

File No.: 04-1000-20-2019-260

June 3, 2019

s.22(1)

Dear s.22(1)

Re: **Request for Access to Records under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the "Act")**

I am responding to your request of April 17, 2019 for:

Records related to the City's responses, decisions, justifications, and pricing for RFA No. PS20161793, Supply of Optical Ballot Tabulators, Accessories, Ballots, Systems and Support Services.

Date Range: March 1, 2017 to October 20, 2018.

All responsive records are attached. Some information in the records has been severed, (blacked out), under s.13(1) of the Act. You can read or download this section here: http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/96165_00

Under section 52 of the Act you may ask the Information & Privacy Commissioner to review any matter related to the City's response to your request. The Act allows you 30 business days from the date you receive this notice to request a review by writing to: Office of the Information & Privacy Commissioner, info@oipbc.bc.ca or by phoning 250-387-5629.

If you request a review, please provide the Commissioner's office with: 1) the request number assigned to your request (#04-1000-20-2019-260); 2) a copy of this letter; 3) a copy of your original request for information sent to the City of Vancouver; and 4) detailed reasons or grounds on which you are seeking the review.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Freedom of Information Office at foi@vancouver.ca if you have any questions.

Yours truly,



Barbara J. Van Fraassen, BA
Director, Access to Information & Privacy

Barbara.vanfraassen@vancouver.ca
453 W. 12th Avenue Vancouver BC V5Y 1V4

*If you have any questions, please email us at foi@vancouver.ca and we will respond to you as soon as possible. Or you can call the FOI Case Manager at 604.871.6584.

Encl.

:kt

EVALUATION SHEET

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS NO. PS20161793 SUPPLY OF OPTICAL BALLOT TABULATORS, ACCESSORIES, BALLOTS, SYSTEMS & SUPPORT SERVICES Evaluation Committee for this section: Jessica Nelson, Rosemary Hagwara and Siobhan Heaney | Excellent 5 Very Good 4 Good 3 Average 2 Poor 1 Unsatisfactory 0 | ***Evaluator Additional Remarks/Assessment must be provided for any scores at 0 or 3 |
|---|---|--|

| Category Point | Weight | Criteria | ESS | | | | JESSICA NELSON | | ROSEMARY HAGWARA | | SIOBHAN HEANEY | |
|----------------|--------|----------|------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | | Weighted Average | Weighted Average | Raw Average | Raw Average | Remarks | Score (0-5) | Remarks | Score (0-5) | Remarks | Score (0-5) |

