



VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 2 Discovery Session Notes

Day 4 – Data Synchronization and List Maintenance

UC 4.14.01 – Process Voter Record Update Batch

Consensus Recommendations:

1. SOS should only trigger this one-time process following discussion with the county. This should not be a regularly scheduled batch.

UC 4.15.01 – Process Election Polling Place Batch

Consensus Recommendations:

2. Batch process should be election-specific (identified by date and EMS-designated uniqueness criteria) and should not include test election data. The EMS vendors may consider including a flag in the database to designate an election as being real or not real.
3. SOS should work with CACEO to develop standardized text on website around things like all mail ballot precincts.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

4. Because the counties want to trigger the upload, the EMS vendors may consider providing an indicator to note that "Polling information is now available." (To EMS vendors and Catalyst)
5. The EMS vendors can provide an indicator along with consolidation information indicating that an election was vote-by-mail. (To EMS vendors and Catalyst)
6. Need cut-off for when election-specific polling place information will be removed from the public access web look-up following an election. (SOS)

Updates to Use Case:

7. Step 2.1 - Add detail that the elections will have to be differentiated by more than just date (EMS-designated standard of uniqueness) to accommodate multiple elections on the same day.
8. Add VBM descriptive text (county-customizable text) should be included in the batch process. Include method for SOS to monitor which counties have not yet triggered the initial batch for an election.

UC 4.16.01 – Process Voter Activity Batch

Updates to Use Case:

9. Update the Requirements section to exclude and include the correct requirements for this use case.
10. Update use case to include batch process scenarios. Consider the following possible scenarios: mass updates to active/inactive status and applying permanent VBM status to a specific election.

UC 4.17.01 – Send Image Batch

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

11. For signature images, system should indicate the source. EMS vendors may need to add a field to attribute the source, which may be loaded to VoteCal (To EMS vendors and Catalyst)

Updates to Use Case:

12. Update step 2.2 to specify the order of priority per image type (i.e. affidavits versus signatures, etc.)

UC 4.07.01 – Jurisdiction Notifies SOS of VNC Printing

Updates to Use Case:

13. This use case is redundant (of use case 4.16.01) and will be stricken from the list of use cases.

UC 3.41.01 – Process Duplicate Voter Detection Job

Consensus Recommendations:

14. When records are merged in local EMS's, the EMS needs a way to notify VoteCal of this merge so that VoteCal knows to merge the records at the state level. (To EMS vendors and Catalyst)
15. Many counties have compiled a list of match cases that have definitively been rejected. Counties prefer that this information be imported to VoteCal to avoid re-review. This may be a one-time database import instead of a batch process. (To EMS vendors and Catalyst)



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 2 Discovery Session Notes

Issues To Be Revisited in Week 5:

16. In order to enable automated matching processes, there needs to be a careful definition of what constitutes the “most recent record”. Catalyst has proposed that the most recent record should be the record which contains the most recent “user-initiated transaction”. Catalyst will work with the EMS vendors to explore the feasibility of this definition. (To EMS vendors and Catalyst)

UC 3.42.01 – Accept or Reject Duplicate Voter Match Case

Consensus Recommendations:

17. Counties would like the option to add comments explaining why a match case was accepted or rejected.

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

18. In addition to the option for the county to Accept or Reject the match case, Catalyst to explore the feasibility of a "flip" option, for situations where it was determined that the other county had the older record to be merged. This option should include the capability to communicate to the other county the reason the match was ‘flipped’. (To Catalyst)

Updates to Use Case:

19. Update the use case to either cross-reference use case 03.41.01 or use the same verbiage.

UC 3.43.01 – Undo Accepted Duplicate Voter Match Case

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

20. When a voter is reinstated, additional checks on the data (e.g. precinct assignment) are required to have a fully active voter record. This list of data checks needs to be confirmed with the EMS Vendors, and the interim status agreed upon. (To EMS vendors and Catalyst)

Updates to Use Case:

21. In step 10.4 explicitly state that the restore action might involve other EMS steps. This is also applicable to the undo transfer function.
22. Change the Actor to include Counties (as primary).

