



ALEX PADILLA | SECRETARY OF STATE | STATE OF CALIFORNIA
1500 11th Street | Sacramento, CA 95814 | **Tel** 916.653.7244 | **Fax** 916.653.4620 | www.sos.ca.gov

January 13, 2016

The Honorable Mark Leno, Chair
Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
State Capitol, Room 5019
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Shirley Weber, Chair
Assembly Budget Committee
State Capitol, Room 6026
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairpersons Leno and Weber:

Attached please find a copy of a status report on the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) activities carried out over the past calendar year, provided pursuant to budget control language adopted under Item Number 0890-001-0890, Provision 3 of the 2015-16 Budget.

I hope you find the report informative and helpful. If there are any questions from your office about this report, please feel free to contact me at (916) 695-1662 or susan.lapsley@sos.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Susan Lapsley
Deputy Secretary of State, HAVA Director and Counsel

cc: The Honorable Jim Nielsen, Vice Chair, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
The Honorable Melissa Melendez, Vice Chair, Assembly Budget Committee
The Honorable Sebastian Ridley-Thomas, Chair, Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee
The Honorable Benjamin Allen, Chair, Senate Elections and Constitutional Amendments Committee
The Honorable Adrin Nazarian, Chair, Assembly Budget Subcommittee, State Administration
The Honorable Richard Roth, Chair, Senate Budget Subcommittee, State Administration and General Government
Mr. Mac Taylor, Legislative Analyst
Mr. Michael Cohen, Director, Department of Finance
Ms. Diane Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel

Status Report: Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) related activities

Pursuant to 2015-2016 Budget Control Language, the Secretary of State is required to report, by January 15th of each year, on the following activities, until the Statewide Voter Registration System (VoteCal), required by Section 303 of HAVA, is fully implemented. This status report, in accordance with 2015-16 Budget Control Language, is required to address the following areas:

- Poll monitoring;
- The expected General Fund exposure for completion of HAVA compliance, including the expected costs of administration; and
- Completion of the VoteCal system, including information on the costs associated with the use of contractors and consultants, the names of the contractors and consultants used, and the purposes for which contractors and consultants were used.

This comprises the ninth annual status report.

Poll Monitoring

Election Day Observation (poll monitoring) – Election Day Observation was conducted during the June 3, 2014, Primary Election and the November 4, 2014, General Election. Reports on these Election Day Observation programs and programs previously conducted are posted on the Secretary of State's website at <http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/voting-systems/oversight/election-day-poll-worker-training-observation-reports>.

Expected General Fund exposure for completion of HAVA compliance (including expected costs of administration)

➤ Voting Systems

The voting system upgrade contracts for California's 58 counties provide reimbursement to counties for the cost to purchase or lease voting systems to meet federal voting system standards or to upgrade local voting systems. No General Fund exposure is expected for current or future activities relating to HAVA voting system requirements.

➤ Statewide Voter Registration System (VoteCal)

An "interim solution" to meet the requirements of Section 303 of HAVA for a statewide voter registration system was implemented pursuant to a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) executed with the U.S. Department of Justice (US DOJ) – the

enforcement authority for HAVA – on November 2, 2005. The interim solution voter registration system is still in use at this time. No General Fund exposure is expected for the activities related to the interim solution.

Under the terms of the MOA, the Secretary of State is required to pursue a long-term solution to meet HAVA Section 303 requirements. The Secretary of State is now in the deployment phase of that project, called VoteCal. Additional details about the project are provided later in this report.

➤ Polling Place Accessibility

The Secretary of State has undertaken projects to improve polling place accessibility pursuant to a grant program conducted under HAVA Section 261, which is administered by the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Under a \$211,534 contract with the Department of Rehabilitation (DOR), the state agency with expertise on physical accessibility standards for buildings, the Secretary of State developed and published in 2010 updated polling place accessibility guidelines required by the federal Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act of 1984 and referenced in California Elections Code section 12280. This effort, conducted in collaboration with county elections officials and the Secretary of State's Voting Accessibility Advisory Committee (VAAC), was followed by a statewide training program for county elections officials in how to adhere to the guidelines and accompanying checklist to assess accessibility of polling places. The response from counties was enthusiastic, and the Secretary of State was able to offer DHHS-funded non-competitive grants up to \$5,000 per county for training and assessing polling place accessibility, or for purchasing supplies needed to modify barriers in order to make polling places accessible. These grants expired on May 31, 2010.

