

Agenda for Uniform Voting Systems Meeting

January 11, 2013

1. Welcome
2. Introductions
3. Purpose of the Committee (Handout)
4. Merle King (Kennesaw State University, GA) Presentation
5. Why pursue a Uniform Voting System? (Handout)
6. Project Plan (Handout)

Break

7. Review of February 29, 2012 UVS Meeting Minutes (Handout)

8. Issues for Advisory Committee Input

- Role of Technical Committee
- Calendar/Milestones
- Determination of Scope
- Funding
- RFI
- Requirements Development
- RFP
- Contract
- Requirements
- Timing
- Testing
- Training
- All Mail Ballot potential
- Statute and Rule changes
- Implementation steps
- Post implementation support
- Other

9. Next steps

- Appoint Technical Committee
- Produce and issue RFI
- Develop Requirements Document

10. Future Meeting schedule



Uniform Voting Systems

Merle S. King
January 11, 2013
Denver, CO

Disclaimer(s)

- Employed by Kennesaw State University
- Do not represent State of Georgia or the Office of the Secretary of State of Georgia
- Do not represent the EAC
- Opinions expressed are my own



The Georgia Experience

- 2000 Election in Georgia
 - 94K “Spoiled Ballots”
 - 20% “spoiled” in one county
- 2001 “21st Century Commission”
 - Two recommendations
 - Uniform Voting System
 - DRE based
- 2001 municipal elections used for 9 pilots
- Contract let in May 2002.



The Georgia Experience

- \$54 M initial outlay
- Two counties used in July primary
- Rest of the state in November 2002 election
- Statewide vendor support during first statewide election
- Added electronic pollbooks in 2005
- Added bar code scanners in 2009
- Multiple version updates



Election Official as IT Manager

- Attitude
- Knowledge
- Skill

What are the core competencies of election officials?



Election Official as IT Manager

- Attitudes
 - IT is an investment
 - IT goals must be congruent with organization goals
 - IT is pervasive and creates dependencies
 - IT is not a capital asset; it's "supplies"
 - Vendor partnerships necessary; vendor management mandatory
 - IT leadership is a meritocracy
 - Youth will be served

Election Official as IT Manager

- Knowledge
 - Must understand core technologies
 - Must understand system dependencies
 - Must be able to plan IT
 - Must understand IT audit principles
- Skills
 - Consider ROI of personal skills
 - Cultivate, delegate, sub contract



Innovation

- What are some of the features that states and localities are looking for in a “next generation” voting system?
 - backward/forward compatibility
 - true cost of ownership defined
 - horizontal & vertical integration
 - long service life
 - adaptive
 - multi-mode

Innovation

- How could the next generation of equipment make voting – and election administration – more efficient?
 - data collection and reporting
 - non-invasive security diagnostics
 - appropriate vendor roles
 - auditability

Emerging Challenge

In the future, we may not be able to separate the consequence of poorly performing election systems from well performing voting systems.



Systems

- A system is a collection of components (including subsystems) that transform inputs into outputs.
- Systems utilize feedback loops to monitor states and adjust performance
- Systems maintain interfaces with other systems

System Components

- Hardware
- Software
- Data
- People
- Procedures



Voting Systems

- Vote Capture
- Vote Tabulation



Election Systems

Systems used to collect, store, compute, analyze, report, and disseminate data related to the election process. Includes voter registration, digital pollbooks, ballot delivery and retrieval, election night reporting, voting systems, social media systems, etc.



Uniform Voting System

- Uniformity of voting systems is multi-dimensional. Within the jurisdiction there may be uniformity in
 - Technologies
 - Vendor (single-vendor)
 - Procedures
 - Administrative organization
- Uniformity enhances standards; standards are the metrics of quality enhancement

Uniform Voting System

- A voting system that consists of a defined set of vote-capture and vote-tabulation devices, consistent procedures applied across all jurisdictions, defined roles for participants in the administration of elections and standard and consistent formats for election data and the management of that data
- Uniformity is already imposed by statute or rule on many aspects of voting and election systems
- Uniformity is a matter of degree



Uniform Voting System

- There are no single-vendor systems
- Every voting system is a collection of proprietary, COTS and integrated sub systems which have multiple vendors (consider the supply chain for consumables)
- At best, a “single vendor” is an integrator
- Vendor dependency: the vendor is a portal to the jurisdiction’s voting and election systems



Uniform or Unified?