UC 3.44.01 – Re-Open Rejected Duplicate Voter Match Case

Updates to Use Case:

23. Update the use case to be SOS-specific for batch actions, and County-specific for manual actions.
24. One of the columns in the Duplicate Voter Match List should be User (who last acted on the match case) for instances in which a county wanted to review all the use cases rejected by a member of their staff.

UC 4.06.01 – EMS Processes Message Queue

Consensus Recommendations:

25. New voters or online registration should start off in a “awaiting county action” status until the county has reviewed the record and assigned a precinct.

Proposed Change Requests:

26. Consider sending an email confirmation to the voter, once online voter registration is complete. (This involves new functionality to auto-generate email confirmations that was not required in the RFP or the Contract. (To SOS)

UC 3.01.01 – Process CDPH Death Records File

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

27. Different counties have different standards for when the cancellation of a record due to death should be effective. While VoteCal should record dates of death and dates of user transactions processing the death record, the policy committee should decide which date is the effective date of the voter record cancellation. (CACEO Business Process Committee)

UC 3.02.01 – Accept or Reject Death Record Match Case

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)



VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 2 Discovery Session Notes

UC 3.03.01 – Undo Applied Death Record Match

Updates to Use Case:

28. Expand the “undo accept match case” functionality to include “undo rejected match case” functionality. This should be added to the use case as an alternate flow.
29. The title of the use case should be changed to “Undo Death Record Match Case”

UC 3.11.01 – Process CDCR Felon Record File

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

30. Policy decision on when to make felon records effective, corresponding to decision in UC03.01.01 (CACEO Business Process Committee)

UC 3.12.01 – Accept or Reject CDCR Felon Record Match Case

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 3.13.01 – Undo Accepted CDCR Felon Match Case

Updates to Use Case:

31. Expand the “undo accept match case” functionality to include “undo rejected match case” functionality. This should be added to the use case as an alternate flow.
32. The title of the use case should be changed to “Undo CDCR Felon Match Case”

BP09 – Process NCOA-CASS

Other Action Items:

33. Counties to provide any current scripts and criteria used to automatically process NCOA/DMV COA information (by Monday March 8)
34. Catalyst to rewrite the NCOA process and bring back to the group for review next week. Consider VoteCal working more like an information conduit that relies on the local decision making process and expertise built into the EMS. VoteCal would send information to the counties for review after verifying it had not previously been sent. Counties and EMS vendors may decide to apply their own automated logic, if they choose. Counties would then send VoteCal the decision information when they have made a determination. (Catalyst)

Day 5 – Extracts/Lists, DMV COA, Poll Lists/Rosters, PVRDR, Administration

UC 06.06.01 – Enter PVRDR/Jury Wheel Request for Organization

Consensus Recommendations:

35. Counties would like the ability to generate extracts across county boundaries, especially when there is a district that crosses county boundaries. It is not expected that this will be used often.
36. File formats to be finalized, as rows/records can be chosen, but columns cannot be changed. Catalyst should replicate the two predefined file formats SOS is currently using.
37. VoteCal should prohibit salt records from being inserted into Jury Wheel Extracts.
38. VoteCal should include capability to use court districts as sort/selection criterion for extracts. (NOTE: This may be outside current scope of RFP requirements and contract and, therefore, subject to change control process.)
39. VoteCal should include capability to select records for extract based on vote-by-mail ballot status. (Alternatively, this may be solved through one of the undefined ad hoc reports.)
40. Consider a self-service tool on the public access website that would allow requestors to retrieve their files (or updates to a request that is repeated daily/weekly). Note that the validation for PVRDR Requestors will be different than the validation for “Am I Registered?”. (NOTE: This may be outside current scope of RFP requirements and contract and, therefore, subject to change control process.)

Issues & Decisions To Be Resolved:

41. Need guidelines on permission levels for creating extracts, including cross-county extracts and when (if ever) SOS secondary approval is needed. (SOS Policy, CACEO Business Process Committee)



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 2 Discovery Session Notes

Updates to Use Cases:

42. Add Permanent Absentee Ballot to the list of statuses.
43. Indicate that activity logs should be visible on the Organization Details screen.
44. Include a security level on statewide organizations that will allow county users to add comments to a statewide organization information (specifically when a request was denied at the county level).
45. Include a restriction against users entering salt records into jury wheels.

