



VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 3 Discovery Session Notes

Day 7 – Public Access Website and Correspondence

BP17 – Verify or Update Information on Public Website

Updates to Documentation:

1. Clarify Provisional Status should be by election.

UC 10.03.01 – Determine Provisional Ballot Status Online

Consensus Recommendations:

2. Add the following process: (1) Search for a voter record, through “Am I Registered” page. The Search Results should display a table including County ID and specific ballot information if there is a match. There should be county contact information if there is an error. (2) May need an alternate approach to search for the provisional ballot for people who are not already registered. Note that currently many counties do not assign a unique number to provisional ballots.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

3. As noted with UC04.12.01 (Day 3), there are several policy decisions to be resolved regarding processing and display of provisional ballot status on the VoteCal website. This includes a determination of whether HAVA funding can be used for numbering provisional ballots, if this becomes a requirement.
4. Determine the length of time to keep provisional look-up available online following an election. There is not currently a standard across counties, but proposed durations were between 2 and 3 months.(SOS, CACEO Business Process Committee)

Updates to Documentation:

5. Add a disclaimer to the results page that the information is subject to change until the canvass is complete (29 days following the election). Decision to make data available immediately with disclaimer explaining to voter that the current provisional ballot status may change.

UC 10.04.01 – Determine Vote-by-Mail Ballot Status Online

Consensus Recommendations:

6. Because of the nature of the information and the need for currency, vote-by-mail ballot status will be sent transactionally, not by batch.
7. System must be capable of tracking/displaying multiple ballots for a voter for the same election
8. Search results should display one line per election. The columns should be: Election Date/Name, County of Origin, Absentee Ballot Effective Issuance Date, Received Date, Challenged (or null), Reason, and Status.
9. Prefer the status of “Accepted” instead of “Counted” (reflecting that the ballot becomes anonymous once separated from the envelope).

Other Action Items:

10. The SOS should standardize Reason codes across counties. (SOS with input from EMS and/or Counties)
11. County-maintained lookup websites (if retained) will need to be updated to be in sync with the SOS website.

Updates to Documentation:

12. This use case should be removed and consolidated into use case 10.01.01. This absentee ballot information will be displayed in the search results from the "Am I Registered" search.

UC 10.05.01 – Select Alternate Language for Online Features

Consensus Recommendations:

13. Standard text on the webpage (e.g. instructions, column/row headers, etc.) will be the primary text that is translated.
14. The data within the fields should also be translated if the codes are standardized and use a lookup code. Note that this is a translation for the website, and will not be translated in the actual record in VoteCal/EMS. If not a translated code, text will still display as in the record (e.g. name, address, etc.).



VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 3 Discovery Session Notes

UC 10.06.01 – Modify VIG Opt-Out Status Online / UC 01.17.01 – Modify VIG Opt-Out Status for a Voter

Consensus Recommendations:

15. There should be verbiage on the website that this preference is being recorded for the voter, but everyone in the household needs to opt-out in order to stop receiving the mailing.
16. The VIG Opt-Out option should be available in multiple locations, including VRC/Affidavit (pending VRC redesign), Online Registration, through “Am I Registered” (pending policy decision below) and in EMS (pending remediation specifications).
17. The Opt-In / Opt-Out status is part of a voter's record and should stay with them as they move between households.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

18. Concern expressed about ability for fraudulent mass changes. Policy decision whether to use “Am I Registered” function search criteria (St #, ZIP, DOB, First Name) or to require additional data entry/validation to protect against such fraud.
19. Should email confirmation be used in this process to provide confirmation to voters of ‘opt-out or ‘in to help prevent such fraud. (SOS) (NOTE: This may be outside current scope of RFP requirements and contract and, therefore, subject to change control process.)

Updates to Documentation:

20. Update Step 4 and remove Step 6, based on outcome of policy decision regarding voter identity validation.

UC 07.02.01 – Generate Failed DMV COA Transaction Mailing

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

21. The frequency may increase to greater than once per month, pending SOS review. (SOS)

UC 07.03.01 – Generate VNC Mailing

Consensus Recommendations:

22. A majority of the participating counties have indicated a preference for the state to send VNC's until E-29 and the county to send anything within E-29. However, there should be a provision for county configuration (either setting flags on an individual record basis or a yes/no county preference).
23. The state will only have one version (with multiple translations) of the VNC card. Counties may design their own variations of the VNC card for their own mailings.