In 2011, the Secretary of State continued the collaboration with DOR to undertake the creation of a series of DVD training programs to supplement the in-person training offered in 2010 and for use as stand-alone training sessions for county polling place surveyors and poll workers. Because county election officers expressed a high level of interest in sending additional staff to a second round of training courses, the Secretary of State extended the contract with DOR for additional training in early 2012. This round of training included intermediate classes for experienced county staff. In conjunction with this new program, counties were able to apply for additional DHHS-funded non-competitive grants up to \$20,000 per county to be used for training and assessing polling place accessibility, or for purchasing supplies needed to modify barriers in order to make polling places accessible. These grants expired on December 31, 2012.

Additionally, counties improved accessibility for voters with disabilities using funds from three competitive grant programs awarded in 2008, 2009, and 2011. All three competitive grant programs have expired, but through these competitive grant programs, \$3,820,341.90 was awarded to 28 counties.

In 2013, the Secretary of State once again collaborated with DOR to create a third round of training for counties, which occurred in February of 2014. This training included basic training on polling place accessibility, as well as intermediate classes for experienced county staff. In conjunction with this training program, counties were able to apply for additional DHHS-funded non-competitive grants up to \$30,000 per county to be used for training and assessing polling place accessibility, or for purchasing supplies needed to modify barriers in order to make polling places accessible. These expired on December 31, 2014.

In 2015, the Secretary of State collaborated with DOR to create a fourth round of training for counties, which will occur April 2016. This training will include basic training on polling place accessibility, as well as intermediate classes for experienced county staff. Counties were able to apply for additional non-competitive grants to be used for training and assessing polling place accessibility, purchasing supplies needed to modify barriers in order to make polling places accessible, tablets used for conducting surveys and improving the accessibility of their website. These grants will expire on June 30, 2016.

DHHS funding will no longer be available after June 30, 2016. All DHHS accessibility grants will have expired for this program and no new federal funding for this purpose has been authorized by DHHS.

Funding provided by federal DHHS is for use in categories specified by DHHS: (1) improving physical accessibility to polling places for voters with disabilities; (2) improving access and participation by voters with disabilities; (3) training elections officials on promoting access and participation by voters with disabilities; and (4) providing information on opportunities for participation to voters with disabilities.

➤ Administration of the HAVA Program

The following ongoing needs are associated with the administration of the HAVA program:

Internally, ongoing Secretary of State staffing costs are estimated at \$1.7 million for each of the next two fiscal years. This funding supports the staff working on HAVA activities, a portion of the cost of the voter hotline in use prior to each statewide federal election, and administrative support (budgeting, accounting, and contracting services) for:

- Tracking and implementing changes to federal voting system testing and certification protocols and voting system standards;
- Activities related to further modifications to the statewide voter registration system project;

- Review and payment of claims for reimbursement against voting system upgrade contracts and contracts executed to improve polling place accessibility;
- Reporting to state and federal agencies as required; and
- Coordinating activities relating to audits of the HAVA program.

While these near-term costs associated with HAVA implementation are a certainty, long-term estimates are difficult to project because they may be affected by evolving federal standards and programs, including new oversight activities.

Completion of the VoteCal system (including information on the costs associated with the use of contractors and consultants, the names of contractors and consultants used, and the purposes for which contractors and consultants were used)

As previously indicated, California achieved interim compliance with HAVA Section 303 requirements to establish a statewide voter registration system. However, under the MOA executed with the US DOJ, California is required to implement the long-term, fully compliant VoteCal project. During the prior reporting period, the Secretary of State successfully awarded the System Integrator and two Election Management System (EMS) remediation contracts. During this reporting period, the Secretary of State completed the Development, Testing and Pilot Phases and commenced the Deployment Phase of the VoteCal project. VoteCal is on schedule to become the system of record, having been deployed in all 58 counties, June 30, 2016.

