escalation windows?	For the majority of committees, a new election cycle will begin on January 1, 2027. For 2027, a mid-year semiannual report will be due from all active committees on July 30, 2027. A year-end semiannual report will be due on January 28, 2028. Municipal disclosure reports will also be filed in the fall of 2027 based on the reporting schedules in G.S. 163-278.40B-E.
29	3.5.5 spec 4	What is the maximum number of disclosure entities a single user may be affiliated with simultaneously? This affects data models and performance design.	There is no maximum. There is no limit on the number of entities a treasurer can manage.
30	3.5.5 spec 17	Which specific e-signature standard under N.C.G.S. 66-58.5 is required, is a click-to-sign acknowledgment sufficient, or is a cryptographically binding digital signature (PKI-based) required?	There is no specific standard prescribed. The vendor is expected to propose a solution that complies with G.S. 66-58.5.
31	3.5.5 spec 21	Is OCR for paper report conversion a required deliverable within the initial contract scope, or is it optional functionality?	No, this is not required. It is optional functionality.
32	3.5.5 spec 27	What is the state's definition of "immutable" for audit log purposes, is tamper evident logging acceptable, or does the state require logs stored in a write-once medium that is physically unalterable?	Tamper evident logging is acceptable as long at the backups of those logs are on a write-once immutable medium to be retrieved as needed.
33	3.5.5 spec 32	The PDF suite specification lists view, convert, edit, redact, search, manage, create, and split within the system. Are all of these capabilities required at initial launch, or can a phased delivery be proposed?	The state does not have a requirement of the initial launch. The state does not have a requirement of the initial launch. Respondents should identify any assumptions, limitations, scalability, possible options, and price dependencies.
34	3.5.5 spec 45	For public filers (non-.gov accounts), will the state accept vendor-managed identity with MFA, or must all user identities be provisioned through a state-controlled identity system?	Vendor managed is preferred for all accounts, state and public

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
35	6.3.2(e)	The ideal proposal includes a pilot by January 1, 2027. Given a projected contract award of August 20, 2026, this allows approximately 4.5 months for pilot delivery. Can the state confirm that the pilot scope is limited to a defined subset of filing types and approximately 20 users as described, and not a full feature complete system?	The pilot scope will be limited as described in the RFP.
36	6.3.2(e)	Will the pilot program users be identified and available for onboarding by the vendor within 30 days of contract award to support the January 2027 pilot target?	SBE can identify pilot program users within 30 days of contract award.
37		Please provide the approximate size (record counts and database size) of the legacy campaign-finance data set and confirm available data formats for extraction.	See response to question 12.
38		Which existing voter registration, payment, identity, or document-management systems must the new solution integrate with, and what integration methods (APIs, SFTP, etc.) are preferred?	Not upon launch but the preferred solution would be able to interact with future voter registration APIs and/or document management systems. There is no expectation for identity integration at this time. SBE does not anticipate an electronic payment mechanism.
39		Will the State accept a current SOC 2 Type 2 report in lieu of FedRAMP authorization at award, provided FedRAMP Moderate is achieved within the first contract year as outlined in Section 3.2.2(b)(ii)?	See response to question 19.
40		What is the historical peak concurrent-user load (or expected transactions per minute) during statutory filing deadlines so we can accurately size auto-scaling infrastructure and meet SLA metrics?	Based on current software, a data point like this is not available. Respondents should identify any assumptions, scalability, and limitations in their response.
41		For pricing purposes, please confirm the anticipated number of administrative users (state + county) and the expected growth trajectory of registered filer accounts over the next three years.	SBE does not have a growth trajectory for registered filer accounts. We anticipate at least 120 admin users. The respondents should identify any assumptions, scalability, price impacts, and limitations in their response.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
42	3.3.6	Section 3.3.6 states the vendor is "fully responsible for end-to-end legacy data conversion and migration" and will be provided with a "database backup file". Ambiguity: The RFP does not specify the size of the database, the number of years of historical data to be migrated, or the schema complexity of the legacy application. Question: "Can the Agency provide the approximate size of the legacy database (in GB/TB) and the total number of historical transaction records to be migrated?"	See response to question 12.
