TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:
12.217

BAA number:
H98210-BAA-11-0001

Title of Proposal:
Advanced Simplification In Military and Overseas Voting

CAGE Code:
[redacted]

DUNs Number:
[redacted]

Identity of applicant and contractors:
South Dakota Secretary of State's Office
Nebraska Secretary of State's Office
BPro, Inc.

Technical contact:
Brandon Campea
President/ Senior Software Engineer
BPro, Inc.
318 South Pierre Street
Pierre, SD 57501
Phone: (605)224-8114
Fax: (605)224-1665
brandon@bpro.com

Administrative/ business contact:
Brandon Johnson
Help America Vote Act Coordinator
500 East Capitol, Suite 204
Pierre, SD 57501
Phone: (605)773-5003
Fax: (605)773-6580
Brandon.Johnson@state.sd.us

Proposed period of performance:
November 1st 2011 – September 19th 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Technical Approach and Justification
- Executive Summary 3
- Goals and Objectives 3
- Schedule and Milestones 5

II. Reports
- Programmatic and Financial Progress Reports 7
- Data Collection Points Reports 7
- Final Report 7

III. Management Approach
- Strategic Goals 8
- Existing Barriers 8
- Current Processes and Justifications for Modification 9
- Identification of Potential Risks and Mitigating Strategies 9
- Projections of the Effectiveness of Modifications 11
- Measurements of Performance and Success 11
- Financial Management 12

IV. Budget Proposal
- Return on Investment 13
- Direct Labor 13
- Administrative and Clerical Labor 13
- Fringe Benefits and Indirect Costs 13
- Travel 14
- Subcontracts/Sub Awards 14
- Consultants 14
- Materials and Supplies 14
- Other Direct Costs 15

I. Technical Approach and Justification

Nebraska and South Dakota (the States), are proposing collaboration between the States and BPro Inc. (BPro) to develop an application that will allow a Uniformed and Overseas Citizen Absentee Voter Act (UOCAVA) voter the opportunity to mark a secret ballot electronically and return the ballot, confident that the ballot will be counted. Although this grant proposal includes the development of functionality that will enable voters to return marked ballots electronically, that portion of the application will be developed for demonstration and security testing purposes. No grant funds will be used for transmitting of marked absentee ballots to be counted in an actual election. If the system that is developed is tested and deemed successful, implementation of the voted ballot return functionality during an actual election will be at the States' expense.

The utility, which will be called the Advanced Simplification In Military and Overseas Voting (ASIMOV), will first serve as a method for the voter to apply for an absentee ballot. The voter will first provide their state-specified unique identifiers (date of birth, driver's license, registered address, etc.). This data will search the States' voter registration system or centralized voter database to pre-populate the application if the voter has an existing voter record; if no voter record exists, the applicant will be able to manually fill in the required information. Depending on specific state requirements, a new or altered existing voter record will either be created by the system or the voter information will be sent to the appropriate election official for processing.

The ASIMOV system will then connect data from the States' voter registration system or centralized voter database (providing the voter's precinct information) with data from the election administration system (providing the voter's precinct specific ballot), to send the voter an e-mail with a hyperlink to their ballot. Clicking this link will open a page specific to the voter allowing the voter to choose to either to print the ballot and return it by mail or to electronically mark and submit the ballot through a step-by-step process on the secure state server.

Upon submittal of the ballot, the voter has the ability to track the status of their absentee ballot. The voter can determine the delivery status, acceptance, rejection, and any applicable rejection reason for the submitted ballot.

In addition to all statewide elections, UOCAVA voters will be able to use the utility for local elections not held in conjunction with the state. UOCAVA voters will be able to quickly access the utility through a web browser on a traditional desktop, laptop, or by downloading an application for the utility on a tablet (Apple iPad, Motorola Xoom) or smartphone (Apple iPhone, Motorola Droid). The States believe voters using this utility will have higher rates of successful return as the key openings for failure for UOCAVA voters resides with the lengthy amount of time it takes for ballots to be sent and received by mail. With this utility voters will have increased awareness of the options to have ballots sent to them electronically and, if they choose to use that option, also return their ballot electronically.