Are jurisdictions moving toward uniformity or unification of election systems?



Emerging Systems

Voter
Registration
Systems

- Online VR Systems
- Online VR Application Systems
- VR Reporting Systems
- Integration with GIS

Emerging Systems

Election
Reporting
Systems

- Statewide rollup
- County/Township/
Precinct level reporting
- Post election analysis
- Data harvesting
potential
- Integration with GIS

Emerging Systems

- Vote-by-mail
- UOCAVA Ballot Delivery Systems
- Internet Voting
- Social Media

Distributed
Voting
Technologies

Emerging Systems

- Ballot on Demand
- Electronic Pollbooks
- Voter ID initiatives
- Accessibility Enhancements
- Security Enhancements
- Training & Outreach

Operations
Enhancement

Mature Systems

- VVSG standard exists
- Testing protocols are established and vetted
- Local focus with some State level control
- Legacy issues
- Oldest technologies; mature market

Voting System
Vote Capture/Vote Tabulation

System Convergence

Voter
Registration
Systems

Election
Reporting
Systems

Distributed
Voting
Technologies

Operations
Enhancement

Voting System
Vote Capture/Vote Tabulation

Unified Election System

Voter
Registration
Systems

Election
Reporting
Systems

Distributed
Voting
Technologies

Operations
Enhancement

Voting System
Vote Capture/Vote Tabulation

Advantages of a statewide, uniform voting system

- The process and outcome of the needs assessment will illuminate unrecognized inefficiencies in your current system(s)
- The implementation of a uniform voting system requires the state to “clean up” conflicting, ambiguous, and unnecessary sections of the code and rules
- The transition becomes a tipping point where past and future relationships are evaluated and affirmed or reformulated
- Quality – “The standard of something as measured against other things of a similar kind; the degree of excellence of something”. Quality requires standards.

Advantages of a statewide, uniform voting system

- Training programs can be economically developed and delivered to:
 - Election officials
 - Poll managers
 - Poll workers
 - Voters

The entire state is being trained to implement a single set of procedures. In a highly mobile population, this increases the effectiveness of election administrators and the effectiveness of voters moving within the state

Advantages of a statewide, uniform voting system

- Small counties receive the same consideration and quality of service as large counties
- Integration of new products and innovations into the existing system is better planned, tested and controlled
- Disaster recovery and election continuity plans can leverage personnel and resources from surrounding counties
- Career paths for election administrators are broadened. Recruiting from within state becomes easier
- Communication to voters on critical issues is managed centrally – one message; no confusion

Advantages of a statewide, uniform voting system

- Research on anomalies can be centrally coordinated and resulting message is fast, accurate and relevant
- Economies of scale exist for negotiating services
- Vendor contracts are negotiated at the state/AG level – not with a county attorney and county procurement office
- Opportunities exist to create a firewall between vendors/products and the jurisdiction
- EMS support becomes doable
- Centralized ballot building becomes doable
- Emergency ballot printing becomes doable

Advantages of a statewide, uniform voting system

- Jurisdictions can shift from exception handling/mitigation to more strategic planning
- Interface with VR system is simplified
- State Certification and State Acceptance Testing models become more doable

Disadvantages of a statewide, uniform voting system

- Retirements
 - Election officials
 - Poll managers
 - Poll workers
- Shared vulnerability
- Lack of flexibility
- Inertia
- Unless well-managed, entire states rather than just counties can become captive to a vendor

Things to consider

- Define evaluation criteria early. How will success (failure) be measured?
- Define vendor role. What are the expectations for the vendor(s)? How will they be enforced?
- Determine what portions will be managed bottom-up and what portions, top-down



Things to consider

- Define the stakeholders – their roles and their expected contribution to the project. Participants must contribute
- Beware of scope creep. Define the boundaries of the project, validate them and stick to them
- Develop a strong RFP

Things to consider

- Timelines have to reflect election calendars. What is the optimal time to implement?
- Management of ECOs, maintenance and testing should be addressed – especially acceptance testing
- Ballot building and services

Things to consider

- Training is single most important control
- Retirement of current systems; disposal of new system
- Audit program of vendor performance and compliance
- Communication

Questions?