43	3.5.2	Section 3.5.2, Specification #4, asks vendors to describe how they will work off high-level specifications and make "minimal changes" throughout development without additional costs. Ambiguity: "Minimal" is a subjective term. Without a defined threshold for what constitutes a "minimal change" versus a "change request" or "scope change," the vendor is at risk for significant uncompensated work. Question: "Does the Agency have a specific threshold (e.g., a set number of development hours or a percentage of total project effort) that defines a 'minimal change' as referenced in Section 3.5.2?"	The State does not establish a fixed hour-based threshold for minimal changes. Determinations will be made based on the impact to scope, schedule, cost, and functionality. Material changes may require a formal change request.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
44	3.5.2	Section 3.5.2, Specification #11, asks for "existing or future API integration capabilities" regarding voter registration and management systems. Ambiguity: It is unclear if active integration with the State Election Information Management System (SEIMS) or other databases is a requirement for the initial "Full Launch" or merely a capability to be evaluated for future use. Question: "Is an active integration with the state's voter registration system required for the July 1, 2027, launch, or is the Agency only evaluating the solution's ability to support such integrations in the future?"	SBE is evaluating the ability to support integrations in the future. These integrations are not required for launch. Respondents should identify any assumptions, scalability, and limitations in their response.
45	2.6	Section 2.6 defines this as a "Definite Quantity Contract". While the RFP mentions 1,900+ active committees, it also notes that 100 county boards of elections and SBE staff will use the system. Ambiguity: To provide accurate pricing for a SaaS solution—where costs are often tiered by user count—the vendor needs to know the specific number of "Administrative Users" (SBE and County staff) versus "Public/Filer Users". Question: "What is the estimated number of administrative users (state and county level) that will require system access?"	See response to question 1.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
46	3.5.4	Section 3.5.4, Specification #10, asks how Service Level Agreements (SLAs) are modified during "Campaign Finance reporting periods". Ambiguity: The RFP mentions that committees file semiannual and quarterly reports, but it does not specify the exact duration or "blackout periods" where heightened SLAs (e.g., 24/7 support or 30-minute response times) are required. Question: "Can the Agency provide a calendar of the specific reporting periods during which the modified SLAs would be in effect?"	See response to question 28.
47	3.2.1	Several sections throughout the document are marked as "RESERVED," including Section 3.2.1 (Solutions Hosted on State Infrastructure), Section 7.13 (Recycling), and Section 7.15 (Agency Terms and Conditions). Ambiguity: It is unclear if these terms are omitted entirely or if the Agency intends to add them via an addendum after the question period. Question: "Will the Agency be providing language for the 'RESERVED' sections (3.2.1, 7.13, 7.15) via an addendum, or should vendors assume these sections are not applicable to this RFP?"	Sections marked "RESERVED" do not apply to this RFP.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
48	6.3.2	Section 6.3.2 describes an "ideal proposal" as including a Pilot Program for 20 selected users by January 1, 2027. Ambiguity: The RFP does not clarify if the pilot users will be entering live data that must be preserved or if the pilot environment will use test data. This affects data integrity requirements and environment setup. Question: "Will the 20 pilot program users be utilizing the system for official, live filings, or will the pilot be conducted in a sandbox environment with test data?"	The pilot program users will use the system for official, live filings.
49	General	1. How many persons are using the system? 2. What are their titles and basic roles? 3. How many will need a supervisory dashboard view over a group of persons? 4. Will they each need a username/password combination to access the system? 5. Are there Board level or similarly situated persons who need access to a custom dashboard just for that level of stakeholder?	See response for question 1. Users are county admins, state board admins, and treasurers. Respondents should describe any dashboard views offered. A username/password combination is required.
50	General	How many voter registration applications are received/processed annually?	This is not relevant to this RFP.
51	General	We note the link to a listing of State IT services contracts. Does the State Board have any Master Services Agreements or similar with cloud service providers such as AWS, Microsoft, ServiceNow, or others? The list was unclear to us in this regard.	This should be a fully vendor hosted solution and therefore not integrate with existing SBE cloud services or have any bearing on existing agreements.
52	General	Is there a preference for any SaaS platform such as among those listed in the previous question?	Yes, the solution should be vendor hosted as a SaaS solution.
53	General	In terms of systems load what is the peak level of activity we need to assume around Ethics filing time? In other words, how many concurrent filers might we see near a filing deadline date?	See response to question 5.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
54	RFP sec 2.3	How many people from each the campaign committees (or organizations) would need access to the system through an external portal?	SBE anticipates two to three on average. SBE does not have a defined limitation. Respondents should identify any assumptions, scalability, and limitations in their response.