UC 06.07.01 – Generate PVRDR File Set

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 05.15.01 – Add Customer Organization

Consensus Recommendations:

46. Counties (and SOS) have expressed a desire for the capability to attach a scanned image of the PVRDR request form to the organization's information. (NOTE: This may be outside current scope of RFP requirements and contract and, therefore, subject to change control process.)

Updates to Use Cases:

47. Clarify the use case to include that the "Requestor ID" refers to the driver's license of the contact person for the request, not the statewide UID.

UC 05.08.01 – Record Issuance of Affidavits for Organization

Consensus Recommendation:

48. To enable the county to search by affidavit number and by source (i.e. DMV, organization name, etc.), the SOS should come up with a standard list of Sources. (To SOS)
49. Consider capability for batch transfer/update of county-tracked affidavit issuances out of the EMS to VoteCal. (NOTE: This may be outside current scope of RFP requirements and contract and, therefore, subject to change control process.)

Updates to Use Cases:

50. Update step 8 to include the Proposed Method of Distribution and NVRA Category/Source as fields on the screen.

UC 05.16.01 – Select Customer Organization

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 05.17.01 – Edit Customer Organization

Consensus Recommendations:

51. There should be a restriction for users to only be able to edit the organizations entered by the same county. SOS will be able to edit organizations entered by all counties or by SOS.
52. County users should have the capability to determine whether to search for organizations created by their county or statewide.

Updates to Use Cases:

53. Update step 8 so that the search criteria includes the County of Issuance. This will help the counties identify which contact is the appropriate contact in a statewide organization.

UC 05.19.01 – Add/Edit Customer Organization Contact

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 05.09.01 – Determine Organization that was Issued an Affidavit

Consensus Recommendations:

54. Link from the affidavit number on the Voter Details screen to view the organization details. (If there is no affidavit number or the affidavit number is not linked to an organization, either do not link or issue an error.)

Updates to Use Cases:

55. Create an additional use case to detail how to edit the affidavit issuance record (in the event that a batch of affidavits are returned and reissued).



VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 2 Discovery Session Notes

BP10 – Process DMV COA / UC 03.21.01 – Process DMV COA Record File / UC 03.22.01 – Accept or Reject DMV COA Match Case / UC 03.23.01 – Undo Accepted DMV COA Record Match

Issues To Be Revisited in Future Week:

56. Catalyst to review and resubmit these use cases taking into consideration the following factors:
- Preference for VoteCal to not automatically apply address changes and instead create an informational item as an in-progress change (not the same as pending voter status) to be processed and handled by the County. VoteCal would track the work item until it is resolved or rejected.
 - Preference toward taking non-matches and sending to the county for review, but marked as non-matches. This preference was subsequently reversed in Week 3, following additional discussion.
 - Preference to have address information passed to EMS as sent by DMV without parsing or other modification.
 - Consider using CASS process to pick up corrections to the DMV data.
57. The following potential mailings from this process were noted:
- “No match” that cannot be resolved = a “Permanently Unhandled” mailing, same as current.
 - “Cross county COA” matches = no mailing on cancellation due to ‘1st party notification’ (unless statute changes to allow transfer); can/should we send VRC for voter to register in new county?
 - “Unprecinctable addresses within county” = follow-up letter, with additional voter-specific details (open item – how to transmit comments?)
 - “In county change” = Voter Notification Card (open item – with or without polling place?)

BP13 – Generate Poll List / Roster and UC 06.01.01 – Generate Election Roster (contains notes from Day 6 combined)

Consensus Recommendation:

58. Counties still need process to create Street Index Report from the same data set as used for Roster. (Can this be handled through EMS?).
59. Counties should have option to exclude ‘inactive’ voters from the standard rosters and supplemental rosters. (For exports, counties prefer that the inactives be included in the extract and then be left to the county/EMS as to whether they are included in the printing.) (Note: several counties currently exclude inactives from the roster due to cost savings. In this situation, inactives must vote provisionally in the polling place.)