Merle King
mking@kennesaw.edu

Purpose Statement for Secretary of State's Uniform Voting System Advisory Committee

The Uniform Voting System Advisory Committee is charged with providing perspectives of County Clerks, County Commissioners, Legislators and Interest Groups to the Colorado Secretary of State for consideration in planning for and implementing a Uniform Voting System for the State of Colorado.

The Advisory Committee on a Uniform Voting System shall meet as necessary to make recommendations to the Secretary on the following items:

1. Definition of a Uniform Voting System
2. Determination of the Scope of the Uniform Voting System Project
3. Ongoing discussion, advice and review of issues such as timing, funding, training, statute and rule changes and post implementation support.
4. Assistance in development and implementation of the Uniform Voting System Project Plan
5. Evaluation of progress made in accordance with the Project Plan
6. Review of the work of the Technical Committee
7. Assistance in development of system requirements
8. Review of the Request for Information
9. Review of the responses to the Request for Information
10. Review of the Request for Proposals
11. Review of the Responses to the Request for Proposals
12. Review of the Implementation Plan
13. Review of the plan for supporting the equipment in the Uniform Voting System
14. Establishment of a permanent advisory panel (post selection) to advise the Secretary on ongoing issues that may arise during and after implementation begins
15. Provide perspectives on other issues as necessary.

Why A Uniform Voting System in the State of Colorado?

Why is the State of Colorado looking to create something different than what we have now?

- Current Colorado vote capture and vote tabulation equipment is aging.
- Much of the equipment in Colorado was bought with the implementation of HAVA in the 2002-2006 timespan and is, or will be, ready for replacement in the near future.
- A hard 2014 deadline for the replacement of certain systems is in effect.
- Mergers and changes in vendors have resulted in existing companies supporting products created and previously supported by their competitors.
- Vendor and internal capacity for support for various system components varies by county.
- Turnover in staffing results in a loss of institutional knowledge
- Different system capabilities may result in (at least a perception of) differing qualities of service to voters from county to county.

See attachments:

- ***Overview of Voting and Vote Tabulation Related Equipment for State of Colorado***
- ***Summary of Voting and Ballot Tabulation Related Equipment, by Vendor***

Why is the Secretary of State leading the effort to implement a Uniform Voting System?

- The Secretary of State is, by law, generally responsible for the conduct of Elections in a uniform manner in the State of Colorado.

Minutes from 2-29-2012 Meeting on Uniform Voting System

Attendees”

Merle King	Facilitator
Sheila Reiner	Mesa County
Josh Liss	Jefferson County
John Vicino	Arapahoe County
Stephen Gentry	Larimer County
Doreen Belfry	Larimer County
Donetta Davidson	Clerks’ Association
Rudy Santos	Weld County
Jimmy Flanagan	Denver County
Paul Casper	Denver County
Mike Lyons	Douglas County
Wayne Munster	SOS
Jerome Lavato	SOS
Danny Casias	SOS

County Introductions

Every county represented expressed that there is a high percentage of electors who have chosen to vote by mail.

Each county that the rising cost of conducting elections is concerning. Especially polling place election once every two years.

Some counties expressed that the age of there tabulation equipment is concerning.

One county expressed a desire to obtain a high speed tabulation solution since the number of paper ballots is increasing due to high PMIV numbers.

Stake holders identified

County Clerks

Electors

 Accessibility community

 UOCAVA

 Military

Ex-patriots

Taxpayers

Secretary of State

Political Parties/Unaffiliated

Voting System vendors

 Manufacturing time

 Services provided

Campaigns both major and minor parties

USPS

Activists

 Want better Auditing

 Technology focused

 Accessibility community

Luddites (opposed to technology)

Advocacy groups

 League of women voters

 Language

 Voter rights groups

Poll workers

Legislature

Campaigns both major and minor parties

USPS

Process

Requirements determination

Who will participate in requirements gathering?

Implementation of a uniform voting system should not be hurried. It should be thoughtful and deliberate.