For the foreseeable future, there is a continuing need for internal Secretary of State staff to accomplish tasks relating to HAVA Section 303 requirements to maintain the “interim solution” statewide voter registration list and to pursue the fully compliant VoteCal project, as required under the terms of the MOA with the US DOJ, including:

- Elections Division (program) support to maintain the interim solution voter registration system and to assist in implementing the fully compliant VoteCal voter registration system.
- Information Technology Division (technical) support to maintain the interim solution and to assist in implementing the fully compliant VoteCal voter registration system.
- Administrative support (budgeting, accounting and contracting services) for activities related to planning and executing contracts for the deployment of VoteCal.

Current costs for contractor and consultant needs to support the VoteCal project include:

- **Project Management:** A contract was issued for \$1,043,440 to Kiefer Consulting for services of Linda Wasik as project management consultant for fiscal years 2006-2008. Actual invoices under this contract, which expired June 30, 2009, totaled \$780,290. In July 2009, a contract was issued for \$308,752 to VIP Consulting for services of Fred Wood as a project management consultant through May 31, 2010. \$223,260 was expended under this contract, \$159,120 of it in 2010. In June 2010, a contract was issued for \$1,046,429 with VIP Consulting for services of a project management team consisting of Jonathan Kerhlikar, Mardell Hall, and headed by Kerry Washburn. This contract expired on December 31, 2011, and has been extended through the project duration (June 2016). Consultants on the current contract include Anand Deshmukh, Sean Malone, Eric Scully, Stacy Kilpatrick, and Ralph Petty. A total of \$4,411,509 has been expended under this contract.
- **Project administrator/librarian:** A contract was issued for \$243,168 to COMSYS for services of Melissa Crowley from December 2007 through December 31, 2009. Actual invoices under this contract totaled \$226,950. In January 2010, a contract was issued to Net InComm through December 31, 2011, in the amount of \$283,710. In January 2011, the contract was extended through June 30, 2012, at no additional cost. Pat Melo performed the services under this contract in 2010, followed by Kathleen Cook in 2010-11 until contract expiration on June 30, 2012. A new contract was issued to Net InComm with Kathleen Cook providing service with an expiration date of June 30, 2015. A total of \$311,850 has been expended under this contract.
- **Technical Architect:** A contract was issued for \$328,455 to R Systems, Inc. for services of Pooja Deshmukh from November 2, 2009, through June 30, 2011. A total of \$85,900 was paid under this contract before it expired. A new contract will not be issued.
- **Required Independent Project Oversight Consulting:** A contract was issued for \$762,900 to Continuity Consulting for services of Joan Rene, Tim Jacobs, and Christine Walker from May 2007 to December 31, 2009. Actual invoices under this contract totaled \$566,525. Effective January 1, 2010, a new contract was issued to Meta Vista Consulting Group for \$98,550 for the services of Payson Hall and Rochelle Furtah through June 30, 2012. Payson Hall was replaced by Michelle Colodzin. The contract was extended to the maximum allowable date of February 28, 2013, to utilize remaining funds. Through a competitive bid process, a new contract was executed with Technology Management Solutions, Inc. through the end of the project (June 2016). To date \$229,320 has been expended under this contract.
- **Required Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Consulting:** A contract was issued for \$846,715 with Information Integration Innovation & Associates (I Cubed) for services of Dr. Michael Cox, Arthur G. Mulligan, Al Pangelinan, and Paula Grose from May 2007 through December 31, 2010. Actual invoices totaled \$602,795 during the life of this contract. In March 2011, following a competitive bid process, a new contract in the amount of