| 20 | | | Qualifications, Capabilities & Experience | | | | ESS | | JESSICA NELSON | | ROSEMARY HAGWARA | | SIOBHAN HEANEY | |
|-----|---|---|---|--|--|--|-----|--|----------------|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|
| 2.5 | 3 | Company Profile: Did the Applicant's submission include their company profile, history of successes, number of years in business, major projects and the reason for success to date? Key Personnel: Did the Applicant provide resumes and out line roles and responsibilities for resources they would propose for the project relating to: - issues and resolutions - project management - technical support - training Did the Applicant provide a list of two relevant, successfully completed projects with references that could be contacted? | s.13(1) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.5 | | References and Project Experience - Did the Applicant list recent projects completed similar in nature to the City to indicate a past history of success in like for like projects | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 20 | | | Work Plan/Timeline | | | | ESS | | JESSICA NELSON | | ROSEMARY HAGWARA | | SIOBHAN HEANEY | |
|-----|--|--|--------------------|--|--|--|-----|--|----------------|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|
| 2.5 | | Did the Applicant's workplan clearly demonstrate their understanding of the project and scope of work? | s.13(1) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.5 | | Did the Applicant's submission identify any special challenges or considerations with regard to assumptions made in the RFP, the high level work plan and the types of resources required to implement a solution consistent with the business requirements? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | Did the Applicant's workplan/ submission articulate all assumptions in terms of resources required from the City's staff and provide a detailed list of activities that the City is expected to undertake. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 20 | | | Equipment Requirements | | | | ESS | | JESSICA NELSON | | ROSEMARY HAGWARA | | SIOBHAN HEANEY | |
|----|--|--|------------------------|--|--|--|-----|--|----------------|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|
| 3 | | Optical Ballot Tabulators: Did the Applicant outline an appropriate and comprehensive methodology to ensure the ballot tabulators provided to the City: - Function for a defined period of time without external power support - Have their own unique locking key that cannot be duplicated - Allow the Municipality to identify which users have access to which keys on which machine - Ensure ballots cast and associated information on each machine will not be lost due to machine failure or tampering (Applicant to provide their process for ensuring data redundancy on each machine) - A low for wireless transmission of results (optional - price separately if available) - Produce paper copies of integrity tests and ballot tabulations - Will be delivered and removed (if leased) by the vendor - Are easily transported in a secure and environmentally protected manner - Are shipped with a cables and accessories necessary for operation - Produce testing reports by serial number - Can be recled and regenerated for the purposes of conducting a recount if and when necessary - Are an up-to-date model of the tabulator - Ensure no more than one ballot is fed through and read at a time - Can read a two-sided ballot - Can accept a variety of ballot sizes (provide all standard ballot sizes accepted) - Can read a ballot quickly with no change in speed as memory is consumed - Meet all requirements as per section 6 of the Vancouver Election Bylaw 9070 | s.13(1) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | Ballot Boxes Has the Applicant demonstrated that the ballot boxes will: - Ensure the security of contents (must be tightly sealed) - Ensure contents cannot be tampered with - Ensure contents are not visible from exterior (opaque) - Are configured to seamlessly fit tabulator and accessories - Are transportable, lightweight and easy to carry - Are durable enough to withstand exposure to damp weather (rain or snow) and rough handling (during delivery) - Will be delivered and removed (if leased) by the vendor - Has an auxiliary compartment for storage of un-read ballots in the event the ballot tabulator was to stop functioning - Are able to be re-used or recycled - Can hold up to 3 000 ballots | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | Ballot Marking Devices Did the Applicant outline an appropriate and comprehensive methodology to ensure assistive devices provided to the City will: Voting booths that: - Provide ballot marking instructions designed and printed in the inside (instructions to be provided by the municipality) - Ensure privacy from the exterior (opaque) - Are transportable, lightweight and easy to carry - Are durable enough to withstand exposure to damp weather (rain or snow) and rough handling (during delivery) - Are able to be re-used or recycled - Are simple and easy to setup - Stand upright without extra supports required - Fit four voting booths back to back on a standard 72 in. L x 30 in. W event table Secrecy sleeves that: - Are lightweight yet sturdy allowing for multiple uses - Completely enclose the full ballot - Ensure privacy from the exterior (opaque) - A low for easy submission of the ballot by voters into the ballot tabulator while maintaining the security and privacy of the ballot Options: Provide ballot tabulator insertion instructions designed and printed on the outside of the sleeve (instructions to be provided by the municipality or Contractor) Touch-screen ballot marking devices: - Allow voters to feed a paper ballot into the machine to be marked and then printed to be deposited into the ballot tabulator at the voting place - Be simple and easy to use by voters to mark their ballot - Ensure the security of the voter's vote - Provide access for persons with various mobility or visual impairments - Provide multi-language ballot transmission (audio and/or visual) (provide list of all standard languages provided) - Function for a defined period of time without external power support - Have the same security standards as those applied to the ballot tabulators - Ensure ballots cast and associated information on each machine will not be lost due to machine failure or tampering | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | On-site Printers Did the Applicant outline an appropriate and comprehensive methodology to ensure on-site printers provided to the City will: - Produce on-demand ballots that look the same as professionally printed ballots? - Print to last quality and easily? - Integrate with existing City technology or rented technology (e.g. laptops)? - Are easy to integrate into each Voting Place and to use by Election Office staff? - Are environmentally friendly? - Print double-sided? - Include all necessary ink - Will be delivered and removed by the vendor if leased - Are operable in remote voting locations | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 20 | | | Service Requirements | | | | ESS | | JESSICA NELSON | | ROSEMARY HAGWARA | | SIOBHAN HEANEY | |
|----|--|---|----------------------|--|--|--|-----|--|----------------|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|
| 5 | | Did the Applicant's submission describe an appropriate methodology for how they would: - Ensure tabulation of results to be posted on the City's website; - Distribute tabulation of results to the media; and - Post tabulation of results on the City's open data webpage? | s.13(1) | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3 | | Technical Support Has the Applicant demonstrated that appropriate and sufficient: - Onsite technical support during Advance Voting Days (October 10-13 2018), Special Voting Opportunities (dates TBD) and General Voting Day (October 20 2018); onsite resources will be identified to each Municipality no later than July 1 2018 for vetting and acceptance by each Municipality - Onsite technical support during the above noted periods - Project management support from March to November 2018 including management of project plan and regular project status update meetings with the Municipality (frequency to be determined by the Municipality) and documentation submission (project status update reports) - Established and documented incident tracking and escalation procedures - Configuration and programming of tabulators - Logs & Accuracy Testing as outlined by the Municipality's bylaw where applicable - Full documentation of issues and resolutions - Service Level Agreement(s) for the services included in their proposal including provisions for: o Pre-Election Services: - Project manager response times and contact info - Issue escalation process response times and contact info - Hardware maintenance response process and timeline provide Municipality dependencies o Voting Day Services (SVO Mail Advance and Election Day voting) - Call acknowledgement times - Open ticket response times - Hardware maintenance response process and timeline guaranteed service up-time - On-site support - Off-site support | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