In order to maintain continuity in the voting system the vendor should transfer the systems technology to the county in the event the vendor is no longer a support an element of the voting system.

What entity is monetarily responsible for the acquisition of the uniform voting system?

What technology will be needed as PMIV numbers increase? Will the state move to an all mail ballot delivery system or continue to have a polling place election once every two years for General Elections.

Legislative language should be relatively broad with the ability to address details in SOS rule making. Some detail will be needed in legislation such as the implementation timeline.

Voting system(s) should be tested to a standard. The legislature should set minimum standards and SOS rule should provide the details.

Counties should provide the SOS with proposed rules or requirements for implementation and use of a uniform voting system. After receiving the county input the SOS can begin the rulemaking process.

Acquisition of a uniform voting system

Attention should be given to the total cost of ownership of the system. Cost is duration of the contract not just the purchase price.

How much support will be provided by the voting system vendor? What is the duration and cost of support.

Who are the parties of the contract, state only, county only or county and state?

The vendors supply chain must be known. For example, if vendor no longer supports a component of the voting system can the users find another source for that component to extend the life of the voting system?

The system should be capable to integrate future upgrades or changes to technology. For example, if an operating platform becomes obsolete the system should allow for an upgrade to a new platform.

The vendor should allow users access and ownership of the intellectual property. A user should be able to use portions of the vendors operating manual to create training documentation for employees, election judges and the voting public.

Best practices for software maintenance should be developed.

Users should maintain ownership of all data produced.

Since contracts with voting system vendors are unconventional more scrutiny is required. It would be beneficial to review other states similarly situated to learn form their experiences.

Implementation

Voting system must be tested for conformance to Colorado election practices and requirements.

There is a need for practical test protocols that take into account the timing of the acquisition of the system in relation to the election cycle. Even years are not the time to implement testing and deployment.

Confidentially of the ballot must be maintained.

The voting system must be able to stay in compliance with shifting state and federal law.

Software revisions must be controlled. All users must be operating with the same software version.

Education and training is important for a successful and well executed deployment of a uniform voting system.

Election Official Training

All materials concerning the voting system must be revised when changes are made. Inconsistencies among users will create uncertainty of the process.

Expert level materials and operating methods should be supplied to the users of the sytem.

System level architecture should be provided and reviewed.

Materials should be provided at an appropriate time in the election cycle. This should be well be fore the election cycle begins.

Changes to training materials must be universal or the discrepancies will reflect on all users.

Training materials should be Colorado specific.

Voter education is a critical component of a successful uniform voting system.

Harmonization of the affected election code and SOS rules will be required.

How and by whom is acceptance testing performed?

Trusted build must be installed on all equipment that requires it.

What infrastructure will be required to implement the uniform voting system? Expanded IT support or communication lines? What IT support can be reasonably expected for the users.

Identify and communicate best practices.

Sustainability

Vendor must have a demonstrated record of strategy and implementation.

Vendor's key employees who know the policies and the product must be identified.

What are the current and future contract costs?

A contingency plan must be devised for vendor discontinuance of a component of the system.

System should allow for the addition of new technology.

The most important aspects of the system for all users should be identified and all users involved in development.

Requirements should be developed by the users for a top down design.

For acceptance of the uniform voting system the user's needs must be met.

Pilots and focus groups should be utilized for a successful project.

Users can not be affected by unexpected events that adversely affect budgets or election cycles.

Take Away

Why a 2014 deadline is impractical

2012 requires users to conduct redistricting and a presidential election. Users are not able to participate in the process due to these factors.

2013 should be the period to research and assess a very complex project. Vendor preparedness should be assessed at this time as well.

2014 should be the time period for research, RFP and selection of the uniform voting system.

2015 should be the time period for pilot studies of the uniform voting system.

2016 pilots and study of the uniform voting system, presidential election.

2017 full deployment of the uniform voting system.

Legislation should include a grandfather clause for existing voting systems

County budgeting process varies by county. Some counties are on a two year cycle so they can not change the budget during those two years.

Possibility of a sales tax increase to fund election in the state of Colorado. It is anticipated this would be a minor increase.

Is the current trend of PMIV going to peak?