During the 2010 General Election, the States received 5,442 UOCAVA applications, and the States assert that the cost of less than a million to serve these and any future UOCAVA voters of the States is a small price. Additionally, while the States are the current members of this collaborative effort, once developed this utility can also be made available to any other states that can make the necessary data available. Development of this utility will be completed by BPro Inc., a South Dakota based information technology (IT) consulting company.

The ballot application component of the utility will be made available from the States' elections website. From the start of the application process, a UOCAVA voter and non-UOCAVA voter will be treated as equals with a request for state specific identifying information

(driver's license, for example). If the voter has an existing voter record, a pre-populated application will appear on the screen. The application will require the voter to answer a question determining UOCAVA eligibility. If the voter is not UOCAVA eligible, the user will be prompted to print their application and mail for appropriate submission. If the voter is UOCAVA eligible, the application may be submitted electronically. (The States intend to encourage electronic submission of the absentee ballot application since this is the factor that will provide one of the greatest impacts on reducing the amount of time to vote and submit their ballot.) If the UOCAVA voter provides an e-mail address, then their ballot will be accessed via e-mail.

For those voters providing an e-mail address on the ballot application, the ballot link will be sent to the provided e-mail address. The message will include a hyperlink to access the ballot directly on the States' secure server. Each link will be unique to the voter and disabled after the ballot has been submitted. Upon clicking the received hyperlink, a page will open requiring the voter to provide a state specified unique identifier to log in and access the ballot.

The message and hyperlink will also include instructions for how to mark the ballot, how to submit the ballot, and a cut-out to be used on the envelope to ensure proper handling by the United States Postal Service (USPS), if the voter opts to return their ballot my mail. This means that there are two layers of security in the transmittal of the ballot to the voter. First, the ballot does not exist as an Adobe Portable Document File (PDF) in the voter's or election officials' e-mail in-boxes. Second, since the ballot never leaves the States' secure server, it is protected by the States' digital security systems.

For voters making full use of the utility by electronically marking their ballot, contests will be displayed one at a time. Contests will appear in correct order with candidates being displayed using correct rotation to make this process as similar as possible to those voting in person on Election Day. Likewise, the utility will allow the voter to vote for write-ins, if state law allows, and under-vote.

The utility will also include a progress bar to let the voter know how far along the voting process they are. The voter's selections will be saved each time the voter advances to the next contest, which will allow voters with time constraints or poor internet connections to reconnect without having to start the process over again. A "bread crumb" trail will also be present to allow the voter to easily return to previous contests. After completing the last contest the voter will be shown a preview page of their marked ballot which will allow them to verify their selections and return to and modify their selection for any contest they wish.

When ready, the voter will be prompted to submit their ballot. When submitting the ballot, they will need to digitally sign an affidavit. The digital signature will include the voter's date of birth and state specified unique identifier to verify identity. The submitting process will use Crystal Reports to generate a PDF of their marked ballot and save it in a hosted secure file on the States' server. When submitted, a message will be sent to the respective local election official, notifying them that the ballot has been submitted. The official will then follow local procedures to access and create a hard copy of the submitted ballot and affidavit.

All ballots returned digitally will be assigned a system generated password protecting the ballot in a manner known only by the local election official, or their authorized staff. After the file is opened and the ballot and other required materials printed, the ballot will be sealed in an envelope and sent to the appropriate election board to be tabulated on Election Day. Again, the ballots that are being returned will only be during mock elections for testing purposes and not during an actual election.

This utility will also contain a reporting mechanism allowing counties and states to track their UOCAVA voters. When a county is accessing the utility, the report will only contain the information for their UOCAVA voters. Officials at the state will be able to access an aggregated list of all UOCAVA voters from all counties. The report will include, but not limited to, the following information: who requested a ballot, when it was requested, in which format the ballot was sent, when the ballot was sent, when the ballot was returned, and in which format the ballot was returned. Information learned from these reports will help the States to determine which methods of ballot transmission and return resulted in the highest rates of success. Future educational efforts for UOCAVA voters can then stress utilizing those specific methods.