Other Action Items:

24. Revisit the decision on whether the EMS and/or VoteCal will assign / clear the flag, pending decisions about NCOA/DMV COA precincting.

Updates to Documentation:

25. Update Business Rules to indicate that "assigned precinct" and "assigned political district" MAY trigger a VNC, rather than creating a mandatory flag. Revisit these rules, pending decision on whether the EMS should create the flag. Update to all use cases referencing calculations from an election date: VoteCal must receive information about all local elections and not just statewide/Federal elections.

UC 07.17.01 – Confirm VNC's Were Sent

Updates to Documentation:

26. This use case will be removed and relevant steps included in use case 07.03.01.

UC 07.07.01 – Generate ARCP Mailing List

Updates to Documentation:

27. Add: When the mailings are bar-coded, they are coded with the local ID. (applicable to all such notices)
28. Clarify selection parameters to exclude Inactive voters and voters with a Registration Date less than four years old.
29. Add: When the ARCP is sent out, the voter's record should be updated to Inactive (in both VoteCal and EMS).



VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 3 Discovery Session Notes

UC 07.16.01 – Generate RCP Mailing

Consensus Recommendations:

30. Most Counties currently use the NCOA process in lieu of these postcards, and prefer to continue unless SOS absorbs all additional workload.

UC 07.08.01 – Generate CAN Mailing List

Consensus Recommendations:

31. The counties have indicated a preference for the state to do the CAN mailing on their behalf.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

32. There is a question about whether a CAN should be mailed to the new or old address, particularly if it involves a transfer. (CACEO Business Process Committee)

Other Action Items:

33. Counties to send samples of CAN notices (including logic of how which addresses are included where) and mail received from third parties notifying the counties of an address change. (To all counties)
34. Candy Lopez to look for an advisory letter saying 8(d)(2) doesn't need to be sent to undeliverable addresses. (To Contra Costa County)

Updates to Documentation:

35. Update references to "8(d)(2) Notice" instead of "Change of Address Notice".
36. Update: The NCOA use case(s) should include logic about how a flag for the CAN mailing can be set for the required message based on the nature of the third party notice of the change of address. (e.g., moved in-county, moved out-of-county, no forwarding address)

UC 07.09.01 – Generate VIG Mailing List

Consensus Recommendations:

37. Counties prefer that SOS continue mailing past the E-60 cutoff, assuming that mailings are timely (see discussion of UC 07.10.01).

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

38. Will SOS assume responsibility for the VIG mailings after the E-60 cutoff? If so, will this be for all counties, or a county-by-county preference? (SOS, CACEO Business Process Committee)
39. SOS to decide if additional mailings will be included from categories that are currently sent by counties (e.g. out-of-state mailings, addresses requiring corrections, foreign addresses, etc.) (SOS)

Updates to Documentation:

40. Update: The actor should be SOS Users, not County users.

Day 8 – Public Access Website, NCOA and DMV COA

BP18 – Online Voter Registration / UC 10.02.01 – Register to Vote Online

Consensus Recommendations:

41. The effective registration date of an online registration form should be the date it was submitted.
42. The voter should enter birth date instead of the "Will you be at least 18 years old on election day?" verification question.
43. Person trying to register should receive a confirmation number that is populated as the Affidavit number in the EMS/VoteCal.
44. The counties would like the submission of an online registration form to send an email confirmation to the voter. This email address should also be used to notify a voter if their registration was rejected by the county. (NOTE: This may be outside current scope of RFP requirements and contract and, therefore, subject to change control process.)
45. The Counties prefer to receive the registration as soon as possible, even if the signature has not yet been received. This would require a status (similar to Fatal Pend) that would exclude the voter from mailings, rosters, and reports until the registration is completed by the DMV signature.
46. For potential voters unable to complete the IDV process (single match not found), the public access website will point to SOS's best solution at that time (e.g. blank form, fillable PDF, online form, etc.)



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 3 Discovery Session Notes

47. If the DMV's IDV system is down, the VoteCal online registration tool should not be available. The system should issue a message to the user that "this feature is not available."
48. Pending review of the CACEO decision on political parties, the counties would like to include an option of "Other" in the drop down, which would activate a text box for the user to populate another value. If someone does not choose a political party, they should receive a warning message indicating that they will be considered a "Decline to State" voter and may only get a nonpartisan ballot in a primary.
49. If the voter was assisted, this information should be entered on the online form as well. This should use the same fields and verbiage as the paper affidavit (without a signature).
50. The verification questions at the beginning of online registration should include the two questions from the National Voter Registration Card regarding felony convictions and mental incompetence.

