Project / Executive Summary:

Technical	Business	Schedule
Yellow (D)	Green (D)	Green (S)

I = Improving D = Deteriorating S = Stable

Technical:

- Saber made the decision to officially move away from Citrix Access Gateway (CAG) to the Citrix Secure Software (CSS). The decision was based on the history of the CSS in other States and the results of the i-Beta initial testing (100+ Vusers, typical login logout process) that resulted in no Citrix SSL errors. i-Beta went on with additional test where the scripts were changed to login and logout with each transaction. This caused the Citrix errors to occur, was determined to be a non-realistic test of the application. Saber provided the State with a paper that documents their position and the testing conducted to this point. The project plan was updated and the plan currently is to be up and running on fully load balanced equipment by 2/20/2008 and a monitoring period through 3/25/2008. This means the SCORE infrastructure would be "stabilized" before the start of the Group 3 rollout. According to the current CAG to CSS plan the users were to be brought up on the Site 1 on 12/28. The SCORE IV&V has not received any communication indicating that the switchover was completed.
- Citrix has provided feedback to Saber on the CAG issue progress. Saber provided the information and it is currently being evaluated by State and IV&V. The plan is to test the CITRIX CAG changes over the course of the next two weeks. If the changes do not produce a completely clean environment based on internal and external testing, the site will be converted to the CSS software.
- SCORE IV&V met with the State on the Performance & Security deliverable and recommended rejection due to the lack of key coverage in the test. Specifically, the Citrix load information was not provided. The deliverable has a number of significant issues that must be addressed. Saber is focused on resolving the Citrix issue before revisiting the performance testing. It was suggested that the regularly scheduled meeting continue until the deliverable is completed. Saber has not established the meetings to this point. Saber has made some progress with their own Citrix load testing using the AppLoad product. Saber has been able to test a 50 user load using the product. The plan will be to test all the way to 1000 users as the contract indicates. The existing VSS tools will be used to simultaneously test the Vote Center module.
- The SCORE IV&V conducted another round of external Independent Security Testing during the first week of November. The tests produced some new results that were discussed with Saber. The logs contain a significant amount of superfluous information that makes it difficult to identify critical issues. The State is experiencing similar issues with the logs and the lack of Saber interpretation. The SCORE IV&V has generated a new risk to address this issue. An additional round of Security testing will be conducted before the Citrix Secure Software gateway solution effort has been completed. The SCORE IV&V are currently planning to conduct

testing during the week of February 4th. The timing of the test will be coordinated with the State, Saber and the i-Beta testing.

- The lack of a Test Platform continues to slow progress in addressing the Citrix Protocol / SSL error and Performance testing. Site 1 has been used for this purpose to date making the site unavailable for production. Saber has recommended that both sites must be fully functional starting in early February for the third statewide rollout groups. The initial hardware and maintenance costs are estimated at roughly 240K. Support cost is around $115K regardless of the hosting location. The SCORE IV&V is recommending proceeding with the purchase, hosting the system in Colorado. Additional discussions on the hosting cost breakdown are needed before Saber is given final approval. Saber recommends putting the system in their Ohio facility and moving it back to Colorado as the transition of SCORE responsibility occurs. The cost of such a move needs to be discussed and documented.

Business:

- The decertification of the majority of the states voting equipment has added an additional load to the counties during the critical Statewide rollout period. The additional potential work load and planning distraction may cause some of the counties to pull back from their SCORE commitments.
- The connectivity issues and the number of SCORE software releases are stretching the counties during their election cycles. Several of the counties are pushing back on their availability during the post election period Emergency releases to support specific requests continue to be required.
- The CDOS Elections Director has established the SCORE Task Force to address and set the priority of the issues and enhancements being developed. The SCORE IV&V is being included in the task force. The SCORE IV&V's role will be limited to advisory and restricted by the contractual priorities of the project. The SCORE IV&V will continue to attend meetings as the topics dictate. The SCORE IV&V PM will attend task force meeting as topics and time permits. The priority of the outstanding items may need to be re-visited as the issues grow and additional counties are added to the project.
- The Group 1 Statewide training class was very well received by the counties. There were however a number of questions and issues that were documented through the first week of training. The SCORE PM intends to use the information for lessons learned moving forward. The trainers and training materials is much improved over the pilot training. The time investment in the walkthrough week has proven to be well spent.

Schedule:

- The State and Saber have not yet agreed to the timing of the release for the Priority 3.2 issues. The 3.2 release was originally intended for the updates to the Petitions module. The Petition model changes have been delayed to a subsequent release. Saber has agreed to release the software to the State on January 7th in the FEQA environment. Early release or exposure to the functionality is needed in order for the State and IV&V to complete the test of all items by the planned production release schedule. The production date for the release will be established after the first week of testing by the State and IV&V.

- Updates to the infrastructure required by the Independent Security Test (IST) along with the "official" performance testing were completed before the November 2007 elections. Any additional changes will be put on hold until after the Citrix CAG replacement project has been completed on both sites.
- Changes to the Votec extract must be applied to the Statewide rollout data migration to eliminate the need for counties to update their data after migration. The data migration process will need to be updated in the next month in order to meet the needs of the counties. Saber has contacted Votec and was put off until after the November elections. The State has had additional conversations with the same result. This makes it impossible for Saber to complete their changes in time for the Statewide rollout. Changes to the Votec county data migration will need to be made via custom extracts for individual county needs. The impact could be significant if the Statewide counties have to be taken down for the supplement migrations.
- Due to the many outstanding issues (application / infrastructure), Saber has a very tight window to get all the corrections into place and tested before the beginning of January scheduled 3.2 and now February 3.5 releases. The STF has prioritized the outstanding issues into modules buckets for better organization and to allow Saber to address multiple issues affecting the same area. The limited time constraint is pushing this issue into a risk, for the SCORE application, that incorrect interpretation of requirements or incomplete regression testing.

Accomplishments:

- The SCORE IV&V successfully installed the latest source code release on the Escrow server. The release was smoke tested and can be used to verify source code changes. The process continues to have issues with the database installation that require manual intervention to the provided scripts. The disks did not include the Vote Center modules as expected. A request for the latest update will be made through the SCORE PMO for a copy.
- The SCORE IV&V continued to perform Acceptance Testing over the period. The new goal is to complete the entire 1540 test cases by the completion of the Statewide rollout (March 2008). This will allow Saber enough time to address the issues by the Priority # 3.5 implentation date. The HAVA compliance has risen to 80%. Provisional ballots are the only component not tested to this point. Testing will continue with each release of the application. There are 2 issues related to HAVA compliance: Agency interface implementation for state and Provisional Ballots. The analysis for the Colorado statues has been completed at this time, but cannot be implemented until 3.5 bucket.
- The SCORE II PMO and IV&V continue to review and respond to multiple Saber Plans and deliverables. The SCORE IV&V has shifted two of its Quality Assurance and Voter Registration / Election Management subject matter experts to performing Acceptance Testing and finalizing the User Acceptance Testing support for the Priority #3.2 & 3.5 issues. In addition, the Security and Infrastructure resources are being re-directed toward the Independent Security Testing findings follow-up. This movement supports the Graded Approach scheme with emphasis toward product or application not paper deliverables.