- \$532,585 was issued to I Cubed for the services of Dr. Michael Cox, Arthur G. Mulligan, Al Pangelinan, and Aftab Mohammed (who was later replaced by Clancy Priest). In July 2013, the IV&V budget was aligned to coincide with the last approved SPR value of \$1,182,524. Actual invoices totaled \$1,039,155 during the life of this contract. In July 2014, a new contract was issued to I Cubed for the services of Dr. Michael Cox, Arthur G. Mulligan, Al Pangelinan, and Clancy Priest. To date, \$932,443.23 has been expended.
- Primary system integration vendor: A deliverables-based contract was signed September 8, 2009, for \$18,177,000 to Catalyst Consulting Group, Inc. (Catalyst) for a fully operational system. The bid included the services of Scott Hilkert, Don Westfall, Kurt Schwartz, Matt Benton, Kalyn Ferris, and Timothy Smith to serve in lead roles for the project. Actual invoices under this contract totaled \$1,869,666 for both 2009 and 2010. The contract was terminated on May 21, 2010. On March 27, 2013, through a competitive bid process lead by the Department of General Services (DGS), a contract was awarded to the new System Integrator, CGI Technologies and Solutions Inc. with a budget of \$38,751,929. To date \$17,323,948.80 has been expended.
 - EMS Remediation: Two EMS remediation services contractors were procured using DGS-approved Non-Competitive Bid processes. Contracts with DIMS and DFM were executed on April 19, 2013, in the amounts of \$6,005,462 and \$8,772,489 respectively. To date, DIMS has invoiced \$2,860,519.79 and DFM has invoiced \$4,074,656.22.
 - Security Auditor: A deliverables-based contract was issued in August 2014 for \$55,660 to Objective Business Solutions. To date \$44,990 has been expended.
 - Quality Assurance Manager: A contract for a Quality Assurance Manager was issued to Andes Consulting in March 2010 in the amount of \$386,840 for the services of Chris Moore through October 31, 2011. A total of \$26,790 was expended under this contract before it expired. A new contract will not be issued.
 - County Contracts: Contracts with counties for participation in previous design sessions expired in 2012 with an expenditure of \$181,921. Contracts with counties that migrated to a different EMS provider expired in 2012 with an expenditure of \$566,347. New contracts with counties for participation in the implementation of VoteCal were issued in June 2013. To date \$329,032.51 has been expended.
 - Legal Services: \$56,454 was expended in 2011 and \$14,501.50 was expended in 2012 to advise the Secretary of State (SOS) as the SOS prepared the revised Request for Proposal (RFP) for publication. The contract expired June 30, 2013, and the unspent balance of \$13,855 was disencumbered.
 - Organizational Change Management (OCM): A contract was issued in January 2014 for \$500,000 to Infiniti Consulting Group. To date \$395,544.17 has been expended.
 - Migration contracts with Modoc and Trinity counties: Contracts with Modoc and Trinity counties were issued for \$62,221 and \$100,000 respectively in

February 2014. A total of \$154,484.06 was paid under this contract before it expired. The contract expired on December 31, 2014 and the unspent balance of \$7,736.77 was disencumbered.

- Testing Services: A contract was issued in March 2014 for \$500,000 to Staff Tech, Inc. A total of \$297,483 was paid under this contract.

Other contracts yet to be issued based on the approved SPR #5 budget include:

- Web language translation: Projected costs are \$79,152 for FYs 2012-16.
- Back-up, Restore, and Disaster Recovery (BRDR) services: Projected costs are \$921,141 for FYs 2013-17.
- Website accessibility testing: Projected costs are \$55,000 for FYs 2015-16.

Contracts with state departments are not included in this list.

Based on the legislative-approved SPR #5, the total VoteCal project cost is estimated to be approximately \$98 million (including one year of maintenance and operations). Of the estimated \$98 million, one-time total cost is projected at \$92.8 million and one year of operational cost is projected at \$5.3 million.

The VoteCal solution has seven project phases: Phase I – Planning, Phase II – Design, Phase III – Development, Phase IV – Testing, Phase V – Pilot, Phase VI – Deployment and Cutover, and Phase VII – Maintenance and Operation. All Phase I deliverables and activities were completed in October 2013. All Phase II design deliverables and activities were completed in September 2014. Phase III – Development, was completed in March 2015. Phase IV – Testing and Phase V – Pilot were completed in December 2015. Phase VI - Deployment and Cutover is in progress.