Finally, the utility includes an application that will allow all voters to track the processing of their ballot. When accessed, the application will prompt the voter to provide some state specified unique identifier. The application will use this information to pull up a record of progress of that voter's voting process. It will indicate the date that a ballot was sent to the voter, regardless of which method the voter selected to receive the ballot. After the voter receives, marks, and returns their ballot, they can again use the application to learn when their local election official receives their returned ballot. As required under UOCAVA, a UOCAVA voter will be notified if their ballot is not accepted for tabulation and they will be given the reason as to why it was not accepted. This ballot tracking utility is available to all voters within the state, not just UOCAVA voters.

We expect that the utility, as described above, will lead to higher return rates in the jurisdictions utilizing it for the 2012 election cycle. It is anticipated that voters who make full use of the utility to mark and submit their ballot will have a 100% successful return rate and the privacy of their choices and security of their ballot will be maintained at the highest level. The States anticipate the successful return rate will decrease when voters choose to return the ballot by mail too close to the return deadline. However, since the ASIMOV system will reduce the amount of time it takes for a voter's request for a ballot to be fulfilled, a voter opting to return their ballot through the mail will have several extra days for the postal service to deliver the marked ballot to the appropriate local election official.

In addition to the UOCAVA voters of the States, it is possible that other jurisdictions would choose to adopt the tool after it is developed. The utility is driven by data supplied from a jurisdiction's election administration system and voter file to indicate which voters receive which ballot and then pass the balloting information on to the voter.

The milestones for this project include:

- January 1st, 2012: development of the utility completed
- February 1st, 2012: ASIMOV system installed on the States' servers
- April 30th, 2012: state testing of the utility completed
- June 30th, 2012: states meet with developer to discuss utilities performance
- August 31st, 2012: enhancements complete, if applicable
- November 30th, 2012: testing of enhancements to be complete, if applicable
- December 31st, 2012: final performance evaluation of the utility

From the time work begins on the utility until the project is to be completed by December 31st, 2012, the States and BPro will conduct monthly status calls to report on the status of the project. Documentation on work done will be provided by BPro and, as development on the ASIMOV system progresses, demonstrations of the utility are to be offered. This will allow the States to ensure that the utility is being developed to required specifications. By January 1st,

2012, the utility will be completed and BPro will have worked with the States' respective IT departments to place the utility on servers within the States' system.

The States will test all aspects of the utility, including, but not limited to the following: the application process, the ballot delivery process, the ballot marking utility, return of the ballot digitally and in hard copy form, storage and access of marked ballots on the state's servers, and use of the ballot taking application. Should any problems be discovered, the States will present BPro with a full written report detailing the issues by February 29th, 2012 with fixes being completed with all due haste. If no problems with the utility are discovered during testing, then the States will provide BPro with written acceptance of the utility.

The utility will be programmed, as part of the ballot tracking application, to record when applications are received and when ballots are transmitted to the voter. By the 45th day before the Primary all records of applications received by the 45th day will also have a ballot transmittal date of no later than the 45th day. The utility will be able to create reports, both on the county level and the statewide aggregate, to display that the 45 day milestone was met.

By June 30th, the States and BPro will again meet to review the performance of the utility during the mock elections. If the utility worked as desired, the States will provide BPro with documentation indicating complete acceptance of the utility. Should enhancements be needed or desired, the States will present BPro with a full written report detailing the requested enhancements. Any requests are to be completed by BPro by August 31st, 2012 and testing by the States is to be concluded by November 30th, 2012, with the States again providing documentation to BPro to indicate acceptance of the utility.

The final milestone of this project will take place no later than December 31st, 2012. A final meeting will take place between the States and BPro for a wrap up discussion on how the utility performed functionally as well as changes in the successful return rates of UOCAVA voters who made use of the utility. During this meeting a final report on the success of the utility will be created for the States.

II. Reports

The States and BPro will produce a number of reports during the period of this grant. BPro will produce programmatic and data collection points reports, along with a project timeframe report to submit to the States. The States will submit annual financial progress and performance reports to the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) and/or the Defense Human Resources Activity (DHRA). The States will also submit, if needed, quarterly reports to all of the respected government agencies. Finally, the States and BPro will submit a final report by January 1st, 2013 describing the overall process of the project.

