

# PILOT ELECTION REVIEW COMMITTEE

## JUNE 18, 2015 MEETING



**Colorado Secretary of State**  
**Elections Division**

# Agenda

- Public Comment
- Committee member resignation - George Leing
- Tentative bi-weekly meeting schedule through July
- Update – status of temporary approvals and testing
- Update – prospective pilot counties
- Draft oversight and evaluation materials
- New business
- Adjournment

# Public Comment

- All those who wish to comment or testify should complete and sign the sign-up sheet on the back table, so the committee knows who you are and the organization you represent, if any
- Depending on the number of people who wish to comment, we may need to limit speakers to 3 minutes each

# Resignation of Committee Member

- George Leing notified the Secretary that, due to new travel requirements of his job, he needs to step down from the committee
- Secretary has not yet decided whether or whom to appoint as a replacement member. Committee and public will be informed as soon as decision is made.
- George was a member of both the UVS Advisory Committee the Pilot Election Review Committee. He is a citizen who cares about the way our government functions, and particularly the manner in which elections are conducted. The Secretary thanks George for his service to the people and voters of Colorado.

# Meeting Schedule through July

- PERC meetings will be held every other Thursday, starting June 18<sup>th</sup>, through July. The dates of the scheduled future meetings are July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>
- All of the meetings through July will be held at 1:30PM, in the Blue Spruce conference room on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Secretary of State's offices at 1700 Broadway, Denver.
- Meetings after July will be scheduled in the future by the committee

# Status: Temporary Approval and Testing

- No UVS system has yet been temporarily approved for use in 2015 Coordinated Election
- Before Secretary can temporarily approve, systems must undergo testing by federally accredited laboratory according to a test plan approved by Elections Division voting systems team
- 3 systems are currently in testing under approved test plans: Clear Ballot, Dominion, and ES&S
- Voting systems team continues to work with Everyone Counts and Hart to approve test plans so they too can begin testing

# Status: Temporary Approval and Testing (continued)

- July 31<sup>st</sup> - absolute drop-dead deadline for temporary approval of all systems
- August 14<sup>th</sup> – deadline for voting systems team to verify hardware and install trusted build onsite at all pilot counties
- September 4<sup>th</sup>: Ballot certification deadline – counties need to start using their voting systems
- September 19<sup>th</sup>: Deadline for counties to send mail ballots to overseas and military electors
- Timeline is very tight – pilot counties only have a little more than 2 weeks to learn the new voting systems and make appropriate adjustments to their existing business processes

# Status: Temporary Approval and Testing (continued)

- In order to provide additional time for counties to train on new voting systems, Secretary has agreed that providers may deploy hardware and software components before temporary approval, on the following conditions:
  - ❖ Advanced deployment does not mean the system will be temporarily approved – that decision must be based on test results report
  - ❖ Provider should deploy exactly the same components that are undergoing testing – probably doesn't make sense to train the county on different software and hardware
  - ❖ After a system is temporarily approved and before the county can use any part of the system for purposes of programming the 2015 Coordinated Election, Elections Division staff must install trusted build. Counties can start building election databases to practice, but must understand trusted build will essentially wipe the slate clean on all temporarily approved components



# Status of Pilot Counties

- Clear Ballot: Adams and Gilpin
- Dominion: Denver and La Plata
- ES&S: Jefferson and Teller
- Everyone Counts: Bent and Park
- Hart InterCivic: Douglas and Garfield
- At this point, all five providers have informed us they expect to finish testing and obtain temporary approval by July 31<sup>st</sup>. Additional pilot counties unlikely, but not impossible.