Management Attention*: None in the period*

Information:

- The Saber Data Migration process calls for fields that do not comply with database and business rules to be changed during the migration process. Those changes are not currently being documented inside the legacy system. The SCORE IV&V recommends that whenever a data field is changed in the data migration process that an activity record be generated describing the change and the timing of the change. This information has been verified and will be removed. It is not clear when the information will be loaded during the Statewide rollout waves. This will be tracked as an issues until the data is loaded for the remainder of the counties.
- The SCORE IV&V continues to monitor outside influences including the status of other states HAVA implementation. The information is used to assess the SCORE II project. The next meeting of the SCORE IV&V Executive Steering Committee has been scheduled for 1/8/2008.
- The SCORE IV&V continues to see corrections which are being implemented outside of the established list provided by the Score Task Force (STF). The STF was designed to review any SPIRIT issues for statues and policy rules. CDOS and Saber will work together to ensure a compliant design and then present the solutions to the CCB for the final decision. The release process will be tightly coupled with the Spirit Work flow in the future.
- The SCORE IV&V is addressing the weekly code drops in between major releases code drops. This is unplanned testing which was not part of the original scope of work. The State should re-evaluate the use of an automated tool for testing.
- The SCORE IV&V continues to request the configurations settings IDS/IPS and updated switches/routers and firewall. The information was requested as part of the initial Internal Security Testing.
- During the previous Code review audit a large amount of "unused" code was identified in the customized Colorado code. It was agreed at the time that the code would not be removed until after the 3.0 Priority release of the application. This issue needs to be revisited since the 3.0 release is in production and the code continues to stabilize.

Schedule / Activities & Tasks:

Completed & Planned Activities / Tasks		
Completed Last Week		
Activity / Task	**Date**	**Priority**
SCORE Task Force Meeting (CDOR Interface Walkthrough)	1/2/2008	High
Priority 3.2 Testing Preparation	1/4/2008	High
Security Test Planning for Citrix Gateway Updates	1/4/2008	High
OIT Project Certification Planning Meeting	1/4/2008	High
SCORE IV&V Audits (Licenses, Performance, Code Review)	1/4/2008	High
Continue to respond to Saber Deliverables and Activities (DED's)	1/4/2008	High
Plan for Next Week		
Activity / Task	**Date**	**Priority**
Security Test Planning for Citrix Gateway Updates	1/4/2008	High
Priority 3.2 Test Planning	1/7/2008	High
SCORE IV&V Executive Steering Committee Meeting	1/8/2008	High
OIT Project Certification Planning	1/8/2008	High
SCORE Task Force Meeting	1/9/2008	High
SCORE Change Control Board Meeting	1/10/2008	High
SCORE IV&V Audits (Licenses, Performance, Code Review)	1/11/2008	High
Continue to respond to Saber Deliverables and Activities (DED's)	1/11/2008	High

WDS WYANT DATA systems, inc.
WDS Confidential Draft Working Copy

Staffing: As of 11/30/2007:

Resource Type / Role	Contract Hours	Hours Used to date	% Used	Hours in Period
Project Management	2347.00	2323.50	99%	171.00
Infrastructure / Disaster Recovery SME	289.00	391.25	135%	3.50
Application / Infrastructure SME	737.00	268.75	36%	3.00
Oracle / Application SME	630.00	165.00	26%	8.00
Voter Registration / Election Management SME	1206.00	1,208.00	100%	90.00
Quality Assurance SME's	2369.00	2,259.00	95%	153.00
Security SME's	860.00	774.25	90%	78.75
Totals	8438.00	7389.75	88%	507.25

Planned Activities	Contract Hours	Hours Used to date	% Used	Hours in Period
Project Management (Status Reports / Meetings)	1599	2221.75	139%	217.50
Source Code Escrow Responsibilities	180	27.00	15%	0.00
Saber / SCORE II Deliverables / Activities Review	3599	1813.75	50%	55.75
SCORE II Independent Assessments (Security…)	544	744.50	137%	79.00
SCORE II Acceptance Testing (User / System)	1940	2244.75	116%	155.00
SCORE II Project Audits	576	338.00	59%	0.00
Totals	8438	7389.75	88%	507.25

Acceptance Testing for V.1.5.0.1 code baseline - Test Case Execution:

Total Cases	**1540**	**100%**	HAVA Requirements		Total Bugs	
Pass	**732**	**48%**	Pass	80%	Critical	0
Fail	**156**	**10%**	Fail **	20%	High	61
N/A	**68**	**4%**	Block	0%	Medium	68
Block	**2**	**0%**	Total Req.	100%	Low	72
Total Tested	**958**	**62%**			Closed	215
Total to be Executed	**581**	**38%**			Total	416

** Provisional Ballots are still an issue with the system. Requirements have been gathered and scheduled

Priority 3.5 for the Provisional Ballot Process.

Priority 3.2 Release - TBD

Emergency December Release - 3 Test Cases: 3 Pass

Priority 3.0 Release - 168 Test Cases: 47 Pass, 4 Fail, 3 Incomplete and 135 to Test

Priority 2.7 Release - 84 Test Cases: 64 Pass and 20 to Test

Emergency October Release - 6 Test Cases: 6 Pass

Functional Area	Total Cases	Cases Executed	Cases Passed	Percent Complete	Percent Passed
Absentee Application	55	47	39	85%	83%
Address	103	85	79	83%	93%
Administration	85	45	39	53%	87%
Ballot	61	52	34	85%	65%
Calendar	18	1	0	6%	0%
Candidate	25	13	13	52%	100%
Contacts	14	8	8	57%	100%
Contest	17	10	10	59%	100%
Districts	56	56	53	100%	95%
Document Management	7	7	7	100%	100%
Elections	169	111	95	66%	86%
Election Workers	33	20	19	61%	95%
Exports	5	4	3	80%	75%
Help	2	0	0	0%	0
Interfaces	22	7	7	32%	100%
Miscellaneous	18	15	6	83%	40%
Performance	16	9	8	56%	89%
Petition	37	20	19	54%	95%
Poll Book	28	7	7	25%	100%
Polling Places	26	10	10	38%	100%
Reports, Labels and Mailings	205	68	29	33%	43%
Scheduler	19	0	0	0%	0
Software/Hardware Compatibility	10	2	2	20%	100%
System	102	11	9	11%	82%
Voter Management	406	271	227	67%	84%
Totals:	1539	879	723	57%	82%

Category	Total	Percent
Total Test Cases	**1540**	**100%**
Pass	**732**	**48%**
Fail	**156**	**10%**
N/A	**68**	**4%**
Block	**2**	**0%**
Total Executed	**958**	**62%**
Total to be Executed	**581**	**38%**