An analysis of the Colorado voting model should be conducted to understand the how a uniform voting system may affect it.

Users are vital to the decision making process. Users can be more effective in identifying goals, strengths, constraints and strategies.

There must be strategy in place if a uniform voting system is not implemented. If there is not a vendor positioned to meet Colorado standards what does the state and users do next.

Implementation strategy needs to take into account the higher level of scrutiny from some users and less for other users.

The legislation should allow counties to use third party support if they choose. Users should have the option to maintain in house control of the voting system and its functions.

There should be an exploration for a center to support voting system functions. What is the funding source and who has oversight of the center?

Overview of Voting and Vote Tabulation Related Equipment for State of Colorado January 2013

The State of Colorado, with 64 individual counties responsible for conducting elections has a wide array of equipment for voting, vote tabulation, voter registration entry, voter registration scanning, ballot scanning and signature verification. Counties are responsible for the purchase and maintenance of such equipment.

Voting Machines and Vote Tabulation Equipment

The equipment in Colorado for voting and vote tabulation is provided by four voting equipment vendors. There are more than a dozen different combinations of equipment from these vendors in place in counties throughout the state.

The vendors supplying equipment in Colorado are:

- Election Systems and Software (ES&S)
- Hart
- Sequoia/Dominion
- Premier (Serviced by both ES&S and Dominion)

The total number of identified pieces of voting and tabulation equipment, based on reporting from the Counties to CDOS is 9,908.

ES&S represents	5% of the Counties 15% of Colorado Voters 4% of the voting and tabulation equipment
Hart Represents	70% of the Counties 25% of Colorado Voters 36% of the voting and tabulation equipment
Sequoia/Dominion Represent	6% of the Counties and 26% of Colorado Voters 37% of the voting and tabulation equipment
Premier Represents	19% of the Counties 34% of Colorado Voters 22% of the voting and tabulation equipment

The equipment identified in this document includes electronic voting machines (DRE), optical scan ballot readers (central count and precinct count) voter authorization equipment, DRE printers and computer units used exclusively for voting and vote tabulation. It does not include laptops or computer units used to access the electronic pollbook during Early Vote and from Vote Centers on Election Day.

We have not yet gathered equipment information for equipment used for signature verification processes, whether performed by individuals or via an automated evaluation system.

Equipment used by the Counties to perform SCORE functions is not considered to be a part of the Uniform Voting System project.

**Summary of Voting and Ballot Tabulation Related Equipment by Vendor
State of Colorado**

Equipment Vendor	Equipment Type	Quantity	Leased Units included
ES&S	DRE	386	3
	Optical Scan M650	7	2
	PC	5	
Vendor Total		398	
Hart	DRE	1,123	
	Judge's Booth Controller	634	
	DRE Printers	1,459	
	Optical Scanner	209	
	PC	167	
Vendor Total		3,592	
Premiere	DRE	1,314	
	DRE Card encoders	595	
	AccuVote Optical Scanners	288	
	PC	19	
Vendor Total		2,216	
Sequoia	DRE	944	411
	DRE Printers	1,463	
	Card Activators	1,158	
	400 Optical Scanners	11	
	Insight Optical Scanners	74	
	PC	52	
Vendor Total		3,702	
STATE TOTAL		9,908	416

Contact Information for Uniform Voting Systems Advisory Committee

Name	Title	Email	Phone	Extension
Staff Members				
Judd Choate	State Director of Elections	judd.choate@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6301
Wayne Munster	Deputy Director of Elections	wayne.munster@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6303
Al Davidson	Project Lead	al.davidson@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6361
Christi McElveen	Voting Systems Coordinator	christi.mcelveen@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6340
DJ Davis	Deputy Director of Elections	dj.davis@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6607
Stefanie Mann	Legal Specialist	stefanie.mann@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6341
Danny Casias	Voting Equipment SME	danny.casias@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6356
Jerome Lovato	Voting Equipment SME	jerome.lovato@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6355
Advisory Committee Members				
Wayne Munster	Committee Chair	wayne.munster@sos.state.co.us	303-894-2200	6303
Wayne Williams	El Paso County Clerk	waynewilliams@elpasoco.com	719-520-6202	
Sheila Reiner	Mesa County Clerk	sheila.reiner@mesacounty.us	970-244-1714	
Deborah Johnson	Denver County Clerk	debra.johnson@denvergov.org	720-913-8666	
Connie Ingmire	Morgan County Clerk	cingmire@co.morgan.co.us	970-542-3521	3522
Representative Lois Court	Democratic Legislator	loiscourt@msn.com	303-866-2967	
Representative Janak Joshi	Republican Legislator	janakjoshi.house@gmail.com	303-866-2937	
Faith Gross	Legal Center for People with Disabilities	fgross@thelegalcenter.org	303-722-0300	
Deb Gardner	Boulder County Commissioner	dgardner@bouldercounty.org	303-441-3500	
Donetta Davidson	Executive Director, County Clerks' Association	davidsondonetta@gmail.com	303-948-0171	