Programmatic reports will be submitted by BPro to the States monthly detailing the development process. This report will include, but not limited to: project plan timeline, step-by-step development process narrative, overall project plan, and project completion percentage. BPro has supplied the States with a project timeline and it is attached to the grant proposal (ASIMOV timeline).

Financial progress reports will be submitted by the States to the federal government and will be submitted using the Standard Form (SF) 425. Performance reports will also be submitted by the States to the federal government and will include an overall summary of the project completion percentage, development phase, and to-date results. The reports that will be submitted to the federal government by the States will be completed by the project director.

A final project report will be completed and submitted to FVAP and the DHRA. This report will include, but not limited to: an overall summarization of the project, cost-benefit analysis, cost breakdown, mock election survey results, and test findings. The States will also submit all information that FVAP and/or DHRA requests.

III. Management Approach

The States will work with BPro to develop the Advanced Simplification In Military and Overseas Voting (ASIMOV) system.

BPro is an information technology (IT) and web services company based out of Pierre, South Dakota. BPro is a well-established consulting company originating in the Midwest and has provided professional consulting services since 1985.

BPro has contracted with the South Dakota Secretary of State to create a number of projects in the past. Most notably is the Central Election Reporting System (CERS) that was created in 2008 for South Dakota and then tailored to a number of other states for the 2010 election cycle. BPro has also been awarded the contract to develop South Dakota's new statewide voter registration system (TotalVote).

The experience that the States have with BPro will be exceedingly beneficial with the development of a solution for UOCAVA voters. The barriers that UOCAVA voters face are significant compared the stateside voter. The States' solution, with the help of BPro, will not only impact a significant number of UOCAVA voters, but will be sustainable. The process that the States propose is to create the ability for the UOCAVA voter apply for an absentee ballot, mark the absentee ballot and return the absentee ballot to the local county official in a single browser session. The solution is smart, simple, and streamlined. The browser session can be completed on any computer with access to the internet, or on an application that will be developed for a tablet (Apple iPad, Motorola Xoom, Samsung Galaxy, etc.) and a smartphone (Apple iPhone, Motorola Droid).

Each UOCAVA voter will start in a single website, which will direct the voter to the applicable state section as governed by individual state law. The voter will log in to the Advanced Simplification In Military and Overseas Voting (ASIMOV) system and enter their registered address to apply for an absentee ballot. The system will verify the address through the States' voter registration system. Once the address is confirmed, the system will check their residential address to define precinct data via the States' election administration system, and determine which ballot the UOCAVA voter should receive. The voter will then be able to mark their ballot onscreen, contest by contest, review their ballot and send it back electronically to local county official. ASIMOV will allow a UOCAVA voter to vote in any election, from the national level to their local races.

The States' main strategic goal is to improve the overall absentee voting experience, accessibility, and percentage of ballot return for the UOCAVA voter. To accomplish this goal, the solution must be technologically innovative and user-friendly, yet secure. First, the States must first identify the challenges that all UOCAVA voters face. Secondly, the States must recognize the direction in which individual state law is progressing towards in usability, functionality, and accessibility that pertain to elections. Lastly, the States must implement a solution that is sustainable, cost-effective, and scalable.

The first challenge is to identify the barriers that UOCAVA voters face. The most recognized barrier is the time-in-transit when sending the ballot by U.S. mail from the voter to the local election official. According to the 2010 Local Election Official Survey conducted by the Overseas Vote Foundation (OVF), about twenty percent of UOCAVA voters received their ballots after the middle of October, which is much better than in 2008, when 39 percent received their ballots late. This delay of time-in-transit has many states opting to use a form of electronic transmission to send and receive absentee ballots. According to the U.S. Election Assistance

Commission's (EAC) 2008 Election Administration and Voting Survey, nearly 1 million ballots were transmitted to UOCAVA-covered voters for the 2008 election and of the ballots transmitted, 69 percent (682,341) were returned and submitted for counting. This is a vast improvement upon the survey conducted in 2006. With the progression of states moving towards electronic absentee ballot applications and electronic transmission of blank ballots to the UOCAVA voter and the presence of other barriers UOCAVA voters face, the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment (MOVE) Act was signed into law on October 28, 2009. The MOVE Act established a presence in elections that overseas voters never had before and removed barriers that once plagued the voting experience for the UOCAVA voter. The States' proposal for developing a streamlined online ballot marking tool for UOCAVA absentee voters will meet MOVE Act requirements.