Issues: (Last Reviewed on 01/05/2008)

Issue ID:	Entry Date:	Modified Date:	Description:	Category	Status
II-001	Monday, November 6, 2006 7:36:58 AM MST	Sunday, December 3, 2006 1:03:56 PM MST	Potential higher total cost of ownership for maintaining a Colorado version of the software.Mitigation: Monitor customization costs closely and take advantage of other States customized code when possible.	Technical	Open
II-010	Sunday, December 3, 2006 12:10:59 PM MST	Sunday, January 28, 2007 8:02:18 PM MST	Exploits move rapidly, and appropriate mindset for threat and new vulnerability thinking are required to respond proactively and protect systems according to their asset value. There is no apparent threat modeling process to feed into risk-based methodology. In order to be able to protect assets by value, the threat to those assets must be understood. Require Saber to develop cohesive threat modeling methodology as part of the SCORE Security Plan. (updated 1/28/07 BP)	Technical	Open
II-019	Wednesday, November 15, 2006 3:56:46 PM MST	Tuesday, December 12, 2006 8:25:18 AM MST	How will a county print poll books if the printer fails on the weekend before an election. This same problem could occur if a Branch or County loses power the weekend before an election, but gets it restored on Monday before the Tuesday Election. Two real life examples follow: I had to run the poll books here at SOS and then printed them in the neighboring county. (Lake and Mineral) I also ran them at SOS and printed them at SOS and then had them delivered to the county. (Elbert)	Technical	Open
II-028	Tuesday, December 12, 2006 2:00:39 PM MST	Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:29:42 PM MST	Once the SCORE system becomes the system of record, the State needs to give the counties some guidance on how to "retire" their legacy systems. This should include a listing of the data that will be maintained by the State as part of the data conversion process.	Business	Open
II-030	Sunday, January 7, 2007 3:42:37 PM MST	Tuesday, May 8, 2007 7:29:51 AM MDT	SCORE IV&V reviewed the final document for the Tech Arch Design to see if how/when patches are applied is adequately addressed (Finding 34 in State Review - Technical Architecture Design - 12-Dec-06 - V2.doc)Findings Include:On page 24 of the Final Technical Architecture Design, the last sentence under "Database Failure":Please see the section "Hardware planning" for understanding the process on how software/patches or releases are applied to the SCORE II architecture.Per the Table of Contents, the "Hardware Planning" section is pages 10-29. At no point is there a clear process for maintenance or emergency patching including the testing and migration of these patches.	IV&V Internal	Open
II-031	Thursday, January 4, 2007 10:26:08 AM MST	Tuesday, January 9, 2007 4:16:21 PM MST	Verification and Validation of the power Recpticol requiremtns for the HP Cabinets and the connection provided within the e-FOR3T and CDOS Data Centers should be validated prior to shipment and instalation of electiral connectors to insure proper allignemtn of recpticol requiremts and services.	Technical	Open
II-040	Friday, January 26, 2007 7:35:43 AM MST	Tuesday, January 30, 2007 2:31:16 PM MST	When the relationship between Saber and CDOS has expired, how will the confidential information (data) be disposed?	Business	Open
II-042	Wednesday, February 7, 2007 6:13:38 AM MST	Wednesday, February 7, 2007 6:13:38 AM MST	The Saber Quality Plan indicates that Saber will conduct periodic Quality Audits. They are currently not identified in the project schedule.	Schedule	Open
II-047	Monday, February 12, 2007 6:37:30 AM MST	Monday, February 12, 2007 6:37:30 AM MST	The typical DRP (Disaster Recovery Procedure) should be its own document and distributed across multiple independent documents. System Maintenance Guide contains the bulk of the true DRP type information. A DRP should be a step-by-step guide to continue business / recover from any type of disaster. It is the desire of the State to use this plan beyond the life of the project and well into the program.Saber has indicated they will provide this as part of the transition plan.	Technical	Open
			Numerous concerns about the lack of visible progress on development and implementation of the web based functionality of VPA, Early Voting and Vote Centers all sum to a high risk for the project. There are questions and clarifications that were raised at		

WDS WYANT DATA systems, inc.
WDS Confidential Draft Working Copy

II-068	Monday, February 19, 2007 5:52:15 AM MST	Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:31:54 PM MST	the very beginning of the project about the architecture for the web based interfaces. These have not been closed in the Technical Architecture document and as of this time, serious concerns exist as to whether Saber can deliver this functionality. At a minimum, the Technical Architecture, Security Plans, and Testing Plans should all have details of this implementation. The recent indication that this delivery would be delayed brings to a head the question of exactly who is working on this, and what progress has been made.	Technical	Open
II-069	Sunday, February 18, 2007 10:06:01 AM MST	Monday, February 19, 2007 11:05:45 AM MST	System Test Plan Finding 87The plan does not have a clear process for configuration set ups or changes to set ups that need to occur after intial set up. Non-code related hardware and software changes should be addressed in how changes will be made, tracked, migrated, tested and documented to minimize issues arising from these changes.	Technical	Open
II-070	Wednesday, February 28, 2007 10:59:28 AM MST	Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:31:33 PM MST	During the Hardware Installation Inventory IV&V it was discovered that the Network Hardware components had been secured at the front plate of the unite into the cabinet. This installation leaves a significant portion of the Network Component weight unsupported placing significant stress on the securing bracket and the Network Hardware component. This could pose significant risk during the movement of the cabinets, such as the transition form e-FOR3T hosting facility to the CDOS Hosting Center. It is recommended that additional support bracketing be applied to secure the network hardware components.	Technical	Open
II-071	Monday, March 19, 2007 10:48:44 AM MST	Monday, March 19, 2007 10:48:44 AM MST	The document stops short of providing a complete or industry standard SLA with penalties and rewards associated with the target metrics. It is not clear when or if an SLA will be provided. This may be associated with the Platinum Support Contract once the system is placed into production. Production needs to be defined as the period of time when one or more counties are up on the SCORE system.ASIM: 3/3/2007: We can define when production starts. Added the following line:SCORE II system status will be production, once at least one county has moved to production.Penalties and rewards will be based on the contract. State needs to know more about Platinum.First Paragraph - "Under the agreed upon service-level agreement" Needs to be clarified. Is this a separate SLA, part of the Platinum Support Agreement, or assumed as part of this agreement. ASIM 3/3/3007: This is part of the project, as agreed on the RFP.The SCORE IV&V will carry this as an issue until the Platinum Support Contract is documented.	Technical	Open
II-072	Monday, March 19, 2007 10:51:44 AM MST	Monday, March 19, 2007 10:51:44 AM MST	Security needs to be specifically included in the Descriptions of the Priority Levels. DED Section A specifies that SLA is to be defined for both data centers and counties. This is part of the minimum quality standard requirements all Saber deliverables must meet, and must be consistent on all Saber deliverables in progress and going forward. ASIM: 3/3/3007: It has already been agreed on the DED that the system availability plan will not address county issues, so why this issue has been raised? Isn't this redundant? The following identified as "Severe" issue: "Critical functionality failure exists with excessive risk to the ability of Colorado's election officials to use the SCORE II application system. System or application catastrophic failure has occurred or is very likely to occur imminently."This automatically covers security issue.This will be documented as an issues moving forward.	Technical	Open
II-075	Sunday, April 8, 2007 5:30:27 PM	Tuesday, April 10, 2007 2:59:21 PM	Saber delivered a Quality Management Plan and System Test Plan but the Saber Oregon and Colorado team clearly do not have a complete understanding of the roles that need to be performed, the use of terminology and artifacts to be delivered. The limited exposure to the documentation leads us to believe testing is performed but not according to any Industry Standard. The 2 Oregon testers have only been with Saber for less than 10	Business	Open