The history of the VoteCal project to date includes:

- A Secretary of State Feasibility Study Report (FSR) for the statewide voter registration system project (VoteCal) was approved on April 14, 2006, and an updated Special Project Report (SPR) on VoteCal was issued August 15, 2007.
- An RFP to solicit vendor bids for VoteCal was issued on December 13, 2007. A solution-based procurement process, as provided for in state law, was used for the project.
- Under the auspices of this process, potential bidders notified the Secretary of State by December 31, 2007, of the intent to bid on the project and thereafter engaged in a series of discussions with Secretary of State staff under the direction of DGS personnel in preparation for submission of a bid. During this process, in response to bidder questions and to clarify the RFP, addenda were issued.
- The final addendum to the RFP was issued on December 31, 2008, and a deadline for submission of bids was set for January 29, 2009.

- Under the direct supervision of DGS personnel, a team of evaluators analyzed three bids submitted against the pre-established criteria defined in the RFP. Of the three bids, only one vendor was deemed eligible to proceed to cost opening.
- A Notice of Intent to Award a contract was issued on April 24, 2009.
- As required by the state procurement process, an SPR describing the project in greater detail based upon the winning bid was completed and the SPR submitted to state control agencies, including the Department of Finance (DOF) and Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) on June 23, 2009, which provided copies to the Legislature.
- Meetings with county representatives to describe the project, answer questions and receive input commenced on July 17, 2009. These communications continued, and will continue throughout the project lifecycle.
- The Legislature formally received the SPR on July 23, 2009, from the DOF, and approved the project on August 25, 2009.
- An amended Spending Plan requesting expenditure authority for VoteCal costs for fiscal year (FY) 2009-10 was received by the Legislature from the DOF on August 6, 2009, and approved by the Legislature on August 25, 2009.
- The contract for the VoteCal project was fully executed with the winning bidder – Catalyst Consulting Group, Inc. (Catalyst) – on September 8, 2009.
- The project completed the Planning Phase – Phase I – on December 11, 2009.
- On April 7, 2010, Catalyst proposed a new deployment date that would complete the project in 2013. The SOS asked Catalyst to provide a more detailed schedule and approach before the SOS would consider the request. Catalyst's approach did not consider the network blackout dates. The SOS asked Catalyst to revise its schedule to reflect these dates per the contract, which would result in deploying VoteCal in 2014.
- On April 19, 2010, the SOS determined Catalyst had not yet provided a performance bond as required in the contract. Additionally, the SOS and its independent project oversight consultant expressed concerns about Catalyst's performance, including its ability to meet contractual deadlines. The SOS began working with Catalyst to resolve those issues at that time.
- DGS emailed Catalyst a letter dated April 26, 2010, requesting that Catalyst submit the performance bond to DGS by April 30, 2010. (Performance bonds from vendors are issued to DGS by the surety company and sent directly to DGS by the vendor.)
- On April 27, 2010, DGS indicated to the SOS that DGS would lead the cure process to resolve these issues and transmit the cure letter outlining the issues to Catalyst.
- On April 29, 2010, Catalyst sent a letter to DGS indicating its attempts to secure the performance bond with the expectation it would take an additional 60 to 90 days – or between 9 and 10 months beyond the contractually required date.

- On May 3, 2010, DGS again indicated that the SOS would lead the cure process with Catalyst. When asked for policies or procedures to guide the SOS, DGS indicated it did not have any direction to provide to the SOS and that its legal counsel and procurement staff would not participate in the process.
- On May 4, 2010, the SOS sent Catalyst a letter with a requirement to resolve the issues identified above within 30 days and concurrently offered to meet with Catalyst to discuss the issues.
- On May 6, 2010, Catalyst responded to the cure letter stating it would need 120 days to secure a performance bond – 11 months beyond the contractually required date, but conditioned securing the performance bond on payment that could not be made until the bond was issued, per DGS' direction to the SOS.
- Catalyst requested a meeting to discuss options, which eventually led to a discussion of a negotiated termination of the contract. On May 21, 2010, Catalyst and the SOS mutually agreed to terminate Catalyst's contract.
- On July 19, 2010, the SOS submitted to the OCIO a SPR describing the project status based on the initial FSR for the VoteCal project. The SPR incorporated lessons learned to date, and provided an evaluation of project and HAVA requirements as noted above. The SPR must be approved by the state OCIO before an RFP can be issued to solicit bids.
- On July 23, 2010, the SOS submitted an Information Technology Procurement Plan (ITPP) to DGS. DGS approves all large information technology procurements in the State of California. An ITPP describes the procurement approach proposed by the requesting department. Approval for this ITPP was received on August 4, 2010. (This ITPP approval was moot, however, based on OCIO direction to reduce project scope as noted below.)
- In June and July, the VoteCal team met daily to review the scope requirements in an effort to clarify them. On July 26, 2010, the OCIO directed the SOS to reduce the project budget and schedule (and thus the scope).
- On August 3, 2010, the SOS submitted a revised SPR to OCIO that reflected OCIO's direction to reduce one-time costs and shorten the schedule. OCIO approved the SPR on August 31, 2010.
- On August 6, 2010, the SOS submitted a revised ITPP to DGS. The revised document reflected the reduction in budget and schedule (and therefore scope) directed by the OCIO in response to the July 2010 SPR. Approval of the ITPP was received on August 23, 2010.
- The SOS invited county elections officials to review the original RFP and provide input to the SOS on which requirements should remain in a new RFP that more narrowly focused project scope on voter registration and list maintenance requirements. Six county elections officials reviewed the requirements during August 24-26, 2010, and provided input on each of the functional requirements.

