

# Technology Summit April 8, 2014 | Brainstorming notes

Auditors - Policy	Administrators - Mechanics	IT Staff - Technical
<p><b>Needs for WA's election system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scalable</li> <li>• Options for using features from compatible vendors</li> <li>• Redundancy and QC</li> <li>• Consistent experience for the voter, statewide</li> <li>• Economies of scale for V.R. and V.S. costs</li> <li>• More election results on election night</li> <li>• Delivering/issuing, receiving, processing ballots electronically</li> <li>• Remote accessible voting</li> <li>• Voting system that can adapt to electronically transmitted votes</li> <li>• Automated signature verification</li> <li>• Alternate identifying techniques (not signatures)</li> <li>• Recreating/defining the election fewer times</li> <li>• Streamlined experience for the voter</li> <li>• Increased data exchange and communication with DOL</li> <li>• Single address for V.R. and DOL purposes (info flows both ways)</li> <li>• Plan for fast changes in technology, public's expectations, interface conversions, etc. (shorter life cycles)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Needs for WA's election system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scalability: Small counties and large counties are served</li> <li>• Provide voter options               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Disability needs</li> <li>○ Multiple delivery options</li> <li>○ Future compatibility and sustainability (see #3)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Voter/ Stakeholder trust</li> <li>• Flexibility: ability to accommodate shifts in technology</li> <li>• Data sharing seamlessly (DOL/state/county/ERIC/OLVR)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ County to county transfers</li> <li>○ Minimize/eliminate paper (get rid of ERIC spreadsheet)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All data flows one place to the other</li> <li>• OLVR/online candidate filing</li> <li>• All the functionality we have now, but one vendor fully integrated</li> <li>• Responsive to our timelines (and changes to our timelines), and overlapping elections and jurisdictions</li> <li>• Voter experience online and by paper is the same</li> <li>• Systems interact and data flows seamlessly</li> <li>• Deliver speedy election results               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tabulation</li> <li>○ Posting cumulative results</li> </ul> </li> <li>• One time entry that meets different delivery options for voters</li> </ul>	<p><b>Needs for WA's election system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electronic voting-maintaining secrecy               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Security of votes</li> <li>○ Audibility</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Electronic ballot delivery/return               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Duplication</li> <li>○ Scalability</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Data synchronization (standardized schema)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Voter data</li> <li>○ Jurisdiction data</li> <li>○ Election data</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Redundancy: resiliency to catastrophe-decentralization</li> <li>• Economy of scale</li> <li>• GIS integration               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ address geo-coding</li> <li>○ automatic geographic changes</li> <li>○ Integrate with assessors, OFM, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Configurability:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A la carte options</li> <li>○ Read/write capability (enable/disable in house development)</li> <li>○ Basic standardized data</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Strengths/weaknesses of different vendors               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Customized solution for the whole state</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Shared vendor/schema enables one county to develop queries etc. for others</li> <li>• MyBallot type electronic balloting system               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Or license with vendor</li> <li>○ Use for disability access-online more accessible to them AVU</li> <li>○ Ensure ballot order matches county's ballot</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Technology Summit April 8, 2014 | Brainstorming notes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better county to county data exchanges in V.R.</li> <li>• Sharing crediting information horizontally</li> <li>• Later deadline for updating V.R. addresses (live data during an election shared horizontally)</li> <li>• Better integration between state VRDB and county EMS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued relationship/partnership with good communication and communication channels at state and local levels.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Development</li> <li>○ Testing</li> <li>○ Implementation</li> <li>○ Maintenance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Technical staff to support new system</li> <li>• Easy to use for:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff</li> <li>○ Voter</li> <li>○ Candidate</li> <li>○ Public</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Good usability             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Audio</li> <li>○ Languages</li> <li>○ Flow</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Redundancy: don't create a single point of failure</li> <li>• Secure checks and balances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single file format for all vendors (ballot, electronic ballot, etc.)</li> <li>• Eliminate redundant data entry, multiple proofing-seamless data integration</li> <li>• Certification: platform independent to provide flexibility             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Statewide solution might provide impetus to certify and keep up to date</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Maintain county control of data-county knows county better than state does</li> <li>• County websites-revisit SharePoint</li> <li>• Configurability of reporting apps (OVG etc.)- turn on/off features where applicable</li> <li>• Platform agnostic-mobile device compatibility</li> <li>• Driver license scanning- instant registration (capture and compare signature)</li> <li>• Capability of pre-registering and holding underage registrants.</li> <li>• Same-day registration</li> <li>• Automatic signature verification</li> <li>• Tabulation-Isolation from web             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unified ballot design</li> <li>○ Unified reporting system</li> <li>○ Reporting for public verification</li> <li>○ Ballot images?</li> <li>○ Citizen verifiability- non traceable serial number/tear-off stub?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Roadblock to success</b></p>	<p><b>Roadblock to success</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutes             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Legislatures</li> <li>○ County commissioners</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Roadblock to success</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E1C, Democracy Live- \$1.10 per voter/ per year</li> <li>• Cloud hosting- security?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Longevity of hosting company?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Technology Summit April 8, 2014 | Brainstorming notes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical changes that could slow processing and results</li> <li>• Changes to procedures</li> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Finding a vendor to create our perfect system</li> <li>• Timing: Planning now but not implementing until 2017</li> <li>• Disposability of new technology</li> <li>• Vendor dependability</li> <li>• Are we creating a single point of failure?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Service level agreement</li> <li>○ Reporting vs. VR data security levels</li> </ul>
<p><b>Best Solutions</b></p>	<p><b>Best Solutions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One VR system fully integrated             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ VR</li> <li>○ EMS</li> <li>○ Candidate info/elected</li> <li>○ Petitions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Languages             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Accessible</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Flexible tabulation system (tabulate no matter the format)</li> <li>• Consider phasing out/removing the USPS from the delivery process</li> <li>• Centralized approach</li> <li>• Automatic voter registration and/or modernized motor voter processes</li> <li>• Integration on a national level-ERIC as an example</li> <li>• Identifying roles and responsibilities             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State/county</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Best Solutions</b></p>

Technology Summit April 8, 2014 | Brainstorming notes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Maintain efficiencies<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ ie streets still maintained at county</li><li>▪ Candidates</li><li>▪ Mapping</li></ul></li><li>• Funding<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Fees</li><li>○ Local jurisdiction/county/state blend- gaining economies of scale</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	---	--