WDS Confidential Draft Working Copy

	MDT	MDT	months. Niether of the testers has voter management or election experience. The QTP is limited is only the test scripts generated manually and the values are hard coded. Since the risk exposure is unclear at this time, the IV&V Team needs to ensure all code is exercise and should execute all proposed test cases.		
II-089	Monday, May 21, 2007 1:46:09 PM MDT	Monday, May 21, 2007 1:46:09 PM MDT	The DED request a description of the processes employed to control the test effort. Test Plan needs more clarification on environment controls for the performance and security testing.Saber 4/6/07 - Issue will be revisited with next release of the updated test plan for performance and security testing.This will need to be carried forward as an issue as Saber is not addressing the subject in this release of the System Test Plan.	Business	Open
II-090	Wednesday, May 30, 2007 1:11:39 PM MDT	Tuesday, June 5, 2007 8:30:59 AM MDT	The section does not address the recent issue where by a counties image data may not be converted in the two week wave plan for rollout. This information is needed to make sure the State and counties agree on the process.ASIM 5/17/2007: following line added: During data collection for dry run cycle, the image collection has taken up considerable time. When counties are rolled into production SCORE II, the voter images/signatures for counties might take a little more time for having these available in SCORE II. Since these pertain to existing voter records, the delay in having these available in production SCORE II does not really impact production preparedness for SCORE II.The SCORE IV&V was looking for a statement that addressed the effort to be done in parallel with a subsequent waive. The inclusion of timing metrics or data could close this finding along with an understanding of a plan if all the images can not be migrated in the two week wave window.ASIM 5/24/2007: This is work in progress, Saber will provide this information soon.This finding will be carried as an issue and revisited with Saber during the weekly status meetings until closure can be reached.	Business	Open
II-091	Tuesday, May 29, 2007 11:58:52 AM MDT	Tuesday, August 28, 2007 12:51:25 PM MDT	State is verifying Scanners, Bar code readers and Label printers on the County equipment but using the Colorado FEQA architecture. The risk is IV&V has seen environment configuration differences between Saber location and Colorado (production) location. "The lights are on but no guarantee of working in the correct environment."	Business	Open
II-096	Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:10:38 AM MDT	Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:10:38 AM MDT	According to the delivered agendas, the following items should be covered during Training/UAT and were not: User Administration, User Roles, Election Payment, Election Worker, Election Close-out, Voter Activity, Mailings & Labels (Process/Receive), State Agency Interface Processing, Import tabulation data from voting machines. When will this be addressed? Saber Comments: Added a line to the document on Page 8 that states Saber will provide the finalized agendas for UAT 3 & UAT 4 separate from this document. Additional information does not cover the following specific items: User Administration / User Roles & Responsibilities Saber Comments: A working session with the state is needed to define the roles and privileges appropriate for SCORE II. CDOR State Agency Interfaces Saber Comments: This will be covered during final UAT. Document Updated Importing Tabulation Data Saber Comments: This may not be completed before Pilot Mock Election. Depending upon getting all required technical specifications from the tabulation device vendors, the development is expected to be complete before November 07. Each item will be tracked as issues moving forward. The Final UAT document should close all but the last issue dealing with the Voting Machine interface.	Business	Open
II-097	Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:11:28 AM MDT	Tuesday, August 7, 2007 7:17:37 AM MDT	UAT is focused on county users. UAT scope and depth for each module must include state users and their acceptance sign-off. When will this be addressed? Saber Comments: Added a line on Page 5 that states Saber will provide training for State level testing. Information was added to the document. This will be carried as an issue until the training occurs. The State needs to complete their policy / centralization discussions so Saber has a	Business	Open

WDS WYANT DATA systems, inc.
WDS Confidential Draft Working Copy

			complete list of "State" functions.		
II-099	Tuesday, August 14, 2007 2:39:50 PM MDT	Tuesday, August 28, 2007 12:37:32 PM MDT	Missing voter status verification and political party verification.ASIM 6/28/2007: counties are still advised to do this on the phone calls.Unclear as to how this is documented in the process. Will the subsequent sign-off have additional information in this area?Puneet 07/31/2007: The counties are advised to use the "Additional Comment" area to report these or any other issues not covered by the checklist. The checklist, however is not updated.This will be tracked as an issue going forward and verified as part of the "go-live" migration.	Technical	Open
II-100	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:00:22 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:00:22 AM MST	A specific schedule for transition should be created for each of the Support areas. A longer "parallel" support time is required depending on the area. The plan needs to account for the extensive lead time for acquiring State personnel.Puneet 12/03: Recommendations addedThe schedule of transition events needs to be coordinated with the State. These events will depend on the level and type of support the State will continue to acquire through Saber.Puneet 12/15: Saber agrees that the schedule of activities mentioned are tentative only and will be finalized as the state decides the level and type of support through Saber. Details of saber Platinum Support program have been provided for review. At this point, no further action can be taken on this finding.This will be tracked as an issue for review over after Statewide implementation.	Schedule	Open
II-101	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:01:09 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:01:09 AM MST	Item 1. Citrix Administration - Needs to include both the hardware and software versions of the Citrix Access Gateway. Puneet 12/03: This would depend upon the application architecture at the time. This is currently in the works to implement software solution while the vendor is working on resolving issue on hardware. This will be tracked as an issue moving forward. Saber should include the solution that they believe will be implemented.	Technical	Open
II-102	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:02:35 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:02:35 AM MST	Item 5, Network and Security Components is missing major task for: Monitoring and Log Analysis, an essential component of a deployed system that is mission-critical.Puneet 12/03: Review of logs would be covered under routine support and maintenance activitiesThis will be tracked as an issue and a risk moving forward.	Technical	Open
II-103	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:03:53 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:03:53 AM MST	There should be a design template document for any interfaces files importing into SCORE or export from SCOREPuneet 12/03: All import and exports are application functionalities included in RFP requirements, UAT findings and Spirit issue logs.12/05: As discussed, the process flow overview of the agency (CDOR, CDOC and CDPHE) data interface process has been added to the document.Additional information is required.Puneet 12/15: As per discussion, specific reference to Interface discussion during Application Development training and for sample files has been added.This will be tracked as an issue moving forward and verified during the application training transition.	Technical	Open
II-104	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:05:34 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:05:34 AM MST	This document does not detail the security of the password(s) in scripts and the scripts themselves. Who has permissions to the scripts and how are the scripts stored (Encrypted / Clear text)? Or document where the information will be provided. This needs to be addressed in the next security test.	Technical	Open
II-105	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:11:35 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:11:35 AM MST	This document does not detail if the batch / SFTP process is a push or a pull script with all the different agencies.	Technical	Open
II-106	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:31:28 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:31:28 AM MST	Need documentation for the extract process of all the names and addresses of all registered voters to send to the NCOA. Will this include all addresses associated with a voter including "snow birds" who only live in the State part of the year.	Business	Open
II-107	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:33:44	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:33:44	The file transfer is indicated "on a regular basis". What specifically is the frequency for this transfer?	Business	Open