The States will need to detect the direction in which other individual state law is progressing towards, along with federal mandates, to develop a system that will be sustainable and significant. With the help of the MOVE Act, a number of states have already created or purchased a Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) program to deliver an absentee ballot electronically. All 50 states provided for the electronic transmission of blank ballots to voters, mainly via e-mail or online download. Use of electronic transmission was up from 20 states in 2008 and demonstrates a direct response to the MOVE Act mandate according to the 2010 Local Election Official Survey conducted by the OVF. To accomplish this task, each state needed to pass state legislation to allow the implementation of the MOVE Act and the federal mandates that went with it.

The States also need to implement a solution that will not only be beneficial to each individual state, but with more and more budget cuts, a solution that is cost-effective and sustainable in the long run. To do this, the States must look at current processes.

South Dakota is comprised of 66 counties and 64 county auditors who serve as the local election official for the county. The Secretary of State's Office oversees the election process in the State of South Dakota and provides assistance to the local county officials. The Secretary of State serves as the Chief Election Official and makes sure all aspects of election law are adhered to. South Dakota fully implemented their MOVE Act compliant system (ST23) in 2010 for the 2010 general election. ST23 provides an electronic means for transmitting the absentee ballot application and blank ballot to the UOCAVA voter by utilizing CERS for voter identification and ballot creation, and utilizing the Electronic Voter Registration System County Transport System (ST20) for transport of the absentee voter information to the State. For UOCAVA voters who request to receive their ballot electronically, ST23 provides e-mail access to the Military and Overseas Citizens Web Portal, where the official UOCAVA ballot, specific to the voter, can be obtained. This ballot covers all federal races, as well as all state, county, local, and specific district races down to the precinct level, along with ballot questions. Included with the official ballot are the instructions and mailing template for return of the ballot to the local election official. South Dakota law requires the marked ballot to be sent by U.S. mail only to the local election official. The States proposal will require legislation to allow the electronic return of the marked ballot in South Dakota. The Voter Information Portal (VIP) is another aspect of CERS utilized to fulfill the requirements of the MOVE Act. VIP allows registered voters in South Dakota the ability to log into a secured website to access voter registration information to include the polling place and location, legislative district number, county election information and contact data for their county auditor. In addition, the voter can view the sample ballot specific to them for a federal election. In 2011, legislation was passed to allow a UOCAVA-covered voter

the ability to vote in any election. The use of the portal has been expanded to include absentee ballot tracking information. Going beyond the requirements of the MOVE Act, all absentee voters can access VIP to view the date their absentee ballot application was received, the date their absentee ballot was sent out either by mail or electronically, and the date their absentee ballot was received by their county auditor.

South Dakota sent out 374 ballots to UOCAVA voters for the 2010 General Election. Of those, 291 (78%) were returned and counted in the 2010 General Election.

Nebraska has 93 counties, where in 85 counties, the county clerk is the election official, and eight have election commissioners. The county clerks and election commissioners are tasked with all aspects of the election process at the county level, including but not limited to: registering voters, candidate filing, list maintenance, ballot production, and vote tabulation. The Nebraska Secretary of State's Office provides assistance to the county officials, and ensures that all aspects of election law are followed. Further, the Secretary of State's Office owns the vote tabulation equipment, the voter registration system, and holds the maintenance contract for the tabulation equipment and the voter registration system.

