

Leticia Calvo

From: Bolton, Steve [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2002 9:17 AM
To: 'Leticia Calvo'
Subject: RE: M-650 audit log upgrade

These are in addition to the changes previously sent. In proceeding with continued testing and certification for the state of Florida, requests for less technical and more easy to read audit log messages was requested.

Steve Bolton
Vice President, Product Management
Election Systems & Software, Inc.
Omaha NE, 68137
402-593-0101 ext. 1118
[REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This e-mail transmission and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain information that is confidential, protected by the attorney/client or other privileges, and may constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s) named above. Any unauthorized use, reproduction, forwarding, distribution or other dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not an intended recipient of this e-mail transmission, please notify the sender by return e-mail and permanently delete any record of this transmission. Your cooperation is appreciated.

-----Original Message-----

From: Leticia Calvo [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2002 9:10 AM
To: 'Bolton, Steve'
Subject: RE: M-650 audit log upgrade

Steve, are these the same changes that you have already submitted to us for the upcoming examination, or are these in addition to what you have already sent us?

-----Original Message-----

From: Bolton, Steve [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2002 5:47 PM
To: Leticia Calvo (E-mail)
Cc: McKay, Sue; Shoemaker, Roberta
Subject: M-650 audit log upgrade

Leticia, in reviewing and using the M-650, we found several real time audit log entries that needed to be explained or re-worded to make for improved readability. We went forward with upgrading the version of software on the M-650 to reflect those needs. It was sent to Wyle for review and Jim Dearman will be coming to Omaha to perform minor functionals on it to verify the changes. Since the changes just reflected audit log entries and corrected one anomaly with importing data via the zip drive, it will be a small test. I am submitting to you the change release and subsequent source code review for you to pass on for determination of your requirements to test it for upgrade. Attached are those two documents. Please let me know if this small change warrants a review or not. Thanks for your help with this.

5/22/2002

Steve Bolton
Vice President, Product Management
Election Systems & Software, Inc.
Omaha NE, 68137
402-593-0101 ext. 1118

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This e-mail transmission and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain information that is confidential, protected by the attorney/client or other privileges, and may constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s) named above. Any unauthorized use, reproduction, forwarding, distribution or other dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not an intended recipient of this e-mail transmission, please notify the sender by return e-mail and permanently delete any record of this transmission. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Elizabeth Hanshaw Winn

From: Bolton, Steve [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2002 12:01 PM
To: Elizabeth Hanshaw Winn (E-mail); Paul Craft (E-mail)
Cc: Ann McGaëhan (E-mail); Nick Osborn (E-mail); McKay, Sue

Two examiners recommended certification of Unity 2.2 & all systems, with conditions, and three recommended not to certify, using basically the same conditions as the other two recommending certification as there reason for not certifying. Below is a breakout of the examiners reports and concerns for your information.....Following, I explain why I see no reason not to certify based on the comments from the examiners.

James Sneeringer, PHD, assigned by Attorney General office
Certification NO

Reason: 1. ERM real time audit log has a bug that printed incorrect time stamp.
2. NO real time audit log on iVotronics at collecting results to PEB.
Comments: regarding #2 "I do not perceive this a a great risk, but it does not comply with the SOS admin regulations" (real time audit log)

Barney Knight, Atty, appointed by SOS office
Certification YES

Concerns: 1. Real time audit log on iVotronic
2. ERM audit log confusing
Recommendations: Require M-550 ballot log to be active at all times, require zero tape printing on iVotronic at poll opening, & making sure to clear PEB vote totals prior to delivery to polling location

Tom Watson, Atty
Certification NO

all but M-650. M-650 YES
Reasons: 1. ERM audit log confusing & incorrect time stamp
2. M-550s audit log was not enabled
3. M-100 has not audit log
4. PEB had votes on it from earlier test

Glenn Glover, Analyst, appointed by Attorney General
Certification NO

M-150 & 650 YES
Reasons: 1. ERM audit log confusing & wrong time stamp
2. PEB had votes on it from earlier test
3. M-550 audit log was not enabled
4. M-100 has not audit log
5. No iVotronic audit log for PEB
Recommendations: Eliminated the M-550 audit log option and make it permanant so it can't be disabled
Comments: "encourage ES&S to return with iVotronic"

Nick Osborn, Systems Analyst, works for SOS IT division
Certification: YES on all systems


Recommendation: Check to be sure M-550 ballot log option is always turned on, work on making ERM audit log more user freindly.

