

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. 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 up, running and load balanced by 2/4/2008 and a monitoring period through the beginning of March. This means the SCORE infrastructure would be “stabilized” before the start of the Group 3 rollout.
- Citrix has provided feedback to Saber on the CAG issue progress. Saber provided the information in the period and it is currently being evaluated by State and IV&V. The plan currently is to test the suggestions once Site 2 has been implemented as the primary site running the CSS.
- The 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 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 over the period 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 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 State is pushing for the January 7th timeframe, Saber is indicating that the earliest they will have the release ready for review is the week January 14th. 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.
- 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 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 release 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 |
| Risk / Issues Maintenance | 12/14/2007 | High |
| Priority 3.X Emergency Release Testing & Evaluation | 12/17/2007 | High |
| Ask Saber Conference Call | 12/18/2007 | High |
| SCORE Task Force Meeting | 12/19/2007 | High |
| IT Users Group Meeting | 12/19/2007 | High |
| Group 1 Data Verification Daily Support Calls | 12/21/2007 | High |
| SCORE IV&V Audits (Licenses, Performance, Code Review) | 12/21/2007 | High |
| Continue to respond to Saber Deliverables and Activities (DED's) | 12/21/2007 | High |
| Group 1 / Week # 2 Rollout Training Attendance | 12/21/2007 | High |
| Plan for Next Week | | |
| Activity / Task | Date | Priority |
| Risk / Issues Maintenance for OIT Meeting | 12/8/2007 | High |
| SCORE Task Force Meeting (CDOR Interface Walkthrough) | 12/26/2007 | High |
| SCORE IV&V Audits (Licenses, Performance, Code Review) | 12/21/2007 | High |
| Continue to respond to Saber Deliverables and Activities (DED's) | 12/21/2007 | High |

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.

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: 3 Pass, 1 In-Process and 80 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% |

Issues: (Last Reviewed on 12/08/2007)

| 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 3:10:59 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 requirements for the HP Cabinets and the connection provided within the e-FOR3T and CDOS Data Centers should be validated prior to shipment and installation of electrical connectors to insure proper alignment of reciprocal requirements 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 | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|---|--|-----------|------|
| II-068 | Monday, February 19, 2007 5:52:15 AM MST | Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:31:54 PM MST | <p>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.</p> | Technical | Open |
| II-069 | Sunday, February 18, 2007 10:06:01 AM MST | Monday, February 19, 2007 11:05:45 AM MST | <p>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 initial 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.</p> | Technical | Open |
| II-070 | Wednesday, February 28, 2007 10:59:28 AM MST | Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:31:33 PM MST | <p>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.</p> | Technical | Open |
| II-071 | Monday, March 19, 2007 10:48:44 AM MST | Monday, March 19, 2007 10:48:44 AM MST | <p>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.</p> | Technical | Open |
| II-072 | Monday, March 19, 2007 10:51:44 AM MST | Monday, March 19, 2007 10:51:44 AM MST | <p>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.</p> | Technical | Open |
| II-075 | Sunday, April 8, 2007 5:30:27 PM | Tuesday, April 10, 2007 2:59:21 PM | <p>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</p> | Business | Open |

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|----------|------|
| | MDT | MDT | months. Neither 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 exercised 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 | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | Business | Open |
| II-090 | Wednesday, May 30, 2007 1:11:39 PM MDT | Tuesday, June 5, 2007 8:30:59 AM MDT | <p>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."</p> <p>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.</p> | Business | Open |
| II-091 | Tuesday, May 29, 2007 11:58:52 AM MDT | Tuesday, August 28, 2007 12:51:25 PM MDT | <p>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</p> | Business | Open |
| II-096 | Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:10:38 AM MDT | Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:10:38 AM MDT | <p>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</p> | Business | Open |
| II-097 | Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:11:28 AM MDT | Tuesday, August 7, 2007 7:17:37 AM MDT | <p>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</p> | Business | Open |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---|--|--|-----------|------|
| II-099 | Tuesday, August 14, 2007 2:39:50 PM MDT | Tuesday, August 28, 2007 12:37:32 PM MDT | complete list of "State" functions. 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 |
|--------|---|--|--|-----------|------|

Vendor Initial Deliverable Metrics:

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