A Nebraska UOCAVA voter has the flexibility to register to vote and request a ballot using the same form. He or she may do so using any one of several methods: a standard absentee application, a FPCA, or another form of written request. The voter can send the application either by mail or electronically. If sent electronically, the voter must mail the signed original to the county office. When the application arrives in the county election office, the information is entered into the voter registration system. If the voter has not previously registered, all of the necessary registration data is entered in to the system (name, date of birth, address, driver's license number or last four digits of the social security number, date of registration, source of registration, etc.).

Once the registration information is entered, or if the applicant is already a registered voter, the voter's record is opened, and all of the necessary ballot information is recorded: Mailing address, absentee voter data, time the application was received, the status of the application, and time the ballot was sent. The county official will send out the ballots to all UOCAVA voters at the 45 day time frame. If the printed ballots are not available, then the official will send the final ballot proof to the voter. The proof can be printed out and mailed or faxed to the voter, or, if the official has a valid e-mail address, e-mailed as an attachment. After the passage of the MOVE Act, the Secretary of State's Office instructed the counties, if they had an e-mail address from a UOCAVA voter, to send the ballot and ballot materials by e-mail. Included in the package of materials sent to the voter were instructions on mailing the ballot back, faxing the ballot back, or e-mailing the ballot back.

Nebraska law allows some flexibility for UOCAVA voters when returning their ballot. Prior to the MOVE Act, Nebraska did not require a witness, and has continually allowed for electronic return of the ballot, either by e-mail or fax. In those instances, if the voter communicates their intent to return a voted ballot electronically, the county office must inform the Secretary of State's Office. Additionally, the voter is required to sign an oath stating that they understand the ballot is not a secret ballot, and verifying that all of the information they have provided is correct. (For ease of use, these two statements have been combined in to one oath). Finally, the voter can now access their ballot status on a web page provided by the Secretary of State's Office. Once the ballot is returned, the official verifies that all applicable forms are included with the materials and the information returned matches the application

information. If the ballot was sent electronically, the county resolution board will reproduce the ballot choices on standard ballot stock.

Even with several obstacles removed, UOCAVA voters still face challenges. With respect to the 2010 General election, there were 1,142,247 eligible voters in Nebraska. Of those voters, 497,248 (43.5%) voted. Breaking those numbers down further, UOCAVA voters were sent 1,798 ballots. Of those, 645 ballots were returned (35.8%), and 570 (89.2%) of those returned were counted. Of the ballots that were returned but not counted 41 were returned after the deadline, and 28 had a problem with the address. The most striking feature, though, is the fact that 144 ballots (8%) were returned undeliverable, and 700 (39.6%) were never returned. The numbers show that when the ballot is returned by the deadline, there is a high likelihood that the ballot will be tabulated in the official election count. The obvious disadvantage a Nebraska UOCAVA has, along with many other states, is that many of the ballots never arrive in the hands of the voter, and if they do, may not make it back to the election office in time. That fact is illuminated when compared to the regular absentee voters. Of those, 89,372 ballots were issued and 82,083 (91.8%) were returned and 81,016 (98.7%) were counted. Further, 220 (.002%) were returned undeliverable 116 (.001%) were spoiled or replaced, and 6,953 (7.7%) were never returned. The UOCAVA population of voters is a small sample compared to the greater population of absentee voters, yet as a group they have the most obstacles in place regarding the timely arrival of their ballot and access to resources to assist them.

As presented in the previous paragraphs, many UOCAVA voters have been left out of the voting experience, because of the current technological and legislative barriers. The States' proposal will enhance the current processes to be assured their vote counts. When fully implemented, at the States' expense, the States will measure performance and effectiveness by an increase in the number of ballots returned and counted. With regards to the 2010 General Election, the States' averaged 56% of ballots returned and counted. The States propose an increase of 25% in ballots returned and counted for the 2012 General Election for UOCAVA voters. The States proposal will also include a mobile device application to allow an even broader and more accessible voting experience for the UOCAVA voter. With this mobile application, the States propose a 25% increase in UOCAVA voters accessing the ballot. Technology has become the greatest tool in eliminating these barriers that UOCAVA voters face. The States must embrace technology and assure more UOCAVA voters the right to vote.