Other Action Items:

60. Counties and EMS Vendors to submit samples rosters which will display the format and the content by Mon March 8.

Updates to Use Cases:

61. Include business rules to clear the “printed on roster” flag, which will include voters on the supplemental roster. This may include: party change, address change, name change, ID required, status change, precinct assignment, ballot issues, and affidavit number change.
62. Update step 2.1 that the drop-down should be populated only with the elections pertaining to that county.
63. Update step 5.1.4 to only apply to supplemental rosters.
64. Update the Business Rules item for VoterUID to be the local EMS bar code.
65. Update the Business Rules to change “Ballot Style” to “Regular/Home Precinct”.
66. Mail-only precincts should be excluded from the extract list.
67. Update language regarding inclusion of Inactive Voters following policy decision.
68. Update to reflect additional data/format needs for Primary elections (e.g. party information).

Day 6 – Extracts/Lists, Administration, Correspondence, Reports, Public Access Website

BP15 – Complete VR Work in Progress

Consensus Recommendations:

69. Preference to indicate when research on a work item has been initiated (e.g. add an “Open” or “In Progress” status).
70. Counties prefer all related work items for a registration to be combined into a single work item or grouped together in the display.

Updates to Use Cases:



VoteCal Discovery Sessions February 9 – March 11, 2010 Week 2 Discovery Session Notes

71. Make verbiage consistent across VoteCal and UCs, with regard to 'Declined' and 'Rejected'.
72. Clarify that work items based on a data deficiency or error should contain a short statement of the problem, and not just a non-descript error code.

UC 01.14.01 – Respond to Notice of Data Deficiency

Consensus Recommendations:

73. Non-fatal issues should not disenfranchise the voter. (Note: this is already a basic requirement of VoteCal.)

Updates to Use Cases:

74. Clarify the intent of the use case, to identify fatal and non-fatal errors that trigger each condition.
75. Add requirement that discusses the fatal conditions to the list of requirements covered by this use case.

UC 01.02.01 – Respond to Missing Precinct Assignment Notice Through EMS

Issues To Be Revisited in Week 5:

76. This use case will be redone and resubmitted along with the COA-related use cases. (NCOA, DMV COA)

BP12 – Create User Account in VoteCal

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 05.12.01 – Create User Account From VoteCal Application

Consensus Recommendations:

77. Counties prefer to use the same local usernames on VC as in their local EMS if possible, or a variation of the local usernames (such as adding a county code).
78. Counties would like the ability to re-issue Verisign cards at the county level, by indicating when a card has been disabled for a previous user and re-enabled for a new user.
79. Counties would like to have additional controls beyond those specified, including the ability to reset passwords and add/edit additional contact information for a user.

Other Action Items:

80. SOS will provide username / password criteria and Verisign issuance procedures to the counties, as part of implementation planning.

Updates to Use Cases:

81. Clarify that County Administrators have responsibility to notify users of their new/updated credentials, and that VoteCal will not send an automated email.

UC 01.15.01 – Process Failed IDV Retry Job

Issues To Be Revisited in Week 5:

82. This use case will be updated and re-presented to the group at a later time.

BP16 – Generate Report

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 07.18.01 – Generate Report or Correspondence

Consensus Recommendations:

83. List of previously generated reports should reflect details such as County and User ID. Would prefer to filter results to only display in-county instances.
84. Counties would like to receive email notification when the report has been generated and is ready for review (when it is not immediately available). (NOTE: This may be outside current scope of RFP requirements and contract and, therefore, subject to change control process.)
85. Counties would like the report screen to display a projected run time for the selected report, based on historical run times.
86. Counties would like the option to include a control page that indicates selection parameters and administrative details.
87. The requirement for reporting formats in Excel and Word formats should be satisfied by .csv and .rtf respectively.



**VoteCal Discovery Sessions
February 9 – March 11, 2010
Week 2 Discovery Session Notes**

Updates to Use Cases:

88. Update the Requirements section of the use case to reference the list of 100+ reports in RFP Section VI.

UC 08.01.01 – Review Orphaned Voters

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 08.11.01 – Review Orphaned Precincts

Updates to Use Cases:

89. Update Requirement S21.4 to include Federal Congressional Districts.

UC 08.03.01 – Generate Precinct-District Report

(No significant decisions or items for follow-up)

UC 10.01.01 – Verify Voter Identity Online

(This use case has been deferred to next week)

UC 10.07.01 – Verify Voter Registration Online

(This use case has been deferred to next week)