- In the month of September, the SOS team concluded its review and revision of the business and technical requirements.
- On October 29, 2010, the revised RFP was issued, and seven vendors indicated an interest in bidding on the project.
- In November and December 2010, bidders were allowed to ask questions and protest RFP requirements. Questions were answered with the information being made available via both DGS and SOS websites. No vendor formally protested any requirement.
- After receiving pre-qualification packages from bidders on January 24, 2011, DGS decided, on February 8, 2011, to exercise its authority to return bidder pre-qualification packages and reinitiated the RFP process. SOS worked closely with DGS during the months of March and April to resolve issues relating to the terms of the RFP.
- On May 18, 2011, CTA recommended the procurement process be discontinued, and that a Request for Information (RFI) be issued as a way to address issues raised in December 2010, discussions with vendors about the terms of the RFP and subsequent discussions between SOS, DGS and CTA. Further discussion among DGS, CTA and SOS instead resulted in some material changes to the RFP that were published as addenda to the RFP on June 10, 2011.
- Bidders responded to the addenda with additional questions in July 2011, and responses to those questions were published on August 18, 2011.
- On August 26, 2011, bidders' protests to RFP requirements were received by DGS. Following review by DGS, an addendum to the RFP was published on September 22, 2011, in response to bidder protests; that addendum established a new September 30, 2011, deadline for submission of bidder pre-qualification packages.
- During the months of October, November, and December, 2011, pursuant to state procurement procedures and under the direction of DGS, SOS held confidential discussions with bidders to discuss the terms of the RFP.
- DGS and SOS jointly developed new Key Action Dates in January 2012.
- During the month of February 2012, in collaboration with DGS, SOS established final responses to all pending bidder questions from the 2011 confidential discussions with potential bidders and submitted them to DGS for final review.
- In April 2012, SOS completed confidential discussions with bidders. In May 2012, responses to questions and concerns raised by bidders in the April confidential discussions were published. In June, the SOS received additional questions from bidders. The SOS published responses to Bidders' questions on July 3, 2012.
- The deadline for bidders to protest the RFP requirements was August 2, 2012. No protests were received. SOS prepared and received DGS' approval of the Evaluation & Selection Plan. Final proposals from bidders were received on August 20, 2012. Evaluation of proposals began August 21, 2012, and concluded on September 7, 2012. The draft Evaluation & Selection Report (covering technical proposal content and excluding cost