Security of the system will be another determining factor to measure the success of this project. Since the ballots that will be transmitted electronically, in essence, would be actual marked ballots, and the demographic information of each individual UOCAV voter will be pertained in each state's voter registration system, security of the system is of the upmost importance. The States propose to have each individual state's IT department serve as the hosting environment. Each individual state has already established a secure state network that cannot be accessed from outside the network. As mentioned in the Technical Approach section of this grant proposal, the actual marked ballot will be stored as a "blob" on a server within each state's secure internal network.

Another tool to measure the success of this project will be the incorporation of a survey that UOCAVA voters will be able to fill out during the 2012 General Election once they have completed marking their ballot. This survey will consist of a few questions relating to the overall voting experience, accessibility, functionality, security, and likeability of the ASIMOV system. This survey will give the States a first-hand analysis of how UOCAVA voters truly felt

about their voting experience. The States propose a favorable rate of 85% to deem the project a success.

It will also be extremely important to have sound financial management during and beyond the term of this grant to make this project sustainable, cost-effective, and most importantly, a robust and viable system which will continue to serve UOCAVA voters. The financial aspect of this grant will be a determining factor in how the States approach the development phase of the system that the States propose. Sound, fiscal, and common sense financial management will be one of the leading factors in determining this system a success.

To fully monitor and implement this initiative, there will be a project director who will oversee all aspects of grant management and a member from each state who will serve as a state contact for the project director. Brandon Johnson is the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) Coordinator for the State of South Dakota and will be the project director for this grant. Mr. Johnson holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration from North Dakota State University and serves as the grant manager for all federal funds that pertain to elections in South Dakota. Mr. Johnson will also work closely with Debbie Trapp who is the Fiscal Manager for the South Dakota Secretary of State's Office. Mrs. Trapp holds two Bachelor Degrees; one in Commercial Economics and one in Agricultural Business from South Dakota State University. She also has an Associate's Degree in Business Administration from National College. Both employees are currently employed by the State of South Dakota and will not be funded by this grant. Mrs. Trapp will provide Mr. Johnson with sound fiscal oversight in all financial aspects of this grant.

The State Contact for the State of Nebraska will be Nate Dobbs. Mr. Dobbs is an Elections Specialist for Nebraska and will also cover any aspects related to this grant for that state. Mr. Dobbs holds a Bachelor's Degree in Political Science from the University of Arizona, and primarily oversees the operation, maintenance, and inventory of the HAVA tabulation equipment placed in all 93 counties. Mr. Dobbs also works with guidelines involving Nebraska's military and overseas voters, including the development of new protocols in response to the MOVE Act. Mr. Dobbs assists in election night reporting, approving payments to vendors, matters involving the Standards Board of the Election Assistance Commission (EAC), and assists the counties in the use of the centralized voter registration system.

If awarded this grant, the States will follow all relevant, individual procurement policies, including the issuance of Request for Proposals (RFPs) as necessary.

IV. Budget Proposal

The States' proposed Advanced Simplification In Military and Overseas Voting (ASIMOV) system will yield a high return on investment. The States transmitted 5,442 absentee ballots to UOCAVA voters in the 2010 General Election. The States' proposed funding amount is $668,831. Based on the 2010 General Election data, the proposed solution will cost $122.90 per UOCAVA voter. With the development of both the ASIMOV system and a mobile device application, the States propose an increase of 25% of overall UOCAVA registrants, yielding an increase of UOCAVA ballots transmitted for the 2012 General Election to be an estimated 6,802 UOCAVA voters, resulting in a reduction of cost per voter to $98.33. Also, with 2012 being a presidential election, the States could see a possible increase of 50% in UOCAVA absentee ballot applications sent, bringing the cost per voter to $81.93. If the UOCAVA voter chooses to take full advantage of the ASIMOV system and mark their ballot online and return their ballot electronically, the States could possibly see a 100% success rate in returned ballots.