55	RFP sec 2.3	How many internal users (staff) would be required to access this system?	See response to question 1.
56	RFP sec 2.3	Do you have an estimated annual storage requirement based on current transaction volume for filings, amendments, and disclosure records?	See response to question 12 regarding current legacy system size. SBE does not have any metrics outside of that and what is available on the SBE website regarding the historical reports.
57	RFP sec 2.3	can you please provide an estimate of the existing file storage capacity amount that will need to be migrated from the legacy system?	See response to question 12.
58	RFP 2.3	Do you have an estimated data storage amount that will need to be migrated from the current legacy solution?	See response to question 12.
59	Section 2.3, Page Number 4	How many filings did the State receive via paper in the 2024 and 2025 filing cycles?	See response to question 3.
60	RFP Section 2.3, Page Number 4	For the proposed solution, would an electronic signature (tracked to the required party through login credentials) within the application utilizing a customized attestation satisfy the digital signature requirement and allow you to fully move away from paper submissions?	See response to question 30.
61	RFP Section 2.3, Page number 4	What are the expected peak filing periods and system load/concurrency requirements during those times?	Peak filing periods would be semiannual and quarterly reporting due dates.
62	RFP Section 3.5.5, Page number 16	Will the State provide a complete catalog of compliance rules, validation logic, and filing requirements, including detailed current-state workflows for filing submission, review, approval, and amendment processes for implementation or will the selected vendor need to perform a current system analysis?	During SME engagement, the awarded vendor will receive all relevant references, statutes, procedures, workflows, and documentation.
63	RFP Section 3.3.3, Page number 7	Is there a required IAM solution or is the state open to alternative solutions (like Amazon Cognito)?	See responses to questions 7 and 8.
64	RFP Section 3.3.4, Page number 7	What systems must the solution integrate with (e.g., voter reg systems, fine payment systems, etc.), and are APIs currently available?	See response to question 23.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
65	RFP Section 3.3.6, Page number 8	In addition to providing a copy of the current database, can the state provide detailed documentation of the legacy system data (schemas, volumes, data quality, known issues) to support migration planning?	See responses to questions 12 and 14.
66	RFP Section 3.3.6, Page number 8	What data elements must be migrated vs. archived, and what are the acceptance criteria for successful migration?	All historical data that aligns with data fields in the proposed solution is expected to migrate. Respondents should identify any assumptions, limitations, scalability, possible options, and price dependencies.
67	RFP Section 3.3.6, Page number 8	Please describe your assessment of the current quality of your data, including completeness, accuracy, and consistency. If possible, please, provide specific examples of known issues (e.g., address formatting, capitalization, duplicate records). Please also describe any validation practices or data cleansing processes currently in place.	The data is in a structured SQL database but there was limited quality, duplicate and validation control mechanisms in place within the front-end application. Vendors should assume efforts will be needed to work with SBE Campaign Finance staff for data consolidation efforts as needed.
68	RFP Section 2, Page number 23	Regarding the ability to assign different filers to admins, would only the assigned admin be able to view and modify that filer's info?	SBE prefers a configurable role-based model with multiple administrative tiers. Respondents should identify any assumptions in their response.
69	RFP Section 6, Page number 23	Can you explain what is meant by permissions hierarchy? Example of a manual override you'd need at the field level?	Permissions hierarchy/manual override/restrictions is asking what granular, role based edit permissions to the data fields are there in the solution and can certain fields be read only/restricted.
70	RFP Section 22-23, Page number 25	Is the data visualization expected to be a real time data analysis tool?	There is no real-time data visualization requirement for section 22-23 regarding internal data visualizations, but vendors should outline the capabilities of the solution as it will be used in the evaluation criteria.
71	RFP Section 32, Page number 25	Is it correct that you need admins to be able to configure fields etc. in real time through a configuration tool?	Vendors should outline the field editing capabilities of the solution as it will be used in the evaluation criteria.
72	RFP Section 37, Page number 26	Is the goal to set default values on fields based on filer accounts?	There is not a goal to set default values. SBE would like a warning if a user is exceeding a value SBE prescribes based on committee status. An example is a committee entering a contribution amount that is above the permitted amount.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
73	6.3.3 OFFER SUBMITTAL P 23	"It is the Vendor's sole responsibility to upload their offer as directed on the Office of the State Auditor's website" "Offers must be submitted as directed on the Office of the State Auditor's website…" Please clarify if "as directed on the Office of the State Auditor's website" means that responses should be emailed to campaignfinancerfp@ncauditor.gov, or should be uploaded via https://evp.nc.gov/. At this time, I cannot find RFP# 2026 CFRS on the eVP site.	Responses should be emailed to campaignfinancerfp@ncauditor.gov.
