



VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 1 Discovery Session Notes

Day 1 – General Usage and Search

UC 5.10.01 - Log into VoteCal Web Application – User

Consensus Recommendation:

1. Counties users would like to have capability for concurrent logon to VoteCal from multiple terminals. Counties prefer they have the capability to determine if concurrent logons may continue or whether login on a second terminal by a user forces logoff on the previous terminal. (SOS Policy Decision – to Steering Committee)

UC 08.10.01 - User Accesses VoteCal Help Feature

Consensus Recommendations:

2. All screens should include a 'print' command, including Help pop-up windows.
3. Tool tips (brief help text available by hovering over an icon) will be used where possible.
4. Page-level Help will be in PDF format, which will be searchable and indexed. Field-level Help will be not be searchable.
5. System needs some capability to provide simultaneous viewing of the help window and the VoteCal application screen (e.g., side-by-side, always on top, anchor)

Updates to Use Cases:

6. Add detail for print icon, tool tips, page-level help in PDF format

UC 05.24.01 – Print Screen Information

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 02.01.01 - Search Voter through Web Application

Consensus Recommendations:

7. The parameter "County" will be added to voter search criteria. The voter's county should also be displayed in the search results and results should be sortable by county.
8. Users should be able to configure whether Cancelled or Inactive voter records will be included in the search results Party affiliations that are not recognized by the SOS will be categorized as "Miscellaneous" or "Other". Once the SOS recognizes a party (as qualified or attempting to qualify), the change will not be retroactive to voters who had previously registered with this party before recognition.
9. Registration Date should appear in the search results list
10. It is okay to limit search capabilities by user permissions (so that only users with sufficient permission and training have the capability to initiate searches that could retrieve large numbers of records and adversely affect system performance.)

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

11. Whether and how to standardize additional political parties and local political districts within VoteCal for meaningful searches and reports (To EMS vendors and Catalyst)
12. How will confidential voter be handled and displayed in searches – included in results but confidential fields left blank or simply omitted from search results? (Revisit in week 5, SOS to provide copy of relevant Elections Code for discussion.)

Updates to Use Cases:

13. Add 'County'(including multiple counties), 'Cancelled/Inactive' and Registration Date as potential search parameters., Change 'City of Birth' to Place of Birth, - to be shared before end of Discovery

UC 02.03.01 - View Voter Details through Web Application

Consensus Recommendations:

14. County administrators should have access to activity logs to determine if their users are misusing this feature.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

15. Need to determine what voter activity history will be forwarded to VoteCal by EMS (To SOS with Catalyst and EMS Vendors)



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 1 Discovery Session Notes

Other Action Items:

16. Counties to provide their security role profiles (at a high/general level) by Tuesday March 2 to facilitate analysis of security roles for the system

Updates to Use Cases:

17. Include name suffix in the voter detail returned

UC 02.02.01 - Search Voter through EMS interface

Consensus Recommendations:

18. Do not return all voter detail in the search results, just enough to present a list to the voters. (Allow the user to drill down and select the voter for which to send all the detail.) (EMS vendor preference)
19. Include a parameter in the function call for EMS vendors to limit the number of results returned. If the results were limited by this parameter, VC should return that information (limit exceeded) to the EMS as well. Also, return results in 'chunks' so that vendors can provide their users the ability 'to bail' before the entire list is complete. (EMS vendor preference)

Updates to Use Cases:

20. Conform this UC to the changes made to UC 02.01.01 (above)
21. Limited results in the search results
22. Include voter UID (e.g. State DL or ID, as well as local ID) in the search results
23. Allow for EMS providing option to search locally or statewide

Day 2 – ROR and New Voter Registration and Update Voter Registration

UC 09.06.01 - Answer ROR Survey

Consensus Recommendations:

24. Catalyst to ensure that reports for ROR will be available at both the state and the county level

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

25. What will the business processes be around finalizing the ROR? (For example, will counties still need to certify their numbers?) Keep in mind that snapshot will probably need to be taken for all counties at one time as one county has capability to change the totals for another by transferring voters between counties. (SOS Policy Discussion, possibly refer to CACEO Business Process Committee.)