# Oversight plan overview

- Piloted systems will be used in actual elections
- Oversight plan must mitigate known risks to the election:
  - ❖ County not properly or fully trained: Ongoing provider support
  - ❖ County adopts insecure or improper processes:
    - Conditions of temporary use
    - Onsite CDOS observers at critical stages
  - ❖ Voting system is not compatible with dependent systems:
    - Voter registration database (SCORE)
    - Ballot-on-demand (BOD)
    - Election Night Reporting (ENR)
    - Electronic ballot delivery for overseas and military (Everyone Counts)
    - Risk-limiting audits (RLA)

# Oversight plan overview (continued)

- Piloted systems will be used in actual elections
- Oversight plan must mitigate known risks to the election
- Known risks include:
  - ❖ Inaccurate tabulation or election definition
  - ❖ Defective or inoperable devices
  - ❖ County not properly or fully trained on voting system
  - ❖ County implements insecure or improper business processes:
  - ❖ Voting system is not compatible with dependent systems, such as:
    - Voter registration database (SCORE)
    - Ballot-on-demand (BOD)
    - Election Night Reporting (ENR)
    - Electronic ballot delivery for overseas and military (Everyone Counts)
    - Risk-limiting audits (RLA)

# Oversight plan overview (continued)

## Strategies to mitigate known risks:

- Inaccurate tabulation and election definition - VSTL testing – Secretary won't temporarily approve a system that fails these requirements
- Defective or inoperable devices – Addressed by existing rules requiring acceptance testing, hardware diagnostic testing (HDT), logic and accuracy testing (LAT), and post-election audit (PEA)
- County not properly or fully trained on voting system
  - ❖ Advanced deployment of system components expands training opportunities
  - ❖ Ongoing provider support – either onsite or remote

# Oversight plan overview (continued)

## Strategies to mitigate known risks (continued):

### ➤ County implements insecure or improper business processes:

- ❖ Onsite observation by SOS observers at critical junctures, which may include database build, ballot generation, HDT, LAT, central count and VSPC operations, Election Night, PEA
- ❖ Will coordinate pilot counties' scheduling of these events via conditions for temporary use.

### ➤ Voting system is not compatible with dependent systems:

- ❖ Sending communication to all providers tomorrow
- ❖ Notifying them of ancillary system requirements, and requesting their collaboration to test all interdependencies in advance, and develop any workarounds if necessary

# Oversight plan overview (continued)

## Special note about risk-limiting audits (RLAs):

- Law requires Colorado counties to conduct RLAs by 2017
- Conditions of temporary use will require one pilot county per system to conduct RLA rather than statutory audit
- Dr. Philip Stark, professor and chair of statistics at the University of California, Berkeley, has generously offered to attend post-election audits in person, to observe and provide guidance
- Will request RLA pilot counties to schedule their audits successively every two days, so that Dr. Stark and state voting systems team can go from RLA to RLA in the time permitted
- Tomorrow's communication to providers will solicit their ideas about best way to conduct RLA on each system; may need to develop different RLA procedures for different systems

# Draft evaluation materials

## Develop evaluation materials for the following stakeholders:

- County election staff
- In-person voters with and without disabilities
- VSPC judges
  - ❖ All VSPCs or some?
  - ❖ All VSPC judges or just supervisor judges?
- Central count judges
- Testing board judges?
- Canvass board members?
- Poll watchers? Evaluation may be affected by county practices rather than voting system

# Draft evaluation materials (continued)

## Important principles:

- Stakeholders should be asked to evaluate system attributes within their areas of competency
- Stakeholders should evaluate attributes of the voting system, not attributes of ancillary systems over which they have little or no control
- Simplicity, clarity and thoroughness are all important
- All evaluations from all stakeholders should be incorporated into a single evaluation matrix, so that all systems can be compared side-by-side
  - ❖ Focus on the content of the individual evaluation forms now
  - ❖ Develop the evaluation matrix later



# Draft evaluation materials (continued)

- Now let's review some preliminary drafts of evaluation forms prepared by Elections Division voting systems team
- Drafts were prepared to start the conversation, not dictate content or structure to the committee
- After reviewing the drafts, committee will decide how to proceed

# New business and adjournment

- Any new business?
- Questions from the committee members
- Adjourn