74	Sections 6.3.2 and 5.2, Pages 22–23 and 17	Section 6.3.2 distinguishes between an "ideal" proposal (pilot program by January 1, 2027, full launch by July 1, 2027) and an "acceptable" proposal (no pilot, full launch by July 1, 2027). Please clarify whether proposals that include the pilot program will receive a scoring advantage over proposals that meet only the acceptable timeline, and if so, how that advantage is reflected in the evaluation criteria listed in Section 5.2.	The State is seeking the best overall value for our user community. Ideally a proposal with desired functionality, scalability, and ease of use will also offer a pilot program, but a pilot program will not supersede the attributes.
75	Section 5.2, Page 17	The evaluation criteria list "Total Cost of Ownership" as criterion #3 using a trade-off/ranking method, but no scoring weights or cost calculation methodology are specified. Please clarify how cost will be scored — specifically whether the lowest-cost responsive offer receives the maximum cost score with other offers scored proportionally, or whether another method will be used.	The State is seeking the best overall value for our user community; cost is not the single deciding factor. See the answer to question 87 for additional information.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
76	RFP Section 5.2 (criterion 8); Attachment G	Attachment G requires three references for customers utilizing the proposed solution fully implemented in a setting similar to this solicitation's scope of work. Does the State consider election administration systems more broadly (e.g., voter registration, election management, ballot tracking, candidate filing) to satisfy the "similar scope of work" standard, or must all three references be specifically for campaign finance reporting systems? Relatedly, where references are drawn from a subcontractor or teaming partner with relevant implementations rather than the prime vendor, does the State count those toward the three-reference requirement?	Various types of election administration systems are considered similar scope of work. Vendors should submit references who will be able to speak to their experience with the vendor.
77	RFP Section 3.5.2 #11; Section 2.3	The RFP references API integration capabilities for interaction between election voter registration and management systems. Could the State please clarify (a) all anticipated integrations with other state systems, (b) the direction and cadence of data exchange, and (c) whether integration with these systems is required at full launch (July 1, 2027) or planned for a later release?	See responses to questions 23 and 98.
78	RFP Section 2.3; Section 3.5.5 #43–#44	To support infrastructure sizing, SLA planning, and capacity forecasting, could the State provide any metrics regarding current system usage, including (a) approximate annual filing counts (by report type, if available), (b) estimated peak concurrent users during filing deadline windows (e.g., quarterly, semiannual, and 48-hour report deadlines), and (c) estimated public search/query volumes against the disclosure data?	The State does not maintain reliable metrics regarding peak concurrent users, transactions per minute, or public search/query volumes in the legacy system. Filing volumes vary significantly based on election cycles and reporting schedules. Respondents should identify any assumptions, scalability considerations, system limitations, and pricing impacts associated with their proposed solution. For planning purposes, respondents may reference the responses provided to questions 1, 3, 5, 40, and 41 regarding active committees, paper filing volumes, user estimates, and anticipated administrative users. The proposed solution should be capable of scaling to accommodate fluctuations in filing activity associated with reporting deadlines and election cycles.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
79	RFP Section 3.3.3	The RFP requires the solution to externalize identity and access management per State protocols. Could the State confirm the preferred or required identity provider for (a) SBE and county board administrators, and (b) public filers? Are different identity contexts expected for .gov and non-.gov filers (as referenced in Section 3.5.5 #45)?	See responses to questions 8 and 9.
80	RFP Section 6.3.2(e)(i)(a)	Regarding the ideal pilot program targeted for January 1, 2027: (a) will SBE select the approximately 20 pilot filers, or is co-selection with the vendor anticipated; (b) is there a preferred mix of committee types (candidate committees, party committees, PACs, referendum committees) in the pilot cohort; and (c) will pilot participants be required to continue filing in the legacy system in parallel, or will the pilot replace legacy filing for that cohort?	SBE will select the pilot participants. SBE has not defined formal success criteria. The pilot would run in parallel with the legacy system, but SBE anticipates filing of live data during the pilot.
81	RFP Section 3.5.5 #33; Attachment B Section 18(o)	Could the State provide the records retention schedule applicable to filed disclosure reports, supporting attachments, and committee records under the new system? Specifically, are filings retained indefinitely once filed, or is there a scheduled disposition path?	Disclosure reports filed with the State Board are subject to permanent (archival) retention.