Updates to Use Cases:

26. Clarify that counties only see their items (not all counties), add Assumption that political party must be current

UC 01.11.01 - Register New Voter Through EMS

Consensus Recommendations:

27. County must have ability to manually clear "Show ID" flag, in addition to the automated clearing through VoteCal (after the voter has voted in a federal election.)
28. If the ID validation or check for possible existing registration records must be re-run because the underlying data use for the search was subsequently changed by the county user (e.g., corrected spelling of the name), the reason for redoing the search should be provided to the EMS/user. (Catalyst expressed preference that this be handled in the background by the EMS if possible)
29. Initial checks for previous registrations should include cancelled voter records. At start system should only include cancellations on a go forward basis. Consider adding historic cancellations down the road as time and resources allow (note: this will also include considerations about how these records are identified as historic cancellations).

Updates to Use Cases:

30. Include 'ID Provided at County' parameter for calculating 'show ID; requirement; remove step 6.1, replace "notice" with "work item" for consistent verbiage

UC 01.18.01 - Derive Unique Identifier for Voter Record

Issues and Decisions To Be Resolved:

31. Will SOS have capability to send correspondence on behalf of the counties(SOS Steering Committee and/or Change control Board)



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 1 Discovery Session Notes

32. When IDV returns a different DL for the voter, should the DL field be updated in the voter record by this information? If so, should this be done by VoteCal or the EMS? Note that the UID field will be assigned based on the DMV/SSN validation, but the question here is about the DL/ID field.
33. Consider alternate approach: If IDV fails due to unavailability, provisionally assign voter UID based on the ID provided and correct as necessary when the IDV completes.

Updates to Use Cases

34. Add: When IDV assigns a UID based on a different ID than provided by voter, add a work item to track the requirement to contact voter to resolution

UC 01.19.01 - Handle Local Voter Registration Contingency

Consensus Recommendation:

35. The system should notify the user when VoteCal goes up or goes down. (Catalyst noted that this will probably be a function of the EMS, especially since VC will have no capability to notify the user if the connection is lost to VC.)

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

36. How to handle the situation if a walk-in voter wants to register and vote a vote-by-mail ballot when the system is down? (CACEO Business Process committee)
37. What is the registration status of a valid registered voter if a registration update is in-process or pending due to some issues (such as 'unable to precinct the address')? (SOS)

UC 01.01.01 - Update Existing Voter Through VoteCal Application

Consensus Recommendations:

38. There should be clear policy about the circumstances around which SOS staff may directly update a voter's record. Any such changes should include clear communication to the county about why or the basis for the change.

Updates to Use Cases:

39. Remove step 6.1; update wording in step 8.3.1 to reflect 'pending work item' rather than 'message'; further elaborate step 8.4

UC 01.03.01 - Update Existing Voter Through EMS

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

Day 3 –Update VR (cont'd), Transfer VR, and Batch Data

UC 01.05.01 - Add comment or contact to voter record

Consensus Recommendations:

40. Comments made in EMS should be read-only display in VoteCal
41. Individual comments should include indicator for source (especially state vs. local)
42. Users should have the ability to edit only their own comments, and to add additional comments. Only supervisors (or others with suitable permission) should have the ability to edit comments made by another user.
43. Comments made by SOS should be sent to the EMS

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

44. The specific data model and structure for comments can be worked out between Catalyst and the EMS vendors.

Updates to Use Cases:

45. Changes will send electronic notification to EMS's; replace "contact" with "communication" for clarity

UC 01.06.01 - Modify confidential voter status

Consensus Recommendations:

46. The online website for checking registration status should not include the data for confidential voters.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

47. Whether confidential voters will be input in local EMS's or will we create an interface to input them directly into VC only. (Note – some counties may not have existing business processes to protect confidentiality of electronic data. State may need to publish standards for securing this data) Will any changes to standardize the approach be reimbursed through HAVA funding? (SOS Steering Committee; Catalyst & EMS vendors)



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 1 Discovery Session Notes

48. Should SOS send written notice to all confidential voters that their data will now be stored in a statewide system? (SOS Steering Committee)
49. How to treat confidential status expiration for Public Safety Officers – cancel vs. remove confidentiality (CACEO Business Policy Committee)
50. How should the system handle reporting confidential voters: Exclude completely, Include name but withhold confidential data, or allow counties to specify their preference county-by-county? (CACEO Business Process Committee)

