

Dwight Shellman

From: Al Kolwicz [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 11:19 AM
To: Dwight Shellman
Cc: Colorado Voter Group [REDACTED]; Steve House ; Harvie Branscomb [REDACTED]
Subject: Pilot Election Review Committee - call for temporary hold.

Dwight,

I just sent this to Harvie, and hope that you will consider my recommendation to call for a temporary hold on the work of PERC.

Al

From: Al Kolwicz
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 10:56 AM
To: Harvie Branscomb [REDACTED]
Subject: Pilot Election Review Committee - call for temporary hold.

Harvie,

I have reviewed your annotated transcript. I agree with the direction you are taking, and am concerned that the committee has not established firm entry criteria for subsystem it will undertake to review.

If PERC were making the lease/purchase recommendation for a fleet of state vehicles it would not attempt to actually test carburetors, or make sure that the wiring is insulated. It would assume that the vehicles work and meet standards. It would base its recommendation on comparisons of advantages and disadvantages between solutions.

PERC is ostensibly reviewing on the advantages, disadvantages of several sub-systems competing to fill a major role is Colorado's Election System – the voting sub-system. The work of the voting sub-system begins with ballot production and ends with publication and archiving of materials and final results. It involves several components – some of which have been federally certified, and some have not.

A set of components is combined to form a voting sub-system. The committee assumes (rightfully, as it would in the vehicle illustration above) that each voting subsystem submitted for review meets all must requirements.

PERC is not responsible to (ensure, demonstrate, verify) that the combination of federally certified components used by any specific county meets every must requirement. Yet, until it can be verified with some certainty that the end-to-end solution meets all of the must requirements, it is a waste of time for PERC to evaluate how many extra benefits the untested solution offers. If the system doesn't work, what does it matter that it is efficient or easy to use?

PERC is responsible for evaluating the wants, and not verifying the non-negotiable must requirements.

We have loosely discussed a list of such mandatory must requirements including security, accuracy, verifiability, transparency, and ballot/vote anonymity. These are not negotiable. A system that fails to meet even one must requirement has no place in the pilot election review.

I would recommend that PERC call for a temporary hold – until (a) systems integration and test plans can be formalized and (b) each submission accepted for PERC review has successfully proven that it meets all of the must requirements.

You may publish this if you wish. If you do, please include Colorado Voter Group.

Al Kolwicz