82	RFP Section 2.3; Section 3.5.5 #21	The RFP notes that the modernized system will serve as the repository for paper reports filed with the SBE. Could the State provide (a) the approximate annual volume of paper filings expected, and (b) whether the in-scope solution is expected to include OCR or structured data extraction from paper, or whether SBE staff will key-enter paper filings into the new system?	See responses to questions 3 and 4.
83	RFP Section 2.3; Section 3.5.5 #17	The RFP identifies the lack of compliant electronic signature as a primary pain point in the legacy system, and Section 3.5.5 #17 requires the solution to collect compliant electronic signatures meeting N.C.G.S. Section 66-58.5. Does the State have a preferred or mandated electronic signature provider, or is the vendor expected to propose a provider as part of the solution?	The vendor is expected to propose a solution that complies with G.S. 66-58.5, which may include another vendor.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
84	RFP Section 3.2.2; Section 3.3	Does the State have a preferred or required FedRAMP-authorized cloud hosting environment (e.g., Azure Government, AWS GovCloud) for the solution, given the Section 18(b) US-only data residency requirements including backup and disaster recovery?	No preference, vendors should provide all available cloud hosting options in their response.
85	RFP Attachment B Section 4(b)	The 99.9% monthly availability SLA excludes "agreed-upon maintenance downtime." Could the State clarify (a) the process for establishing agreed maintenance windows, (b) whether emergency maintenance windows (security patching, critical fixes) are excluded from the availability calculation, and (c) the State's expectations regarding the frequency and duration of scheduled maintenance windows?	A. At a high level, identify vendor's scheduled maintenance times and ensure it does not conflict with the State's timelines. B. Emergency maintenance windows may be excluded from the calculation when necessary to address security, stability, and operational risk. These downtimes must be proposed by the vendor and approved by the State. These downtimes should not interrupt standard business hours nor critical reporting periods whenever possible. C. The frequency may be based on how your system functions. Without these details, the State prefers few scheduled maintenance windows that do not interrupt standard business hours nor critical reporting periods whenever possible.
86	RFP Section 2.3	The RFP notes a future expectation that electronic filing may be required for all filers, including county and municipal filers. Could the State clarify whether the in-scope solution at full launch (July 1, 2027) must accommodate all 100 county boards of elections as administrative users, or whether county-level administrative access is planned as a phased rollout?	SBE is expecting all 100 county boards to be accommodated at launch.
87	RFP Section 5.2 (criterion 8); Attachment G	Will the State publish the evaluation rubric or scoring weights applied to the Section 5.2 evaluation criteria, particularly the relative weighting between specification conformance, total cost of ownership, and references / past performance?	The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria identified in the solicitation. The State does not intend to publish additional scoring weights, point allocations, or internal evaluation methodologies.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
88	Section 2.3, Page 4 of 51 (Legacy System Background)	What is the current technology stack and database platform (e.g., SQL Server, Oracle, Access) of the legacy campaign finance application? What is the approximate size of the legacy database (in GB) and the total number of records (transactions, committees, reports) that must be migrated?	See response to question 12
89	Section 2.3, Page 4 of 51 (Legacy System Background)	Will the agency provide vendor(s) with read access to a copy of the legacy application and database during the proposal development period, or only after contract award? If only post-award, will a data dictionary, schema documentation, or representative data sample be made available to finalists prior to oral presentations?	Access to the legacy application and database will be provided to the vendor to whom the contract is awarded. No, there are no current data dictionaries/schemas to make available to the finalists.
90	Section 2.3, Page 4 of 51 (Electronic Signatures)	The RFP identifies the lack of compliant electronic signatures as a primary deficiency of the legacy system, referencing N.C.G.S. § 66-58.5. Can the agency clarify what constitutes a compliant electronic signature under this statute for campaign finance filings: (a) must the signature be cryptographically verified/non-repudiable; (b) are click-to-sign acknowledgment mechanisms acceptable; and (c) is a specific third-party e-signature provider already approved or preferred by the State?	There is currently no approved or preferred vendor for e-signatures. The vendor is expected to propose a solution that complies with G.S. 66-58.5, which may include another vendor.