EXPLANATIONS

1. IVotronic audit log requirement: Administrative rule presented to remove this requirement
2. The ERM "confusion" resulted from having five systems that will never be deployed at one time working on the same system for certification purposes. Typically, there would be only two groups not five going into ERM. This makes the audit log somewhat cluttered with all the changing of groups to load different systems.
3. The incorrect timestamp on the ERM audit log is caused by the fact that the real time print out is a copy of the electronic file printed in real time. The electronic copy has a page heading in it that is being passed to the real time printer. It picks up the time stamp in that header of when the last electronic report was created. We shut the time stamp off on the header and it went away and this was demonstrated at the cert event. However, the page heading remains and should be removed from the realtime log. NOTE. The actual event logs printed the correct time stamp on each event. Also, the audit log printer defaults to 10 CPI, and the audit report is printed to 17CPI. ES&S staff was not aware of this particular and could have set the printer to 17CPI eliminating any page wrapping of the report on this printer.
4. ERM audit log confusion.....continued...due to the page header being printed, and the fact that it is on a dot matrix printer, and the examiners kept rolling the paper up to read the log, this caused the page header to be printed out not at the top of the page, but anywhere on the page. If we just eliminate this header from printing, this all goes away.
5. M-550 ballot log was not present. We changed the setting and reburned the M-550 EPROM and demonstrated that the log was correctly printing as the ballots were being scanned.
6. PEB had votes stored on it from previous test. I demonstrated the automated logic and accuracy test, then cleared and tested the terminals and re-opened the polls on each terminal. The IVotronic system does notify the user if PEB votes are present, but I bypassed this during the exam. My mistake, but I went back and cleared the PEB votes out, re-voted and showed that the results were indeed correct.
7. PEB had votes stored on it.....I explained that we had to allow this due to the fact that during Early Voting, the jurisdictions were requiring us to close the polls everynight, effectively making us allow the opening of poll each day with votes stored on the PEB. It is documented in the user manuals.

Based on the fact that Unity 1.1 and all the tabulation devices are previously certified in the state of Texas, these upgrades provide much needed improvements, and all systems have an FEC qualification on them, I urge the state to see clear to recommend upgrading these particular system versions for certification. Enhancements will be made to improve upon the systems where comments were made by the examiners.

*Steve Bolton
Vice President, Product Management
Election Systems & Software, Inc.
Omaha NE, 68137
402-593-0101 ext. 1118*



Ann McGeehan

From: Bolton, Steve [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2002 4:52 PM
To: Ann McGeehan (E-mail)
Subject: Certs

Hello Ann,

Elizabeth got out of the office today without getting back in touch with me. I believe she said she will be out for a few days. I would like to get to a conclusion on the cert event from Sept yet. At issue yet to be resolved from my conversations with Elizabeth was for someone to view the M-550 audit log start up sheet to verify that the printer will print a configuration page and notify the user that the ballot log option is enabled. We can do this through any of our local customers. I will scan the configuration page and send it to you PDF so you know where it is and can verify for yourself.

The other issue is the audit log of ERM. As you might have seen, I forwarded this on to the examiners for their review and received comment back from Nick already, forwarded it on to you also. As you can read in Nicks email, confusion is not on the part of the audit log, but just the overall certification due to the number of systems we were trying to upgrade.

I am holding shipment of Bexar Counties iVotronic units and we need to ship the units on Thursday of this week in order to meet the contract delivery date. Cliff Borosfsky wants to be sure the latest certified version of firmware is on them. I need to have version 7.4.5.0 (wyle certified) installed on them as it corrects a defect in the last version that caused a lockup on the iVotronic. 7.4.5.0 corrects this.

I am willing to come back down to demonstrate the iVotronic and ERM in January so that it is only the one system and the examiners will not be confused by the other systems if need be, but I would like to at least have a certification on the system for now so that I can deliver the units to Bexar for installation inspection. Please let me know ASAP what I can do to resolve this issue. I really appreciate your response to my request.

Regards,

Steve.

Steve Bolton
Vice President, Product Management
Election Systems & Software, Inc.
Omaha NE, 68137
402-593-0101 ext. 1118

[REDACTED]

Ann McGeehan

From: Bolton, Steve [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2002 9:55 AM
To: Ann McGeehan (E-mail); Elizabeth Hanshaw Winn (E-mail)
Cc: Barney Knight (E-mail); Glenn Glover (E-mail); Jim Sneeringer (E-mail); Nick Osborn (E-mail); Paul Miles (E-mail); Pete Wassdorf (E-mail); Tom Watson (E-mail)
Subject: M-550 log

This pdf is from the configuration page that is generated each time a Model 550 scanner is powered up. I pass this along to show you how the user or coder can easily verify that the ballot audit log is always enabled.

Ann, if you need to have an examiner see this personally, please let me know. Since you have not issued certification on this version as yet, we have not coded any election using this version, so we would need to send a chip to you for the examiner to use.

<<TX 550 Log.pdf>>

*Steve Bolton
Vice President, Product Management
Election Systems & Software, Inc.
Omaha NE, 68137
402-593-0101 ext. 1118*

[redacted]