- information) was approved by DGS on September 14, 2012, and the cost opening was conducted on September 19, 2012. SOS then submitted a final version of the Evaluation & Selection Report, including cost information, to DGS on September 24, 2012.
- The notification of intent to award was published by DGS on October 12, 2012, and the last day to protest selection was October 17, 2012. No protests were received.
 - The SOS submitted SPR #4 to the Department of Technology (formerly California Technology Agency) on October 16, 2012. The Department of Technology approved the SPR #4 on November 21, 2012.
 - During November 2012, SOS began development of the EMS Remediation contracts and gained DGS approval to develop these contracts in partnership with the two EMS vendors, DFM Associates and DIMS. Immediately upon receiving cost estimates from the EMS Remediation Vendors, the SOS submitted SPR #5 to the Department of Technology on November 27, 2012.
 - The Department of Technology approved SPR #5 on January 10, 2013. The SOS collaboratively worked with the DOF and the Department of Technology and submitted the Control Section 11.00 notification to DOF on January 15, 2013. The DOF sent the Control Section 11.00 to Joint Legislative Budget Committee for review and approval on January 21, 2013.
 - The SOS received legislative approval of the Control Section 11.00 on February 25, 2013.
 - On March 6, 2013, the DGS approved the contract with the company chosen as the system integrator, CGI Technologies and Solutions Inc. (CGI). On March 27, 2013, the SOS awarded the VoteCal System Integrator contract to CGI. Also in March 2013, EMS Remediation Services contracts were approved by DGS for DFM and DIMS and both contracts were awarded on April 19, 2013.
 - In April 2013, the SOS hosted the project kick-off meeting with key internal and external stakeholders. Further, the SOS began monthly updates at the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials (CACEO) HAVA subcommittee meeting whose attendees include county CACEO members.
 - During May 2013, the EMS Remediation Services contractors began working directly with the SOS and CGI to develop and coordinate the proposed schedules for modifying the EMS in each county. The VoteCal project team continued finalizing CGI planning phase deliverables and started design phase activities.
 - In June 2013, CGI submitted an Integrated Project Schedule (IPS) to the SOS. The IPS provides the description of work that will be performed by the SOS, CGI, and EMS contractors.
 - During July 2013, the project team finalized multiple Phase I planning deliverables and project management plans.
 - The IPS was conditionally accepted by the SOS in early August 2013. Also during August, as part of the design activities to implement Phase II, the VoteCal project team prepared for a week-long Solution Walkthrough with

county representatives which took place in mid-September 2013, the project's first large-scale county outreach and communication effort. SOS completed formal deliverable review and response for System Requirements Specification.

- In September 2013, the SOS conducted a week-long VoteCal Solution Walkthrough for elections officials from 13 counties. This walkthrough provided county elections officials with: (1) an overview of the proposed VoteCal solution; (2) an overview of the revised county voter registration business processes; (3) breakout sessions with the EMS vendor teams; and (4) an opportunity for counties to give feedback on the proposed VoteCal solution. The IPS was updated and approved. The IPS provides a solid foundation from which to build on and monitor future project progress.
- During October 2013, SOS continued change management activities and educational outreach to internal stakeholders including SOS Elections, Information Technology, and Administration staff. OCM activities also intensified with external stakeholders including the counties. SOS began developing the Stakeholder Needs Assessment survey, defining the "as is" voter registration business processes, and initiating efforts to identify project points of contact within each county. Efforts on VoteCal Back-up, Restore and Disaster Recovery (BRDR) services justification and statement of work (SOW) development accelerated.
- During November 2013, the VoteCal project team continued design efforts including collaborative activities to develop detailed system design specifications. The project team also completed configuration of the non-production hardware and software infrastructure in accordance with the IPS. Additionally, a Request for Offer (RFO) for OCM services was released.
- During December 2013, the project team completed proposal evaluations and awarded the OCM services contract to Infiniti Consulting Group. Additionally, an RFO was released for Testing Services and the migration contract with Trinity County was finalized.
- In January 2014, the VoteCal project team finalized contracts for all 58 California counties for reimbursement for costs that may be incurred throughout the implementation of the project. The VoteCal team also finalized migration contracts with Trinity and Modoc counties for reimbursement for costs that may be incurred during the one-time EMS migration effort. The EMS partners conducted fit-gap presentations for counties to demonstrate how their current voter registration systems will be the same as VoteCal and where there will be differences.
- During February 2014, the VoteCal team conducted EMS Solution Walkthrough presentations for the California counties. These presentations detailed for the counties what is going to change in their existing voter registration systems and how those changes will look and function. Also during February, the VoteCal detailed system design was approved by the Secretary of State, which will be used for the development phase of the project. The VoteCal team also finalized procurement and selection of Test Lead for the project.