91	Section 2.3, Page 4 of 51 (Scope: County Filings)	The RFP states the system must accommodate county and municipal election filings by 100 county boards of elections. Is mandatory electronic filing for county/municipal filers in scope for the initial full launch (July 1, 2027), or will county electronic filing be a phased addition? Approximately how many additional committees file at the county and municipal level statewide?	Mandatory electronic filing for county/municipal filers is in scope for initial full launch. SBE is not prepared to answer the number of county and municipal electronic filers. Respondents should identify any assumptions, scalability, and limitations in their response.
92	Section 2.1 / Section 3.5.5, Pages 3 and 9 of 51 (Public Access)	Will the agency provide a list of specific data fields and record types that must be publicly accessible versus those that are restricted (e.g., contributor personal information)? Does the agency envision a fully open bulk data download capability (e.g., CSV/API), or is public access limited to web-based search and individual record viewing?	See response to question 15.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
93	Section 3.2.2, Page 6 of 51 (VRAR / Security Assessment)	The RFP states that a third-party security assessment report is preferred in the form of FedRAMP, SOC 2 Type 2, ISO 27001, or HITRUST, with SOC 2 Type 1 acceptable as an alternative with explanation. Will the agency accept a SOC 2 Type 1 report issued within the past 12 months combined with a documented roadmap and committed timeline for completing SOC 2 Type 2 certification, as a fully satisfactory response rather than a diminished one?	See response to question 19 and additional security VRAR document required with vendor response.
94	Section 3.2.2, Page 6 of 51 (Data Classification: Restricted)	The RFP classifies campaign finance data as "Restricted." Does this classification extend to all data in the system (including publicly viewable disclosure report data), or only to specific categories such as filer personally identifiable information (PII), administrative credentials, and non-public enforcement records? Clarification would assist vendors in accurately scoping security controls.	"Restricted" does not extend to publicly viewable disclosure report data.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
95	Section 3.2 / Section 3.3.1, Pages 6 and 7 of 51 (IAM Externalization)	The RFP requires vendors to "externalize Identity and Access Management per NC DIT protocols." Can the agency specify which NC DIT IAM solution is to be integrated (e.g., NCID, Azure AD/Entra, or another state-managed identity provider)? Is identity management for non-.gov https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Flinkprotect.cudasvc.com%2Furl%3Fa%3Dhttps%253a%252f%252fnon-.gov%26c%3DE%2C1%2Cr7IX6dKJKdgXNEHlPHSnU4s0GK9jhVXt09U3RZGLY1RcsIl7EBuxqr6tHpreLCpmS3receASxZAKvvwFwvWW_dG8_p-xQjWwDA4YpS9hg-o%2C%26typo%3D1%26ancr_add%3D1&data=05%7C02%7Calex.luboff%40ncsbe.gov%7Ce6845e6c419b491f22de08debdb2375e%7C7a7681dcb9d0449a85c3ecc26cd7ed19%7C0%7C0%7C639156770293921551%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=V6zwpv2nxZY69CiOp6fQ9FXU7FTwpTAOzeoZAh56R3U%3D&reserved=0 filer accounts (the large majority of users) expected to use the same state IAM, or a vendor-managed identity solution with federation?	See responses to questions 8 and 9.
96	Section 3.2, Page 6 of 51 (Multi-Factor Authentication)	What MFA standard is required for the system? Specifically: (a) is MFA required for all user roles including public-facing filers, or only for administrator accounts; (b) are SMS/TOTP-based mechanisms acceptable, or is hardware key (FIDO2/WebAuthn) required for any role; and (c) does the NC DIT IAM solution provide native MFA, or must the vendor implement MFA independently?	See responses to questions 8 and 9 regarding IAM. Vendors should provide all MFA options available in their existing solution as that will be used in the evaluation criteria.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
97	Section 3.3.1, Page 7 of 51 (Architecture Diagrams)	The RFP requires both a Network Architecture Diagram and a Technology Stack Diagram as mandatory go/no-go submission items. Can the agency confirm that diagrams representing a proposed/conceptual architecture (rather than a production deployment) are acceptable at submission, given that final architecture will be determined during the planning phase? Are there specific NC DIT or NCSBE architecture standards templates that diagrams should conform to?	Proposed diagrams are acceptable. More information ca be found here: https://it.nc.gov/cloud-services-network-architecture-diagram-template
98	Section 3.3.2, Page 7 of 51 (Integration with Election Management System)	The SEIMS Modernization (Phase II: Legacy Application Conversion) contract was awarded in February 2026. To what extent has the new election management system's API specification been defined? Will the CFRS vendor be expected to integrate with the incumbent SEIMS modernization vendor, and if so, will the State facilitate a coordination mechanism between the two vendors? What is the anticipated timeline for the new election management system's APIs to be available for integration?	See response to question 38; integration with the Election Management System is not a requirement, only the ability to do so in the future.
