

Requirement #	Suggested change/comment (ES&S suggested changes/comments in Yellow highlighting)
A-34	<p>Allow authorized users to electronically adjudicate ballots <u>manually or electronically</u> to reflect voter intent, while retaining the originally marked ballot image.</p> <p>Note: Please explain the process and time efficiency of ballot adjudication using your system.</p>
A-49	<p>Export <u>or create</u> each report in PDF, XLS, TXT, EML and CSV formats.</p>
A-69	<p>Provide statistics of batches (e.g. number of ballots in each batch, number of batches saved <u>pending</u>, number of batches deleted, <u>and</u> number of batches saved).</p> <p>Note: Does your system have a batch size and/or number of batches limitation and, if so, what is it?</p> <p><u>ES&S Comment: Please clarify your definition of what is included in "batch processing". How would the State/County use these "batch statistics"?</u></p>
A-70	<p>Have the ability to delete saved ballot batches from the system.</p> <p>Note: Please explain how your system manages batch accountability identification.</p> <p><u>ES&S Comment: Please clarify your definition of what is included in "batch processing". How would the State/County use these "batch statistics"?</u></p>
B-6	<p>Handle, <u>and reliably account for</u>, multi-page ballots, including when the pages become separated from each other (votes will count regardless of the sequence pages are scanned or if some pages are not scanned).</p> <p>Note: Please explain how your system accounts for multi-page ballots.</p> <p><u>ES&S Comment: Recommend a new note be added that vendors explain how their solution does not compromise voter privacy.</u></p>
B-11	<p>Provide a secure means to upload <u>or transmit</u> vote count results to the EMS.</p> <p><u>ES&S Comment: Suggest that the State consider reinserting the requirement to transmit vote count results into this requirement. Transmitting results from the polls will expedite election night reporting.</u></p>
C-7	<p>Identify and segregate ballots with overvotes for manual or <u>and</u> electronic image review.</p> <p><u>ES&S Comment: Add new Note that states: Vendors should explain how their central count solution allows them to physically locate a specific ballot in a batch of ballots.</u></p>
C-8	<p>Identify and segregate ballots with write-ins for manual or <u>and</u> electronic image review.</p> <p><u>ES&S Comment: Add new Note that states: Vendors should explain how their central count solution allows them to physically locate a specific ballot in a batch of ballots.</u></p>
C-9	<p>Identify and segregate ballots that cannot be read for manual or <u>and</u> electronic image review.</p>

	<p>ES&S Comment: Add new Note that states: Vendors should explain how their central count solution allows them to physically locate a specific ballot in a batch of ballots.</p>
C-10	<p>Identify and segregate ballots that are read as blank for manual or and electronic review.</p> <p>ES&S Comment: Add new Note that states: Vendors should explain how their central count solution allows them to physically locate a specific ballot in a batch of ballots.</p>
C-14	<p>Handle, and reliably account for, multi-page ballots, including when the pages become separated from each other (votes will count regardless of the sequence pages are scanned or if some pages are not scanned).</p> <p>Note: Please explain how your system accounts for multi-page ballots when pages are out of order or when all ballot pages are not returned.</p> <p>ES&S Comment: Recommend a new note be added that vendors explain how their solution does not compromise voter privacy.</p>
C-18	<p>Allow the option to disable or enable review of undervoted ballots.</p> <p>ES&S Comment: The system should allow the administrator to set this option at the contest level so undervoted contests can be identified.</p>
C-19	<p>Capture votes from paper ballots. Capture votes marked by a voter or a ballot marking device on a paper ballot <u>without adjusting machine thresholds.</u></p>
C-24	<p>Identify and reject ballots that are from another election.</p> <p>ES&S Comment: Suggest this requirement be deleted. This should not be considered a system requirement, but rather, an election official responsibility.</p>
C-25	<p>Continue high-speed ballot processing scanning while electronically or physically segregating and sorting ballots to user identified categories that need additional attention.</p> <p>Note 1: Please describe how your system handles these situations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ballots are unreadable by the scanner. Notifying an authorized user whether a ballot has been scanned successfully or not. Notifying an authorized user that a ballot has been previously scanned. Identifies where a voter marked the box for a write-in and where the voter did not mark the box, but did enter a write-in candidate on the line. <p>Note 2: Please describe the processing speed options of your high-speed ballot scanner.</p> <p>Note 3: Please describe how the relationship of paper ballot to ballot scan to cast vote record will be maintained when this physical or electronic sorting or segregation is taking place.</p> <p>ES&S General Comment on this Requirement: Recommend that the system not require uncounted ballots to be physically separated from within a stack of counted ballots.</p>