Updates to Use Cases:

51. Add a “Confidential-Cancelled” status

UC 01.20.01 - Attach Document to Voter Record

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

52. Whether VoteCal will receive historical image/document data or just collect this information going forward ? (SOS)

Other Action Items:

53. SOS to look up and report RFP requirements regarding system capacities for images.

UC 01.11.02 - Transfer Voter Through EMS

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved

54. What counties should do if a voter was transferred and a ballot was already issued or if the voter is already on the roster in the former county? (Note: this potential already exists in our current system.) (CACEO Business Process Committee)

Updates to Use Cases:

55. System should be able to accept voter participation history transactions after a voter has been cancelled – such as VBM ballot returned.
56. Update title, change “potential” to “always” in step 7

UC 03.50.01 - Accept or Reject Transfer Out Condition

Consensus Recommendations:

57. System should have a county-by-county parameter to configure for counties that want all transfers processed without county review.

Updates to Use Cases:

58. Remove ‘Accept’ from UC title; add detail to step 6

UC 01.11.04 - Enter Rejected Voter through EMS

Consensus Recommendations:

59. Entry of rejected affidavits should be done through EMS, not a VC browser interface.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved Decisions To Be Made:

60. Need standards/guidelines for when incomplete/ineligible affidavits should be entered into system. (SOS, CACEO Business Process Committee)
61. How to handle a voter who indicates non-citizen, but matches with a current active voter record. (Look for possible NVRA ruling) (SOS, CACEO Business Process Committee)

Updates to Use Cases:

62. Standardize all “fatal pend”, “local pend”, “rejected” terminology; add reference to additional requirement for EAC reporting of declined voter registrations

UC 04.18.01 - Process Batch Data Exchange

Other Action Items:

63. Catalyst to provide an architectural diagrams and technical details on the proposed interface and configuration with counties(with security requirements, firewalls, protocols, etc.) around June 2010 (Note: the documentation and process for distributing this information will need to protect the security of the system)



VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 1 Discovery Session Notes

UC 04.10.01 - Send Election Participation Batch - Jurisdiction

Consensus Recommendations:

- 64. Voter participation history should also capture the fact that a voter was eligible for an election but did not participate.
- 65. Voter participation for all elections will be sent to VoteCal. Corrections to history will be kept synchronized.
- 66. Election coding scheme should be worked out between SOS/Catalyst and the EMS Vendors.

UC 04.11.01 - Process Vote-by-Mail History Batch

Updates to Use Cases:

- 67. Remove this use case and replace with a new one that updates Vote-By-Mail activity on a transactional basis.

UC 04.12.01 - Process Provisional Voting Batch

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

- 68. Counties are not uniform in their current practices for reporting provisional ballot status. Many do not identify provisional ballots with a unique number, many do not enter their provisional ballots into a system, but provide status manually via phone. Need to determine:
 - a. Will all counties be required to input provisional data into VC system, or will it be optional? (SOS)
 - b. Will there be a standard approach for tracking provisional ballots (e.g., serial number)? If not, how will voter lookup be facilitated? Will any changes to standardize the approach be reimbursed through HAVA funding? (SOS, CACEO Business Process Committee)
 - c. Must Provisional data be input and update through EMS or will VoteCal provide a direct input interface for this? (SOS, Catalyst & EMS vendors)

Other Action Items:

- 69. Lindsey McWilliams (Solano County) to provide results of county survey on how provisional balloting is currently conducted

Updates to Use Cases:

- 70. Following policy decisions, use case will need to be updated accordingly

UC 04.13.01 - Process Precinct-District Matching Batch

Consensus Recommendations:

- 71. During re-apportionment, VoteCal must be capable of storing the “retained districts” as well as the new district configuration, filtering and reporting them as appropriate
- 72. Definition and coding scheme for local districts should be worked out between SOS/Catalyst and the EMS Vendors

General Action Items:

- 73. Catalyst to collect an external interface list from counties (i.e. GIS, county death list, etc.) (note that in this case, “interface” includes both live and batch data exchange)
- 74. Catalyst to provide the use cases in numerical order for the evaluation sheet for Week 2