**PROJECT PLAN
UNIFORM VOTING SYSTEM**

**COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1700 BROADWAY
DENVER, CO 80290**

CREATED NOVEMBER 14, 2012

UPDATED JANUARY 8, 2013

INTRODUCTION

The Colorado Department of State (CDOS) wishes to move forward with project initiation on procurement of a state-wide uniform voting system (UVS). This project will result in Colorado Counties utilizing voting equipment such as precinct scanners, central count scanners, DREs, ballot on demand technology, and signature verification equipment from a list of approved options. Implementation of UVS provides for consistent procedures, defined roles, technical support by centralized personnel or a vendor(s), greater opportunity for cooperation and/or collaboration between counties, and most importantly uniformity for Colorado voters.

Planning for the UVS project, including requirements gathering will begin in early 2013. An Advisory Committee will be empaneled and provide recommendations to CDOS regarding specifications, process, and vendor selection. Staff recommends that CDOS release an RFI before beginning the RFP process. Full implementation will be in place as early as the summer of 2014. Implementation has already essentially begun with the statewide use of Election Night Reporting, Everyone Counts for electronic ballot delivery for UOCAVA voters, and Ballot on Demand for the 2012 General Election.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Deputy Director Wayne Munster, will have overall authority and responsibility for managing and executing the UVS.

PROJECT SCOPE

The scope of the UVS project includes the planning, design, development, testing, purchasing, certification by a VSTL, acceptance testing, inventory, implementation, training, and transition into a statewide uniform voting system. The scope of this project also includes completion of all documentation, manuals and necessary training aids. Initial project completion will occur when implementation rules are effective and after the creation of a list of certified equipment for use in the state. However, UVS will remain an organic project that is constantly managed, maintained, supported, and developed at the state level in order to ensure future technological, legislative, and procedural advancements are properly implemented at the county level. The UVS team will function as a resource for training and support to counties and, further, to ensure voting system uniformity.

A comprehensive UVS will include procurement at the State level of DREs, precinct count scanners, central count scanners, ballot marking devices, ballot on demand equipment, electronic UOCAVA ballot delivery options, signature verification systems, and warehouse space in Denver and regionally for parts and equipment. (Regional warehousing will not be as necessary if Colorado moves to a 100% PMIV system.) All devices and practices must integrate seamlessly into one “system” to ensure consistent procedures, products and voter experience.

MILESTONE LIST

The chart below lists the major milestones for the UVS project. This chart is comprised only of major project milestones such as completion of a project phase or gate review. There are smaller milestones which are not included on this chart, and are presented in the Timelines section. Any approved changes to these milestones or dates will be communicated to the project team by the Project Manager.

Milestone	Description	Date
Project Kick-Off	UVS project begins. CDOS team holds initial meeting. Roles and responsibilities are assigned and requirement gathering begins.	1/3/13
Seat Advisory Committee	Appoint members to the panel and schedule public meetings	1/4/13
UVS Advisory Committee initial meeting	The first meeting of the Advisory Committee will provide an overview of the project and timelines.	1/11/13
Appoint Technical Advisory Committee	TAC will assist with requirements matrix and system requirements development	1/14/13
Requirements Gathering Begins	All requirements for UVS must be determined to base selection criteria upon	3/15/13
Issue RFI	Invite possible vendors to share what capabilities their systems have	3/31/13
Issue RFP	Release comprehensive system requirements	8/1/13
Select Vendors and Equipment	The Secretary will select approved equipment and vendor(s).	12/31/13
Develop specific implementation plan and schedule	CDOS will work with Counties to develop a plan and schedule for implementation of UVS.	1/2/14-6/30/14
Begin implementation of new equipment and systems	CDOS or a third party provides centralized programming, training, services, and support to counties	7/1/14