	AM MST	AM MST			
II-108	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:35:02 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:35:02 AM MST	Need to document test strategies for Automated and Manual Processes. This can be addressed by again pointing to the document where the information will be contained.	Business	Open
II-109	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:38:24 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 8:38:24 AM MST	The process for reinstating a felon voter needs to be documented. I.e. parolee process. A description of how records are removed from all the interface tables needs to be addressed. This will be used to address application performance questions over the long term. This needs to be addressed in the SCORE training.	Business	Open
II-110	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:08:30 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:08:30 AM MST	Due to the fact that some of the counties are running in parallel with their legacy systems, there may be a need to re-migrate pilot county data in its entirety or for the 2007 election. This needs to be addressed in the Statewide Rollout planning moving forward.Puneet 10/23/07: The discussion around this issue was that SCORE will be the primary application and all data will be kept in synch between the systems. While Arapahoe county is running election from their legacy system, it was discussed that only the voting history for this one election may need to be re-migrated - on the understanding that voter records will be maintained. The open issue would still be around mapping the voting credit to the correct new voter records added in both systems.This will be closed and carried as an issue moving forward. The re-migration or additional migration may not be isolated to Arapahoe, depending on the results of the elections.	Business	Open
II-111	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:09:30 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:09:30 AM MST	Spirit contains several issues that have not been resolved for the pilot counties. These issues need to be addressed and closed.Puneet 10/23/07: Most open issues are in this status because pilot counties have not verified the updates in DV instance. These are around audit log entries primarily. The response was that they would verify the data after election. This data does not impact / affect the election or any transactions being executed on the voter records.This will be closed and carried as an issue moving forward.	Business	Open
II-112	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:15:47 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:15:47 AM MST	The Pilot and Group folders do not contain the current counties assigned (Huerfano, Lincoln, and Routt). Mesa will also need to be re-assigned. Puneet 10/02/2007: Saber and CDOS are working together on finalizing the statewide rollout schedule for remaining 55 counties. The factors to consider are Sequoia System availability, data migration volume and number of users to train on SCORE for each group.This will be carried forward as an issue until the schedule is finalized. The grouping of the files is not important, only that all the counties are accounted for.	Schedule	Open
II-113	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:17:29 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:17:29 AM MST	Lessons learned from the Conversion Detailed Design were not applied to the non-pilot counties. The counties have problems during their go-live conversion based on the issues discovered during the pilot. This should include a formal sign-off with no exceptions outstanding. Puneet 10/02/2007: Saber has worked with all counties statewide to resolve all reported issues for counties statewide. A few counties have few open issues and questions on translation where Saber and CDOS are working together and coordinating with individual counties.This will be carried forward as an issue. The lessons learned document needs to be updated to include any and all issues identified in the pilot rollout process.	Business	Open
II-114	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:19:05 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:19:05 AM MST	Several counties are known to have no images including Pueblo, Delores, Costilla and Saguache. The information provided in this deliverable indicates that Montezuma does not have images as well. This needs to be explained. Puneet 10/02/2007: Saber received images from Pueblo and Saguache. CDOS have also contacted Delores and Costilla and these counties would be scanning their documents directly into the SCORE application after production go-live. Montezuma had some issue with their images that all documents received were corrupt and could not be migrated. The county was communicated on this as well. We have	Business	Open

			contacted LEDS to work on re-collection and test the migration before production.Saber is not tracking this issue on their weekly status report. This issue needs some increased visibility so the issue does not affect any of the Statewide Rollout processing.The issue is now being tracked and addressed. This closes this finding.		
II-115	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:21:28 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:24:15 AM MST	Those fields that are requiring data changes to the legacy data do not indicate that a Voter Activity record is being written in SCORE. Puneet 10/02/2007: the audit logs are being created based upon (1) the history records received as part of legacy data and (2) voter records being filled in with missing / invalid required information like last name, DOB etc. The voter audit log module in the system identifies data of migration in the audit records as the date of conversion / roll over to SCORE production.The SCORE IV&V are verifying that the data has been added to voter activity records.This will be tracked as an issue moving forward. In a meeting with the State and Saber, the Elbert county record was provided. Saber indicated at the status meeting that Arapahoe's records were added to the database. This will be verified along with the other pilot counties in the future.	Business	Open
II-116	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:25:29 AM MST	Monday, January 7, 2008 9:25:29 AM MST	The activity is the last official deliverable related to Data Conversion. With the pending Votec extract changes, the data conversion and translation process will change for the Votec counties and the process needs to be revisited. Puneet 10/02/2007: There are still open questions on VOTEC data fields not included in the data extract - address library flags and multi-page TIFF. These are work in progress between CDOS, Saber and Votec. After receiving the details, this information will be migrated as "post processing" outside of the verified migration procedures / maps and would not change the existing procedure. Hence the validations would be minimal and focused on these changes and complete process would not require revisit / revalidation.The State and Saber are working through this issue and it has not been resolved to this point. Based on information provided by the pilot counties, the Votec Extract must be updated to accommodate the additional fields. Time must be allocated to testing the process before the Statewide Rollout begins in early December.This will be closed and tracked as an issue moving forward. The lessons learned in the pilot rollout and the county effort saved by implementing these changes can not be overlooked. A plan for implementing the Votec changes is needed.	Business	Open

WDS WYANT DATA systems, inc.
WDS Confidential Draft Working Copy

Vendor Initial Deliverable Metrics:

Deliverable	Deliverable Dates				Findings Status					Current
Name	Contract	DED	Draft	Final	High	Major	Moderate	Low	Observation	Status
Project Plan	10/23/2006	11/2/2006	12/6/2006	12/18/2006	8	38	92	58	32	
Agency Interface Plan	10/23/2006	11/1/2006	11/22/2006	12/13/2006	1	6	37	6	11	
Organizational Change Management Plan	10/23/2006	11/17/2006	2/2/2007	12/22/2006	0	0	6	2	2	
Project Web-Site	10/23/2006	11/6/2006	1/16/2007	12/22/2006	0	0	6	3	0	
System Acceptance Criteria	11/6/2006	11/13/2006	1/26/2007	1/4/2007	5	11	4	4	1	
System Test Plan	11/6/2006	11/13/2006	1/29/2007	12/15/2006	15	19	36	33	19	
Conversion Plan	11/13/2006	11/13/2006	1/26/2007	1/3/2007	4	2	27	9	9	
Disaster Recovery Plan / Business Continuity Plan	11/13/2006	10/30/2006	1/29/2007	12/27/2006	2	15	25	20	45	
Security Plan	11/13/2006	10/30/2006	2/12/2007	1/30/2007	26	8	18	9	5	
Training Plan	11/27/2006	11/5/2006	1/19/2007	12/26/2006	0	15	13	7	8	
Detailed Design for Colorado Customizations	12/4/2006	11/13/2006	2/7/2007	3/7/2007	1	6	32	12	0	
Implementation Plan	12/4/2006	11/30/2006	4/30/2007	5/22/2007	0	4	12	5	1	
Technical Architecture Design	12/8/2006	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	13	17	25	12	15	
Pilot Test Plan	12/18/2006	11/17/2006	2/1/2007	1/8/2007	2	7	21	13	6	
System Availability Plan	12/19/2006	11/17/2006	1/17/2007	2/12/2007	3	8	20	5	4	
Application Requirements	12/22/2006	11/17/2006	2/2/2007	2/15/2007	0	3	7	3	2	
Conversion Detail Design	2/9/2007	11/30/2006	3/26/2007	5/22/2007	0	0	13	0	1	
Prepare Pilot Counties	3/2/2007	1/31/2007	6/13/2007	7/6/2007	1	3	2	0	1	
Configure Software	3/30/2007	11/17/2006	4/12/2007	6/29/2007	0	1	0	0	0	
System Test	3/30/2007	11/13/2006	5/3/2007	7/19/2007	1	9	1	0	0	
Updated Detailed Design for Colorado Interfaces	3/30/2007	1/25/2007	2/15/2007	3/7/2007	0	8	12	3	2	
Updated Test Plan	3/30/2007	2/2/2007	3/22/2007	4/10/2007	1	16	14	1	4	
Integrated Development Environment	10/23/2006	11/3/2006	1/16/2007	1/30/2007	0	0	3	1	2	
Source Code	10/23/2006	11/7/2006	1/16/2007	1/3/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Duplicate Voter Check Criteria	TBD	12/5/2006	12/19/2006	2/23/2007	0	0	3	3	0	
Pilot Data Migration	4/20/2007	2/20/2007	5/15/2007	6/1/2007	0	1	7	0	0	
UAT Planning & Testing	3/27/2007	4/3/2007	5/4/2007	6/6/2007	0	2	7	4	0	
UAT / Pilot Training	4/20/2007	3/26/2007	7/10/2007	7/23/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Performance & Security Test	5/4/2007	2/8/2007	8/30/2007	9/10/2007	6	27	9	2	1	
Installation and Configuration Guide	2/1/2007	2/8/2007	5/31/2007	6/19/2007	2	6	8	1	1	
Verify Pilot Data Migration	3/7/2007	3/14/2007	6/28/2007	7/9/2007	0	9	3	3	2	
User Acceptance Test Plan	5/18/2007	7/11/2007	8/17/207	9/5/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Duplicate Voter Check	6/1/2007	3/19/2008	4/16/2008	4/28/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Test Conversion	6/1/2007	6/13/2007	8/8/2007	8/30/2007	0	4	3	0	0	
Regression & System Test / Production Build	6/15/2007	4/11/2007	8/15/2007	8/27/2007	0	3	5	1	0	
Documentation	3/16/2007	3/23/2007	6/22/2007	6/27/2007	0	5	6	19	0	
Pilot Counties Data Migration	7/9/2007	6/25/2007	5/1/2007	10/2/2007	0	3	2	0	0	
Train Pilot Users	7/20/2007	8/27/2007	9/14/2007	9/24/2007	0	3	2	0	1	
SCORE II Pilot Readiness	7/21/2007	6/19/2007	8/3/2007	8/24/2007	0	5	7	2	3	
Pilot County Survey	8/24/2007	9/19/2007	8/16/2007	11/2/2007	0	1	4	0	1	
Data Centers GAP Analysis	11/24/2006	11/14/2006	11/15/2006	12/18/2006	1	4	3	2	8	
Hardware Installation - CDOS	12/15/2006	12/22/2006	8/6/2007	8/14/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Hardware Installation - e-Fort	3/2/2007	12/22/2006	4/9/2007	5/11/2007	0	0	6	0	1	
Hardware Procurement Plan & Inventory	1/26/2007	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	3	3	7	0	8	
Software Inventory	1/26/2007	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	2	2	2	0	9	
County Hardware Survey	2/2/2007	1/30/2007	2/13/2007	2/28/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Report Status / Status Meetings	5/1/2007	N/A	N/A	6/30/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Prepare Statewide Counties	11/16/2007	6/27/2007	4/17/2008	4/24/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Final Acceptance Testing/Mock Election	NEW	3/24/2008	5/15/2008	6/6/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Transition Plan	12/24/2007	10/22/2007	12/12/2007	12/24/2007	2	11	8	3	0	
Train End Users	3/18/2008	9/27/2007	4/10/2007	4/17/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Help Desk Plan	3/28/2008	6/11/2007	7/20/2007	7/30/2007	1	7	10	1	6	
Implementation Roll Out	3/28/2008	10/5/2007	3/31/2008	3/31/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Maintenance and Support Plan	3/29/2008	12/10/2007	3/10/2008	3/18/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
SCORE II Readiness	3/30/2008	10/8/2007	6/2/2008	6/16/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Totals					100	292	528	247	211	
		Accepted Deliverable			Conditionally Accepted			Rejected Deliverable		

Vendor Current Deliverable Metrics:

Deliverable	Deliverable Dates				Findings Status					Current
Name	Contract	DED	Draft	Final	High	Major	Moderate	Low	Observation	Status
Project Plan	10/23/2006	11/2/2006	12/6/2006	12/18/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Agency Interface Plan	10/23/2006	11/1/2006	11/22/2006	12/13/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Organizational Change Management Plan	10/23/2006	11/17/2006	2/2/2007	12/22/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Project Web-Site	10/23/2006	11/6/2006	1/16/2007	12/22/2006	0	0	6	3	0	
System Acceptance Criteria	11/6/2006	11/13/2006	1/26/2007	1/4/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
System Test Plan	11/6/2006	11/13/2006	1/29/2007	12/15/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Conversion Plan	11/13/2006	11/13/2006	1/26/2007	1/3/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Disaster Recovery Plan / Business Continuity Plan	11/13/2006	10/30/2006	1/29/2007	12/27/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Security Plan	11/13/2006	10/30/2006	2/12/2007	1/30/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Training Plan	11/27/2006	11/5/2006	1/19/2007	12/26/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Detailed Design for Colorado Customizations	12/4/2006	11/13/2006	2/7/2007	3/7/2007	1	6	32	12	0	
Implementation Plan	12/4/2006	11/30/2006	4/30/2007	5/22/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Technical Architecture Design	12/8/2006	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Pilot Test Plan	12/18/2006	11/17/2006	2/1/2007	1/8/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
System Availability Plan	12/19/2006	11/17/2006	1/17/2007	2/12/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Application Requirements	12/22/2006	11/17/2006	2/2/2007	2/15/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Conversion Detail Design	2/9/2007	11/30/2006	3/26/2007	5/22/2007	0	0	3	0	0	
Prepare Pilot Counties	3/2/2007	1/31/2007	6/13/2007	7/6/2007	0	2	0	0	1	
Configure Software	3/30/2007	11/17/2006	4/12/2007	6/29/2007	1	9	1	0	0	
System Test	3/30/2007	11/13/2006	5/3/2007	7/19/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Updated Detailed Design for Colorado Interfaces	3/30/2007	1/25/2007	2/15/2007	3/7/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Updated Test Plan	3/30/2007	2/2/2007	3/22/2007	4/10/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Integrated Development Environment	10/23/2006	11/3/2006	1/16/2007	1/30/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Source Code	10/23/2006	11/7/2006	1/16/2007	1/3/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Duplicate Voter Check Criteria	TBD	12/5/2006	12/19/2006	2/23/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Pilot Data Migration	4/20/2007	2/20/2007	5/15/2007	6/1/2007	0	0	3	0	0	
UAT Planning & Testing	3/27/2007	4/3/2007	5/4/2007	6/6/2007	0	2	7	4	0	
UAT / Pilot Training	4/20/2007	3/26/2007	7/10/2007	7/23/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Performance & Security Test	5/4/2007	2/8/2007	8/30/2007	9/10/2007	6	27	9	2	1	
Installation and Configuration Guide	2/1/2007	2/8/2007	5/31/2007	6/19/2007	0	3	4	0	0	
Verify Pilot Data Migration	3/7/2007	3/14/2007	6/28/2007	7/9/2007	0	4	2	0	0	
User Acceptance Test Plan	5/18/2007	7/11/2007	8/17/207	9/5/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Duplicate Voter Check	6/1/2007	3/19/2008	4/16/2008	4/28/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Test Conversion	6/1/2007	6/13/2007	8/8/2007	8/30/2007	0	4	3	0	0	
Regression & System Test / Production Build	6/15/2007	4/11/2007	8/15/2007	8/27/2007	0	3	5	1	0	
Documentation	3/16/2007	3/23/2007	6/22/2007	6/27/2007	0	1	3	0	0	
Pilot Counties Data Migration	7/9/2007	6/25/2007	5/1/2007	10/2/2007	0	3	2	0	0	
Train Pilot Users	7/20/2007	8/27/2007	9/14/2007	9/24/2007	0	3	2	0	1	
SCORE II Pilot Readiness	7/21/2007	6/19/2007	8/3/2007	8/24/2007	0	5	7	2	3	
Pilot County Survey	8/24/2007	9/19/2007	8/16/2007	11/2/2007	0	1	4	0	1	
Data Centers GAP Analysis	11/24/2006	11/14/2006	11/15/2006	12/18/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Hardware Installation - CDOS	12/15/2006	12/22/2006	8/6/2007	8/14/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Hardware Installation - e-Fort	3/2/2007	12/22/2006	4/9/2007	5/11/2007	0	0	6	0	1	
Hardware Procurement Plan & Inventory	1/26/2007	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
Software Inventory	1/26/2007	11/14/2006	11/16/2006	12/26/2006	0	0	0	0	0	
County Hardware Survey	2/2/2007	1/30/2007	2/13/2007	2/28/2007	0	0	0	0	0	
Report Status / Status Meetings	5/1/2007	N/A	N/A	6/30/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Prepare Statewide Counties	11/16/2007	6/27/2007	4/17/2008	4/24/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Final Acceptance Testing/Mock Election	NEW	3/24/2008	5/15/2008	6/6/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Transition Plan	12/24/2007	10/22/2007	12/12/2007	12/24/2007	2	11	8	3	0	
Train End Users	3/18/2008	9/27/2007	4/10/2007	4/17/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Help Desk Plan	3/28/2008	6/11/2007	7/20/2007	7/30/2007	0	4	6	1	0	
Implementation Roll Out	3/28/2008	10/5/2007	3/31/2008	3/31/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Maintenance and Support Plan	3/29/2008	12/10/2007	3/10/2008	3/18/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
SCORE II Readiness	3/30/2008	10/8/2007	6/2/2008	6/16/2008	0	0	0	0	0	
Totals					10	88	113	28	8	
		Accepted Deliverable			Conditionally Accepted			Rejected Deliverable		

Risks:

RISKS										
RISK ID	ENTRY DATE	UPDATE DATE	ARTIFACT	IDENTIFIED RISK	PROJECT AREA	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	EXPOSURE	MITIGATING FACTORS / ACTIONS	STATUS
IVV - 2	12/21/2005	12/21/2007		The counties decide to stay with their respective legacy systems as opposed to migrating to the State Wide Voter Registration System. Similar to the rogue county problems from other states.	Business	3	3	9	Keep the counties informed on the decisions being made on the project. Allow the counties to once again participate in the selection process. It is critical that the State continues to send a consistent message to the counties and the state of the project. 8/24/2007 - Steering committee decision where Mesa County decided no to go forward. A total of nine counties are moving forward in various forms of rollout. 10/6/2007 - The uncertainty of Arapahoe's participation in the pilot needs to be clarified. 12/21/2007 - The decertification of the voting equipment could have negative SCORE implementation affects due to county resources involved in both projects.	Open
IVV-29	11/10/2006	11/9/2007		The Saber resources are being stretched thin by the acquisition of other states and or the process of going after additional states.	Schedule	2	3	6	Lock down resources early. Stay informed on the other state acquisition process. The proposed phased approach of software delivery is increasing the probability of this risk. Saber has indicated they have won Wyoming during the audit trip. Vote Center development is starting back up, competition for resources will most likely occur. Saber announced that their Colorado Functional Manager is being re-assigned to the Wyoming implementation project. Saber continues to provide the contract resources as needed for the critical phases of the project. 11/10/2007 - Additional Saber resources being added to the project to support the Statewide rollout.	Open
IVV-31	12/1/2006	9/1/2007		That the SCORE II Vote Center Application can be adequately stress tested during the UAT process. The system must be Stress tested according to industry standard in order to provide the necessary due diligence required by the counties that had issues during the last election. **Saber's performance testing results do not match the expectations established as part of the Updated Test Plan deliverable. Saber has used a tool that was not part of the proof of concept documentation. In addition, a load of only 700 users were tested on a part of the infrastructure forcing the results to be extrapolated for the full 5500. Saber does not have the necessary experience with the application to make this judgment.**	Technical	3	3	9	The meeting held of February 12th did not produce the desired results. Saber did not come to the meeting prepared to discuss the tools and approach as expected. The State will need to continue to put pressure on Saber to prove the 5500 user requirement. Mitigation Strategy: Independent Stress testing. The State has entered into negotiations with two companies to perform independent performance testing. 5/19/2007 - Saber has documented their Performance Testing Plans in the Updated Test Plan deliverable. Saber will conduct a "Proof of Concept" before the "official" Performance Test. 6/2/2007 - The State provided the IV&V with a copy of the two proposals for the Independent Performance Testing. 7/6/2007 - Performance and stress testing will be just in time due to product deliver, CDOS Data Center implications, and outside contract work. 8/3/2007 -Updated risk. 9/1/2007 - Saber has been asked to revisit the deliverable and perform another test. 11/03/2007 - The application has been adequately tested for the 2007 Election.	Open
IVV-36	1/28/2007	7/6/2007		During the Project Schedule DED review, Saber stated that another Load (Performance) Test would be added to the schedule. The current version only has one formal performance test scheduled (5/21/2007). Another test should be scheduled after or during the Pilot. Stress Tests independent of the standard Load/Performance Tests are also not specified in the Project Schedule. This should represent a Project Risk.	Schedule	3	3	9	Another load test needs to be planned, and executed after all counties are on the SCORE II system. 6/2/2007- Due to the increased Citrix license requirement due to Early Voting Requirements, this risk needs to be revisited. 7/6/2007 - The SCORE IV&V is proposing an audit based on the increase of the number of Citrix Licenses and the potential application impact.	Open
IVV-37	2/9/2007	6/2/2007		The SCORE IV&V could not find the info documented in the System Maintenance Guide of the DRP, Change Control Document of the DRP or the Technical Architecture Design. It is risky to assume that all Oracle or other software is fully patched. In addition, bugs or issues may occur over the duration of the project requiring patching. **In each case of a patch or bug for Oracle and other software it is not clear: 1.**How is a patch tested? 2. Where is a patch tested? 3.If it is tested in production, what downtime occurs? 4.How is the patch removed from production if a problem is found after its application? 5. What contingencies are made for bugs without patches? 6.Is there a policy to apply patch sets rather than one off patches whenever possible? If this information is going to be provided in the Configuration Management Plan it should be indicated.	Technical	3	3	9	The State must approve all changes to the SCORE system. Any proposed must be tested in a non-production environment. 6/2/2007 - The State needs to consider creating a "sandbox" environment for the purposes of testing SCORE infrastructure changes. This was discussed as part of the installation and configuration guide deliverable review.	Open
IVV-38	2/9/2007			The Disaster Recovery Plan scenarios provided by Saber fail to address any real world disasters e.g. catastrophic damage to a data center. This should have potential real world disaster scenarios.	Technical	2	3	6	The State needs to incorporate the SCORE II project in their Disaster Recovery Planning scheme. Within the State scenarios, a complete loss of a data center should be addressed.	Open
IVV-40	2/21/2007	11/9/2007	10/6/2007	Substantial security responsibility may fall into State's realm. Adherence to security best practices consistently found to be lacking, and even the most basic hardening steps such as scan/analyze/patch iterative refinements at a subsystem level are missing. Waiting until after 3/26/07 (per Wave Plan) to begin Independent Security Testing may be too late to patch holes uncovered at the device, system and network level for critical path milestones to be achieved.	Technical	3	3	9	Highly recommend appointing a State Security Officer for security officer 'perform', oversight, and governance duties. Independent Security Test will be used to address issues. 10/6/2007 - Based on the feedback from Saber on the IST, the number of issues that will not be implemented is minimal. 11/09/2007 - The initial IST tests were conducted. Follow-up continues with Saber on the Issues that are affecting the SCORE environment.	Open
IVV-46	7/20/2007			The lack of detailed design information on the Vote Center Web Module (Database Design, Technical Architecture, Disaster Recovery) limiting the States exposure to arguably the most critical component of the SCORE system. The information is needed to accurately test the system in the area of performance, security and disaster recovery.	Technical	3	3	9	Saber provide additional information and or a walkthrough of the final Architecture in lieu of the updated materials.	Open

RISKS										
RISK ID	ENTRY DATE	UPDATE DATE	ARTIFACT	IDENTIFIED RISK	PROJECT AREA	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	EXPOSURE	MITIGATING FACTORS / ACTIONS	STATUS
IVV-48	9/1/2007	12/15/2007		Citrix protocol errors continue to be a problem for the pilot counties. The errors have not been isolated despite the efforts of Saber and Citrix. The problems are beginning to erode at the counties confidence in the SCORE system.	Technical	3	4	12	Saber and the State need to have a "Sandbox" environment that would allow the testing of configuration changes to repair the problem. The State does not have a sandbox environment that includes the SCORE infrastructure. 10/6/2007 - The counties were polled and the larger counties continue to have problems despite the implemented changes. 11/03/2007 - Saber and Citrix met over the period to try to salvage the appliance Citrix Gateway before going back to the Software version. 11/24/2007 - Saber is has started conversion of Site 1 back to the Software version of the Citrix Gateway product. 12/15/2007: The last round of Citrix testing did not go as planned. These issues need to be addressed by Saber and a decision to move over to Site 1 according to the established deadlines in order to make the January deadline to be up on the full infrastructure.	Open
IVV-51	11/19/2007		November 2007 Election	Saber is not demonstrating the configuration management expertise that is expected to manage an enterprise architecture. The problem discovered on election day with the database setting being too low to handle the expected low is an real time example of this issue. Without some additional process and discipline the SCORE infrastructure will continue to be in question.	Technical	3	3	9	Require Saber to demonstrate the same level of configuration management discipline the SCORE infrastructure as is being applied to the SCORE application.	Open
IVV -52	11/19/2007		ISTP	Saber is not demonstrating their ability to monitor and respond to the SCORE log files. Their lack of a qualified tool and the lack of a response to know attacks puts the SCORE infrastructure at risk.	Technical	3	3	9	Saber acquires a tool for monitoring logs and continue to develop the "production" monitoring capabilities for the system.	Open
IVV-53	12/18/2007			The decertification of voting equipment will significantly change the way SCORE will be used in the November 2008 elections. The change could include legislation that would be adopted either during or immediately after the Statewide rollout planned for the first quarter of 2008.	Business	3	3	9	Adoption of an all mail ballot election for 2008 would simplify the use of SCORE for the November 2008 Elections	Open

Impact				
Probability	1 - Negligib	2 - Marginal	3 - Critical	4-Catastrophic
1 - Improbable	1	2	3	4
2 - Remote	2	4	6	8
3 - Probable	3	6	9	12
4 - Expected	4	8	12	16