EVALUATION SHEET

| | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 3 | <p>Project Management The Municipalities require that each Municipality have a dedicated Project Manager that is responsible for ensuring all service deliverables are met. The Applicant will provide a project manager who will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create and manage a detailed project plan including all key deliverables, time lines and resources assigned • Provide project status update reports to Municipality staff; the frequency to be determined by each Municipality • Participate as part of bi-weekly (to begin) then weekly project status update meetings • Create agendas for each meeting and distribute in advance of the meeting to participants | s.13(1) |
| 2.5 | <p>Logic & Accuracy Testing Support Did the Applicant outline an appropriate and comprehensive methodology to address logic and accuracy testing, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The testing of all machines provided to the City in accordance with the City's election bylaw? • The provision of documentation and test reports relating to the testing? • The assurance of secure storage of all machines and related equipment during and after testing, and prior to delivery to a specified site and acceptance of the equipment by the City? • The provision of controls to address any related risks? • The completion of an on-site sample audit of the machines with the City's Chief Election Officer, Internal Audit resource and witness(es) identified by the City in accordance with the Vancouver election bylaw and as approved by the Chief Election Officer? | |
| 2.5 | <p>Security Did the Applicant outline an appropriate and comprehensive methodology to secure the devices provided to the City, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storage of all devices in a highly secured facility? • Providing a copy of security policies and procedures to the City for their review? • Ensuring that all vendor staff with access to the devices are informed of and abide by a vendor security policies and procedures? • Manage and provide a list of personnel with access to the facility? | |
| 2 | <p>Training for Key Election Office Staff and Trainer/Developer Did the proponent outline an appropriate and comprehensive methodology to provide training that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is instructor-led? • Is provided by an experienced, knowledgeable trainer? • Includes all scenarios of ballot tabulator use? • Includes the use of all other equipment provided by the proponent (e.g. assistive devices, etc.)? • Includes training materials (both soft and hard copy) with visuals and step-by-step instructions? | |

| | | |
|----|--------------------|--|
| 15 | Auxiliary Services | |
|----|--------------------|--|

| | | |
|---|--|---------|
| 5 | <p>Disposition of existing tabulator fleet Did the Applicant outline an appropriate and comprehensive methodology to dispose of the existing tabulator fleet that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is innovative and environmentally conscious? • Includes the proponent being responsible for the removal and transportation of the existing fleet? • Provides the City with assurances related to data destruction? | s.13(1) |
|---|--|---------|

| | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 10 | <p>Ballot Design and Production Services Did the Applicant provide an appropriate and comprehensive methodology that demonstrates how they will:</p> <p>a. Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce a ballot design within the time constraints as dictated by statutory deadlines • Produce a professional design that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets all legislated requirements • Can accommodate a large number of candidates (NO) on a single page and paper size • Is easy for voters to read and navigate • Meets all ballot tabulator reading requirements; and • Is acceptable to the CEO <p>b. Supply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure services of a printer within geographic proximity acceptable to the City • Coordinate with the printer for the production of approximately 250,000 ballots • Provide documentation that ballot paper is within specifications required for the optical ballot tabulators • Provide ballots in an amount adequate for final Logic & Accuracy testing • Deliver ballots to City-specific location according to dates as outlined <p>c. Municipalities Provided: The following information will be provided by each Municipality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Races • Candidate names and associated parties. Note that some candidates may have names with special characters that need to be accommodated on the ballot. • Referenda-type questions should they be required <p>Each Municipality will provide access to the following personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chief Election Officer • Deputy Chief Election Officer • Election Manager/Lead • Technical support • Subject matter experts as required <p>d. Acceptance Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System security certification • Access to final software(s) source code (for auditing purposes) • Demonstration of function for each machine and all accessories • Documentation of operational test results for each machine indicating 100% normal function • Visual inspection of all equipment and accessories • UAA testing that meets Municipality bylaw requirements, the Municipality's IT approval and the Municipality's Internal Audit approval | s.13(1) |
|----|---|---------|

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 25 | Total Cost of Consulting Services (Supply Chain to Complete this Section) | |
|----|---|--|

| | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 30 | <p>Proponents Financial Offerings: total cost of ownership (Deviations & Exceptions on Terms & Conditions)</p> <p>Conflicts, Collusion, Lobbying</p> <p>Insurance</p> <p>Proposed Form</p> <p>Declaration of Supplier Code of Conduct</p> <p>Corporate Sustainability</p> | s.13(1) |
|----|---|---------|

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---------|
| 100 | TOTAL COST OF 100 | s.13(1) |
| | Sub-totals, excluding Prices | s.13(1) |

***Evaluators General Remarks/Assessment

Note: 1. Evaluation must be done impartial without any bias
 2. Evaluators are not to discuss the evaluation or any issues of the RFP with any of the Proponents
 3. Each evaluator will do the evaluation individually and will not share the scoring with another evaluator
 4. Comments will need to be provided if an evaluation item is given a score of 0 or 5.
 5. The evaluators will need to enter their names, sign and date each evaluation sheet

Evaluated by: _____

Signature _____ Date _____