KEY STAFF

Scott Gessler	Project Sponsor	Stefani Mann	Legal Specialist
Judd Choate	Director of Elections	Danny Casias	Voting Equipment SME
Wayne Munster	Deputy Director	Jerome Lovato	Voting Equipment SME
DJ Davis	Deputy Director	TBD	Consultant from existing UVS state
Christi McElveen	Voting Systems Coordinator	TBD	Logistics/Implementation Manager
Al Davidson	Project Lead	TBD	Attorney General staff

FUNDING

Questions related to funding must be addressed early in the project. First, CDOS must determine if funding at the state level will be made available to purchase, maintain, license or support equipment.

CDOS must also determine whether to host or outsource ballot programming and technical support. In Georgia, where UVS has been implemented for several years, the State contracts with Kennesaw State University to provide support to county clerks. Kennesaw State University, in effect, operates as a separate ‘service vendor’ for specific tasks. In Louisiana, where elections have been run by the state and UVS was implemented in 2005, the state provides all programming and support while also controlling all inventories.

Funding Decision Items	Reason for Decision
Will a third party vendor be used for county support?	If a third party is not utilized, CDOS must increase and train staff to fulfill counties’ needs
Who pays for purchasing, licensing, and maintenance of equipment?	Affected agencies must budget appropriately
Will funds be made available to incentivize project participation?	Funds appropriated to equipment replacement or purchase will greatly increase participation. If funding for replacement is provided, determination as to equipment ownership must be made
Should a dedicated project manager be retained by CDOS?	CDOS staff may not have bandwidth or expertise for certain tasks, such as drafting the RFI and RFP, evaluating proposals, writing responses, ensuring contracts are drafted and signed in a timely fashion, acceptance testing, delivery, inventory, training, and support for such a wide variety of systems

PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Staff proposes issuing both an RFI and an RFP prior to equipment selection. Technologies as yet unknown to CDOS may be available to create additional ease of use, transparency, accuracy or mechanical reliability. Once RFI responses are received, a comprehensive requirements matrix can be developed and issued through a formal RFP. Proposals will be reviewed by the Advisory Committee, which will make a recommendation to the Secretary. The Secretary will then create the approved equipment list and begin negotiations with selected vendors.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

To be successful, staff proposes to establish an Advisory Committee responsible for making recommendations on systems, components, and timelines to the Secretary. The Advisory Committee would be seated throughout implementation and continue through the life of the program. It will review RFI and RFP responses, hold public meetings, and make formal recommendations. In order to have an effective group of decision makers, staff recommends the Advisory Group have no more than 9 members plus the Chair as follows:

Name	Represents
Wayne Munster	CDOS, Chair
Faith Gross	Legal Center for People with Disabilities
Wayne Williams	El Paso County Clerk
Sheila Reiner	Mesa County Clerk
Deborah Johnson	Denver County Clerk
Connie Ingmire	Morgan County Clerk
Donetta Davidson	Executive Director, County Clerks Assoc.
Representative Lois Court	Appointed by Democratic Leadership
Representative Janak Joshi	Appointed by Republican Leadership
Deb Gardner	Boulder County Commissioner

TIMELINE

4 Jan 2013 -Project Kick-Off

UVS project begins. CDOS project team holds initial meeting. Roles and responsibilities are assigned and requirement gathering begins.

4 Jan 2013- Advisory Committee Seated

Advisory Committee members are appointed. Organizational meeting is scheduled.

11 Jan 2013 – Advisory Board Initial Meeting

31 March 2013-RFI Issued

CDOS releases Request for Information to interested parties. The RFI will contain broad requirements and visions.