	<p>ES&S Comment Note 1 item C: Suggest this requirement be removed to protect the voter's privacy.</p>
D-28	<p>Provide a user option to view on the screen the list of certified write-in candidates.</p> <p>ESS Comment: We would recommend removing this requirement, as there would be no reasonable way to update the election definition with certified write-in names and still maintain the integrity and uniqueness of the overall election definition. In addition, if this option is not removed, we would expect that the State would also require that an audio presentation of the certified write-in candidates be available to the sight disabled voter.</p>
D-30	<p>Provide a screen response that would allow a voter to request the list of certified write-ins.</p> <p>ESS Comment: We would recommend removing this requirement, as there would be no reasonable way to update the election definition with certified write-in names and still maintain the integrity and uniqueness of the overall election definition. In addition, if this option is not removed, we would expect that the State would also require that an audio presentation of the certified write-in candidates be available to the sight disabled voter.</p>
E-8	<p>Have an option for sort/pass to various methods with the ability to customize sorting definition (e.g. style, precinct, district, unaccepted ballots, signature discrepancy and no signature) or identify them electronically for easy separation.</p>
G-5	<p>Log all activity on voting equipment including: when turned on/off, by whom, any errors, power fail, power restore, when an error occurred and when an error is resolved.</p> <p>ES&S Comment: Generating user specific credentials for poll workers is an unwieldy process and can be better served by using role-based credentials to control access and logging functions performed by that access.</p>
G-9	<p>Have a permanent paper record of each vote for audit purposes. Preferably all paper records of all votes are in the same format and indistinguishable other than by ballot style</p> <p>ES&S Comment: Suggest that sentence two be deleted. The mere presence of a paper record should override the desire for that record to be of the same format. A mechanically marked ballot will always be distinguishable. Preferring a requirement that ballots be in the same format could limit your options for newer innovative technology.</p>
G-10	<p>Support a Risk Limiting Audit, as defined in CRS 1-7-515(5)(b) on both electronic tabulation and paper ballot tabulation devices.</p> <p>Note 1: Please describe how your proposed system supports the execution of a Risk Limiting Audit.</p> <p>Note 2: §1-7-515 C.R.S. stated that Colorado must begin risk-limiting audits in 2014, but was revised in the 2013 session to extend the start of the requirement to 2017.</p> <p>ES&S Comment: The system should capture all data necessary to do a RLA without the need to rescan all ballots.</p>
G-23	<p>Be configurable so as to be capable of performing the following tests on all system hardware/software, in compliance with current Colorado statutes and rules:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hardware test Logic and Accuracy Test Post-Election Audit Pre-Recount Logic and Accuracy Test

	<p>e. And capable of performing the Colorado Risk Limiting Audit commencing no later than 2017.”</p> <p>ES&S Comment (e): As stated in our comment to G-10, the system should capture all data necessary to do a RLA without the need to rescan all ballots.</p>
G-24	<p>Allow authorized user creation of scripted simulation Logic and Accuracy tests with various patterns (e.g. 1,2,3 or 1,1,1 or 1,2,3,4,5...).</p> <p>Note: Please explain how your system allows for scripted pre-determined simulation for creating test ballots and electronic voting equipment test input.</p> <p>ES&S Comment: Replace “scripted” with “pre-determined” to allow for test deck solutions that do not require a script.</p>
G-31	<p>Provide an environment whereby all databases and data are maintained with provisions for operational security, access control and auditability.</p> <p>Note 1: Please describe the authentication protocols for access to the EMS database and your system’s processes for providing operational security and auditability.</p> <p>Note 2: System security must not obstruct authorized access to event and audit logs, and printing or exporting of reports</p> <p>Note 2 Comment: Add “authorized” to note. Request that the State clarify that they are not suggesting “unauthorized” access to the EMS.</p>