99	Section 3.3.6, Page 8 of 51 (Data Migration)	The RFP states the vendor shall be fully responsible for end-to-end legacy data conversion and migration. Will the agency provide: (a) a data dictionary or schema documentation for the legacy database; (b) a representative anonymized dataset for pre-proposal scoping; and (c) subject matter expertise from agency staff to assist with business rule interpretation during migration design? What known data quality issues or gaps exist in the legacy data?	See responses to questions 12 and 14. SME expertise is limited but available.
100	Section 3.3.6, Page 8 of 51 (Data Migration: Timing)	The RFP states migration should "preferably" be completed by full launch and "no later than" 6 months post-launch. During any transition period between full launch (July 1, 2027) and migration completion, will both the legacy system and the new system operate in parallel? If so, what data synchronization or freeze process does the agency envision?	See response to question 80. No data synchronization is required between legacy and the modern system.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
101	Section 3.5.2, Item 4, Page 10 of 51 (Work off High-Level Specs)	Can the agency clarify the degree of business rules documentation that will be provided at contract kick-off? Specifically, will there be formal written business rules documentation, a subject matter expert engagement model, or will the vendor be expected to derive rules from existing statute and administrative code independently?	SBE will have subject matter expert engagement and they will assist with business rules documentation for the duration of project planning.
102	Section 3.5.2, Item 19, Page 11 of 51 (AI Utilization)	Does the State have any existing policies, executive orders, or pending guidance that restrict or require specific approval for AI-based processing of State data classified as Restricted? For example, are there limitations on using large language models or AI APIs hosted outside state infrastructure for processing campaign finance data?	Yes, AI processing of "Confidential" or "Restricted" classified data is strictly prohibited. AI processing of "Internal" classified data requires SBE approval and AI processing of "Public" data is allowed. The vendor should be also able to comply fully with the state data classification policy.
103	Section 3.5.3, Item 6, Page 12 of 51 (Training)	The RFP requires training at least 2 months prior to each production release. Given the proposed full launch date of July 1, 2027, this implies training completion by approximately May 1, 2027. Is training expected to be delivered to all SBE and county board staff simultaneously, or can it be conducted in a phased/train-the-trainer model for the 100 county boards of elections?	SBE expects a train-the-trainer deliverable to us, and SBE will train the county boards.
104	Section 3.5.4, Item 10, Page 13 of 51 (SLA Modifications During Reporting Periods)	The RFP states that SLAs "may be modified during Campaign Finance reporting periods." Can the agency identify the primary reporting periods (by month/quarter) where elevated SLA standards would apply, and indicate whether modified SLA terms would be agreed upon in the contract or negotiated on an ad hoc basis?	For 2027, a mid-year semiannual report will be due from all active committees on July 30, 2027. A year-end semiannual report will be due on January 28, 2028. Elevated SLA standards apply to all reporting periods. Modified SLA terms would be discussed if/when needed.
105	Section 3.5.5, Items 1-8, Pages 13 and 14 of 51 (Role Management: Geographic Permissions)	The RFP references "geographic/group-limited administrator permissions" for county administrators. Can the agency describe the current permission model: (a) how many distinct permission profiles or roles currently exist; (b) whether county administrators are limited to viewing/managing only their own county's data; and (c) whether any users currently have cross-county or statewide non-admin permissions?	See response to question 68.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
106	Section 3.5.5, Item 21, Page 14 of 51 (OCR Integration)	The RFP lists OCR as a required feature for "electronic conversion of handwritten or printed text." Can the agency describe the primary OCR use case: (a) digitizing paper disclosure reports filed with the SBE; (b) reading handwritten fields within paper-filed forms; or (c) another use? What is the approximate annual volume of paper reports currently filed with the SBE that would be subject to OCR processing?	OCR is not identified as a requirement in the RFP. For volume, see response to question 3. The respondent should identify any OCR solutions available.
107	Section 3.5.5, Item 46, Page 16 of 51 (Mailing / Communications)	The RFP requires the ability to "generate and track mailing lists using disclosed addresses." Does this refer to physical mailing addresses for postal mail, email addresses for electronic communications, or both? Is the system expected to integrate with or replace any existing bulk mailing or notification platform currently used by the SBE?	This refers to physical and electronic communications. This system should replace an existing notification platform. Respondents should identify any assumptions, scalability, and limitations in their response.