2 Apr 2013-Rule Drafting

Project team works with Policy and Legal units on preliminary draft rules. Initial rules will address topics such as grandfathered equipment, timelines for purchases, and roles and responsibilities of CDOS and county staff

1 May 2013 RFI Review

Advisory Committee meets to review RFI information and RFP Requirements Matrix is created

10 June 2013 Stakeholders Meeting

CDOS hosts meeting of stakeholders and interested parties to discuss UVS plan and concerns. Attendees might include media, members of the legislature, and voting equipment vendors.

1 Aug 2013-RFP Issued

CDOS issues RFP to interested parties.

2 Jul 2013-County Purchases Suspended

Counties may not purchase any new voting equipment without specific CDOS approval

18 Jul 2013-Initial Rulemaking Hearing

3 Sep 2013-RFP Response Review

Advisory Committee and project team review proposals and prepare to make procurement recommendations to the Secretary.

5 Dec 2013-Procurement Recommendation

Advisory Committee presents recommendation to the Secretary.

31 Dec 2013-Secretary Selects Vendors

Secretary reviews Advisory Panel recommendations and selects approved vendors.

18 Mar 2014-Contract Negotiations Begin, Warehouse Procurement, Staff

CDOS and AG staff begins contract negotiations with all selected vendors. It is likely that 3 or more vendors will be selected to provide various pieces of systems including, voting equipment, signature verification and ballot on demand. Warehouse space in Denver and regionally will be procured and prepared for use. Additional state “Operations and Programming” or third party staff will be hired/contracted.

1 Jul 2014-Contingency Planning, Purchasing, Etc.

CDOS begins to plan for situations where vendors may dissolve, be acquired or otherwise discontinue project support. Purchasing of equipment will proceed, along with acceptance testing, state or third party training by vendor, delivery, and inventory.

1 Jan 2021-Deadline for legacy equipment replacement

All counties must have approved equipment in place. Grandfathered equipment is no longer permissible.

STAFFING MANAGEMENT PLAN

Decisions regarding project management and county support post-implementation determine CDOS staffing needs.

Once the UVS has been deployed, CDOS should ensure counties have a centralized support structure. Implementation may allow centralized ballot design and creation, election management/tabulation set up, routine and in-field support, verification and installation of trusted build, and troubleshooting. Currently, there are nearly 10,000 pieces of voting equipment in Colorado. There are three primary methods by which support can be provided.

- A. Counties are responsible – This scenario keeps in place the status quo. Counties would be required to contract directly with the vendor(s) supplying voting system components. Counties are responsible for costs and each county has its own, potentially unique, contract with the vendor.
- B. Centralized third party – CDOS contracts with a vendor or university to provide needed support. Counties or CDOS are responsible for costs, and service levels are uniform across the state.
- C. Centralized at CDOS – CDOS staff provides all necessary equipment, maintenance, ballot layout, programming, and support to counties at no cost.

	PRO	CON
A. County Responsible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County has autonomy • Reliance on CDOS minimal • CDOS costs minimal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County has full responsibility • No consistency in fees or service levels • Vendor determines priorities and may put small counties at the bottom. Larger counties potentially receive more attention • CDOS has no oversight of contracts, practices or procedures • Vendor may be unprepared for a statewide implementation, as evidenced in Ballot on Demand project • No buffer for the counties between them and the vendor. Vendor may be motivated by profit, not necessarily best solutions

<p>B. Centralized Third Party</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counties receive uniform services and costs • Reliance on CDOS resources minimal • Vendor/ University responsible for deploying or adding resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDOS has limited oversight • Responsibility for errors is unknown • Cost structure is unknown • Vendors control timelines of service/product delivery
<p>C. CDOS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counties receive uniform services • No cost to counties • Increased steering and control by CDOS • All counties treated equally and protected from vendor priorities • Goodwill established between state and counties as the state commits itself to success in every county • Accuracy and integrity ensured by the state. State can delegate responsibilities to local government, rather than a vendor • Problem management oversight by state, not at discretion of vendor • Colorado will always come first. Vendors that have interests in other states often put them first. With a state controlled system, this will no longer be a problem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional CDOS staff would be needed • Responsibility for error with CDOS in all aspects of election (ballot design, ballot printing, tabulation, signature verification levels) • Warehouse space must be procured in Denver and regionally <p>Cost to CDOS significant, funding sources not currently identified</p>