Itemized Budget:

Category	Requested Amount	Justification
Direct Labor	$45,000	The States' proposed solution requires direct labor costs. The project director and state contacts are current employees of each individual state, therefor their salaries are already being funded and do not require grant funding. The project director and state contacts do not foresee an abundant number of hours required to mark this project a success, therefore the States submit no direct labor costs for state employees. However, the States' proposal requires each individual state to host the application on their secured network servers. There will be labor costs involved in transitioning the application from BPro, Inc. to the States' servers for security testing. The States' IT departments estimate the project will take 100 hours to set up at $75 per hour for labor and 3 employees from each state.
Administrative and clerical labor	$0	The States' proposed solution requires no administrative and clerical labor costs. The States do not foresee costs associated with administrative and clerical labor. The project director and states contact, as mentioned above, are state employees, therefore no costs associated to labor will need to be funded by the grant.
Fringe Benefits and Indirect Costs	$0	The States' proposed solution requires no fringe benefits and indirect costs. The project director and state contacts are state employees;

		all benefits that are associated with those employees will be covered by state funding and not grant funding.
Travel	$50,000	The States propose for its members, 3 total, to attend the UOCAVA Solutions Working Group Meeting in San Francisco, California, August 6th and 7th, 2011. The purpose of attending this meeting is to discuss further the development of the ASIMOV system with Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) professionals and other election officials. The estimated cost to attend the workshop would be $1,500 per employee, which includes airfare, lodging and meals. The States also propose to travel to military installations to test the application and security of the ASIMOV system with first-hand knowledge of the voting experience that UOCAVA voters face. Travel to these military installations will be done by each individual state during the testing phase of this project. Based on each individuals state's per diem, travel will be at the cost of $4,550 per person, equaling $22,750 per state.
Subcontracts/ sub awards	$400,000	The costs associated to the budget proposal in this section were completed by BPro, Inc. (BPro). The total costs of this section are based on BPro's official bid to the States. The costs associated in this section are strictly development costs for the ASIMOV system. No development equipment or testing equipment is referenced in this section.
Consultants	$10,000	At this time, the States foresee no cost for consultants. BPro does not foresee using consultants during the development phase of this project. When testing begins, there may be a need to hire consultants for testing purposes. If such a case arises, the States propose funding for consultants at a cost of $10,000.
Materials and Supplies	$103,029 Each: Apple iPhone: $299 Annual 3G: $300 Motorola Droid: $199 Annual 3G: $360 Apple iPad: $829	Materials and supplies that are listed in this section include mobile devices for testing purposes for each state and the necessary servers (web and SQL) required for storage and security testing. Because of the nature of technology, the States propose to have the ASIMOV system as a mobile application for the Apple iPhone, Motorola Droid, Apple iPad,

	Annual 3G: $300 Motorola Xoom: $599 Annual 3G: $420 Each: Dell PowerEdge R715 web server: $12,237 Dell PowerEdge R715 SQL server: $11,086	and Motorola Xoom. The States are comprised of Nebraska and South Dakota; therefore the States are requesting one of each mobile device for each state's election department employee (10) to test each individual state's application of the ASIMOV system. The ASIMOV system will be tailor-made to represent each state's election law; therefore requiring different functionality within the ASIMOV system and requiring testing for all of the States. Servers will be used to store the critical voter information that relates to the ASIMOV system. Both SQL servers and web servers will be used for development and testing purposes. The States will need to test the servers for maximum load capacity as it relates to number of users and data storage. The servers would also need to be tested for security purposes.
Other Direct Costs	$60,802	All costs have been accounted for to the best of the States' knowledge. However, the States propose this amount to cover charges that may arise during the period of this grant. For example, additional costs from each individual state's IT department that is unforeseen. Additional costs for equipment in case of supply and demand increases due to natural disasters, work shortages, etc.
Total	**$668,831**	

The actual purpose of this grant is to develop and test the ASIMOV system for usability, functionality, and security testing purposes. It is not the States intent to use the ASIMOV system, using grant funds, in an actual election during the period of this grant. Upon completion date of this grant, the States intend to use the established ASIMOV system in the 2012 General Election for the electronic return of the marked ballot. At that time, it will be the States responsibility to pay for the programming expenses to allow the electronic return of the marked ballot in the 2012 General Election and future elections.