108	Section 4 / Attachment D, Pages 16 and 44 of 51 (Cost Form)	Can the agency publish Attachment D (the Cost Form) in advance of the Q&A addendum so vendors can confirm the expected line-item structure for pricing? In particular, vendors need to understand whether implementation/one-time costs and ongoing SaaS subscription costs should be presented as separate line items, and whether the cost form requires multi-year pricing for the two optional renewal years.	Vendors must fill in the table(s) Cost Form table included in the RFQ and provide on a separate sheet with a detailed itemization of all costs in accordance with Section 4.1.
109	Section 4, Page 16 of 51 (Contract Term: Implementation Period)	The initial contract term is "1 year from the effective date in the Notice of Award." Given the anticipated award date of August 20, 2026 and the full launch target of July 1, 2027, it appears that full implementation would not be complete within the initial 1-year term. Can the agency confirm how the contract term structure accommodates a multi-year implementation timeline?	The term shall be 1 year and will expire upon the anniversary date of the effective date unless otherwise stated in the Notice of Award, or unless terminated earlier. The State retains the option to extend the Agreement for two (2) 1-year periods at its sole discretion subject to performance and funding.
110	Section 7.14, Page 27 of 51 (Acceptance Testing: 3-Month Period)	The RFP specifies a 3-month post-delivery/post-training acceptance testing period. For a SaaS solution where "delivery" is iterative, how does the agency define the start of the 3-month acceptance testing clock: at the pilot program launch, the full production launch, or after data migration completion?	The start time would apply to each.

#	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
111	Section 5.2, Page 17 of 51 (Evaluation Criteria: Financial Stability)	Criterion 4 is "Financial Stability." Can the agency clarify what documentation is expected to demonstrate financial stability: for example, audited financial statements for a specific number of years, a Dun & Bradstreet report, a bank reference letter, or another standard? Attachment H references a "Financial Review Form": can this attachment be published prior to the Q&A addendum?	Please see section 7.2 Financial Statements. Please utilize the form/format provided in the RFP.
112	Section 5.3, Page 18 of 51 (Oral Presentations / Product Demonstrations)	Oral presentations are scheduled for July 20-24, 2026 and can be virtual or in person at SBE offices. Can the agency provide additional guidance on the expected format: (a) will there be a standard agenda or list of required demonstration scenarios; (b) will the demonstration be of a live/configured system or presentation materials; and (c) what is the maximum number of vendor personnel expected to participate?	The format will be provided to the finalists invited to present. Vendors should present in a manner they deem as suitable for the format provided. 3 to 5 vendor representatives are reasonable for in-person presentations. However, additional personnel may join virtually.
113	Section 6 / Attachment G, Page 48 of 51 (References)	Attachment G requires client references. Can the agency specify: (a) the minimum number of references required; (b) whether references must be government entities specifically or whether commercial references are also acceptable; (c) whether campaign finance or election administration experience is a requirement for references; and (d) whether references must be for the proposed software platform specifically or may include references for the vendor team's prior work on other platforms?	A. 3 B. Both are acceptable C. & D. References within like North Carolina communities / industries are encouraged. The Vendor should have implemented the respective proposed service within the last three (3) years. Customer references whose business processes and data needs are similar to those performed by the Agency needing this solution in terms of functionality, complexity, and transaction volume are encouraged.
114	Section 6.3.2, Page 22 of 51 (Pilot Program)	The ideal proposal includes a pilot program by January 1, 2027 with approximately 20 selected users. Can the agency clarify: (a) who selects the pilot participants: the agency, the vendor, or jointly; (b) what constitutes pilot program "success" and whether there are formal success criteria; and (c) whether the pilot would run in parallel with the legacy system so pilot participants can file simultaneously in both systems, or whether it will be the sole filing mechanism for pilot users during the pilot period?	See response to question 80.

Check **ONLY ONE** of the following options and return one properly executed copy of this Addendum prior to the Solicitation opening time and date.

☐ A response was submitted prior to this Addendum. An updated response has been submitted to address the changes resulting from this Addendum.

☐ A response was submitted prior to this Addendum. **NO CHANGES have resulted** from this Addendum.

☐ A response was **not** submitted prior to this Addendum. **ANY CHANGES resulting** from this Addendum are included in our response.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME

Authorized Signature	Date
Printed Name	Title