Other Action Items:

51. SOS to verify that if the Social Security Administration's system is down, the DMV system will not be down as well.
52. SOS to verify that the IDV process includes a check that the driver's licenses returned are not declined, expired or cancelled.
53. Catalyst to look into potentially creating a new use case for forced match issues (notifying a county of a moved voter, when VoteCal does not return any matches to transfer).

Updates to Documentation:

54. Add: When the voter completes the online registration, the system should present a confirmation number and confirmation message that includes a statement that the registration is still subject to verification and county review.
55. Update: Voter to specify county of residence and VoteCal to route accordingly. Add the option for the county to redirect as necessary (via VoteCal) (BP step 17-21)
56. Add: Real-time validation to prevent the user from entering a post office box in the Residence Address field (check for "P.O. Box", "P.O." or "PMB", and display a warning message).
57. Update: BP step 22 should create a decision point for either an Update to the state record or a New Registration.
58. Update: The use case should clarify whether the VIG-opt out will be available on the online registration form.
59. Add: The County drop down should default to "blank", not the first value, "Alameda".
60. Update: Clarify verbiage of UC step 14.6.1.2 that this isn't the IDV search.
61. Update: Clarify the use case verbiage to include who is doing what in each step.
62. Add corresponding updates for each consensus recommendation that is enacted.
63. Update to the Online Voter registration use case: The requirements should include any requirements related to allowing anyone who is 17 years of age to register.
64. Update to Voter Verification use case: The results screen of the "Am I Registered" screen should include the most recent registration date. This will show whether a recent registration has taken effect.
65. Update to Rosters use case: Voters who are 17 should be allowed to register with Active status, but should not be included in the roster or reports unless they turn 18 as of the date of the election.

BP09 – Process NCOA/CASS

Consensus Recommendations:

66. There should only be one NCOA work item at any given time for a single voter. Unresolved work items should be cleared if a new more recent NCOA record is received.
67. The NCOA process should not be run on Inactive or Cancelled voters.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

68. While the SOS normally stops triggering the NCOA batch process E-90 days before federal elections, some counties would like to trigger this batch process on demand. The group agreed that the SOS may trigger this process whenever they like, but they should come up with policy on when it is run and not run. (SOS, CACEO Business Process Committee)

Updates to Documentation:

69. Update: Step 21 (Flag for 8(d)(2)) should be moved to the VoteCal swim lane (since it is not done by the EMS).

BP10 – Process DMV COA Records

Consensus Recommendations:

70. The system should filter out all non-matches.
71. Preference for SOS to send a notice to voters that are Cancelled due to out-of-county move, inviting them to re-register. May require alternate language and inclusion of blank VRC and/or link to online registration.



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 3 Discovery Session Notes

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

72. The counties would like to request a policy/statute change for DMV COA's to allow the system to initiate cross-county transfers, if applicable. (Lindsey to raise with the CACEO Leg Committee)

Other Action Items:

73. Collect county best practices for finding matches with DMV data (e.g. hyphenated last names, missing DOB, etc.) (Catalyst and Counties)

Updates to Documentation:

74. Update: Change step 26 to read "work item" instead of "voter record".

75. Add: In step 27, add a note that this could be automated by the EMS (not necessarily "viewed" by a human)

76. Update: Remove "In" from all swim lane titles.

77. Update: Step 21 and step 29 should be moved to the VoteCal swim lane (since this is not done by the EMS).

78. Update: In steps 21 and 29, the SWMY verbiage should be changed to the "DMV Transaction Failure Notice (Verification Mailing)"

UC 07.10.01 – Generate Post-VIG Mailing List

Consensus Recommendations:

79. The counties have expressed a desire for the SOS to send the post-VIG mailing on their behalf.

80. Counties will need to be notified when a mailing has been processed (in addition to adding history to an individual voter record) so that they can properly respond to voter inquiries.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

81. Will SOS assume responsibility for the VIG mailings after the E-60 cutoff? If so, will this be for all counties, or a county-by-county preference? (SOS, CACEO Business Process Committee)

Updates to Documentation:

82. Update: Mailing flag/status/record should indicate the date sent as well as the "run" (e.g. primary mailing, supplemental mailing 1, supplemental mailing 2, etc.)