- In March 2014, the VoteCal team attended Legislative Budget Committee hearings for approval of the fiscal year 14/15 project budget funding. In addition, during March the VoteCal team began review of proposed data standards with the California counties and continued outreach to the partner state agencies (Department of Motor Vehicles, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, California Department of Public Health and Employment Development Department).
- During April 2014, the VoteCal team completed review of the proposed data standards and conducted county readiness meetings with California counties. The VoteCal team began preparing for testing, implementation and training, including set up and configuration of the network connections between the SOS and EMS test environments.
- In May 2014 the VoteCal team released the draft deployment schedule. When the VoteCal project is completed, it will be implemented in California's 58 county elections offices in a series of waves beginning with a pilot phase in July 2015 and the final wave being completed in March 2016.
- Between June and August 2014, the VoteCal project team continued design and development activities. Preparation for testing also continued and included developing and finalizing the system integration test scenarios and coordinating with the EMS vendors on anticipated system integration testing activities.
- In September 2014 all Phase II design activities and deliverables were completed.
- The SI and EMS Remediation contractors continued Phase III and Phase IV development and testing efforts through December 2014. In addition to those efforts, the VoteCal project team established the County Business Process Committee that includes select California county Registrar of Voters and/or designees which make recommendations to the VoteCal project on county elections business processes and identified the five (5) VoteCal pilot counties (El Dorado, Mendocino, Orange, Sacramento, and Solano).
- In January 2015, development, testing and deployment activities continued. The VoteCal project team completed review and refinement of the SOS To-Be and the county To-Be business process documentation. Individual Functional System testing was completed. Scenario System Integration testing, Iterative Load and Validation Data Integration testing, End-to-End (System) testing and Performance Test planning activities all continued.
- During February 2015, development, testing and deployment activities continued. Iterative Load and Validation Data Integration testing was completed. Scenario System Integration testing, End-to-End (System) testing, Performance Test planning, and Business Function Data Integration testing continued. The SOS began its User Acceptance Testing (UAT) for the core VoteCal system. The SOS continued review of UAT test scenarios with the counties for the second phase of UAT.
- Phase III, the development phase, was completed in March 2015. Phase IV (testing) and Phase V (pilot) activities are underway.

- In April 2015, testing and deployment activities continued. System Integration testing, End-to-End (System) testing and Business Function Data Integration testing was completed. SOS User Acceptance Testing (UAT) activities continued. Pilot deployment activities also continued, including the VoteCal team conducting implementation orientations for each of the five pilot counties.
- During May 2015, testing and deployment activities continued. CalVoter/Remediated EMS testing and the initial system performance test was completed. SOS User Acceptance Testing (UAT) activities continued. Pilot deployment activities also continued, including data preparation of pilot county data and county readiness assessments of the pilot counties.
- In June 2015, testing and deployment activities continued. SOS User Acceptance Testing (UAT) activities, which include the pilot counties, continued. Pilot deployment activities also continued, including data preparation, data certification, data load and county readiness assessments of the pilot counties.
- During July 2015, final SOS User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and deployment activities continued. Pilot go-live occurred on July 20 with Orange County and Sacramento County.
- In August 2015, seven counties were deployed ahead of [schedule](#) on the VoteCal system. Final SOS User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and deployment activities continued.
- During September 2015, Pilot go-live completed with El Dorado County, Mendocino County and Solano County going live. Twelve counties are deployed on VoteCal. Final SOS User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and deployment activities continued.
- In October 2015, seven counties went live on VoteCal, including five counties that went live ahead of [schedule](#). Final SOS User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and deployment activities continued.
- During November 2015, the Wave 2 counties went live on VoteCal, including five counties that went live ahead of [schedule](#). Over half of California's counties are now live on VoteCal, with 33 counties deployed. Final SOS User Acceptance Testing (UAT) completed. Deployment activities for Waves 3-6 continued.
- In December 2015, the Wave 3 counties went live on VoteCal. This deployment included Los Angeles County, California's largest jurisdiction as well as three counties going live ahead of schedule.
- As of December 31, 2015 a total of 38 counties are deployed on VoteCal.

The VoteCal Project continues to be executed within the cost structure as approved in SPR #5 and full deployment is planned for June 30, 2016.