83. Update to Generate VIG Mailing List use case: combine this use case with the 07.09.01 Generate VIG Mailing List use case. The 07.09.01 use case could include an indicator that allows the user to select whether or not the report will include voters who received a VIG since the last time it was sent.

Day 9 – Data Standards and SOS-Only Use Cases

Data Standards

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

84. Catalyst will work with the EMS vendors to consolidate lists of codes, for review by counties. This will include Voter Status, reason codes (for cancelling, for updates, for inactivating, etc.). (To EMS Vendors and Catalyst)

85. Currently, when permanent absentee voters don't vote in a number of consecutive elections, the counties revoke the status. Counties have requested the ability for these voters to request reinstatement of their permanent absentee status online (either through Am I Registered or modified online registration). (SOS and Catalyst)

Updates to Documentation:

86. Update: Table C-6: There should be a drop down and a free form text field option (for other countries) for Place of Birth.

87. Update: Table C-8: The terms "Gender" and "Sex" should be made consistent. Expect to use only these three values, so translations will be needed for other codes used by counties or DMV.

88. Update: Table C-9: There will be a party-code (a drop down list maintained by the SOS) and a text field to allow the user to define another value (activated by selecting "Other" value in the drop down). This "Other" value will be different than "Decline to State".

89. Add: Table C-10: Should include Cancelled voter, Declined/Rejected voter, and all variations of Pending (e.g. Fatal Pending, Local Pending).

90. Add: Table C-12: There should be an "Online" value. Include all current EAC values.

91. Update: Table C-15 should be removed.

92. Update: Table C-18: This table needs to be reconciled again with the NVRA list. May also include "Online" and "Re-registration with no change"

93. Update: Table C-19: include all local election codes (to be standardized in discussion with EMS vendors).



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 3 Discovery Session Notes

94. Remove: Tables C-23, C-24, C-25, C-26, C-27, and C-30 are removed as they are CalVoter specific.
95. Update: "Ballot Type" should be changed to "Voting Method".
96. Update to the Online Voter Registration use case: The signature request process should be a parallel process to the voter record processing. The record will be "work in progress", allowing the county to complete precincting steps.
97. Update to the Online Voter Registration use case: Registering online should clear the "Show ID" flag automatically, since the DMV validation will verify the voter's identity.

SOS-Only Use Cases

Consensus Recommendations:

98. When a new political party is updated, it will be updated in VoteCal, and the SOS will still send the counties notification through the CCROV. (UC 05.23.01 – Add Political Party)

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

99. Catalyst should create the "dials" for match settings and then allow the counties to help determine the level of the dials. This is also an iterative process depending on how the level changes will affect the level of match cases.. (To Catalyst) (UC 05.03.01 – Configure List Management Match Settings)
100. Using input from county samples of current EMS security profiles, Catalyst/SOS will create security profiles for VoteCal and allow this group (Discovery participants) to provide feedback. (UC 05.11.01 – Adjusts Functions Assigned to Security Role)

Other Action Items:

101. Catalyst to look into providing a demonstration or screenshots of a similar "bottom-up" statewide system or proposed user interfaces for VoteCal.

Updates to Documentation:

102. Catalyst to update UC 08.09.01 – User Defines Ad-Hoc Report and present it during Week 5.
103. Catalyst to update UC 01.16.01 – Processes DMV Registrations and COA's and present it during Week 5.

Other Use Cases with No Questions:

104. 01.13.01 - Check for Duplicate Driver License of State ID Rejections
105. 03.51.01 - Review Unresolved List Maintenance Issues
106. 05.01.01 - Sweep of Expired Confidential Voter Status
107. 05.02.01 - Modify Printed Notification and Post Card Templates
108. 05.05.01 - Configure Standard Codes
109. 05.06.01 - Edit Political Party
110. 05.07.01 - Modify ROR Format and Content
111. 05.13.01 - Edits Security Policy Settings
112. 05.14.01 - Adjusts Allowed Idle Session Time
113. 05.18.01 - Determine Organization that Requested PVRDR Using Salt Record
114. 05.20.01 - Schedule a Job
115. 05.21.01 - Check Job Status
116. 05.22.01 - Add/Edit Political Party Contact
117. 06.08.01 - Create or Modify PVRDR Salt Record
118. 07.01.01 - Generate Expired Confidential Voter Status Mailing
119. 07.13.01 - State Admin Updates CAN Formats
120. 07.15.01 - Modify VNC Format