Here are some questions I have about the Slalom report. If it would be possible to get answers, I'd much appreciated it. Answers to these questions would likely facilitate increasing other's understanding of the report and the business case issues.

1. It appears that the listed ranges of costs and elapsed times in Section 5 (starting on page 14) include the additional "+100%" margin / contingency to allow for uncertainty about requirements, but that similar ranges in Appendix B, Sections 11.2.1 through 11.2.7 (starting on page 48) do not include that "+100% margin / contingency. Is that the intended interpretation of those ranges?

2. What are any other significant, known "existing assets", as mentioned in the descriptions of delivery options 3 and 4 in Section 4 (on page 13), other than resources from the OSET Institute?

3. The various delivery options are defined in Section 4, starting on page 12.
    a. Why are the use of vendors and Open Source Community Engagement treated as mutually exclusive options, i.e. every option uses one or the other, but no delivery option uses both?
    b. Why is there no delivery option involving vendors and other jurisdictions?

4. Are differences in risks between the different delivery options substantially all reflected in the different ranges of estimates for costs and elapsed times for those options? If not, what are significant differences in risks that are not reflected in those ranges? (See Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 starting on page 16.)

5. The need for a +100% margin / contingency is ascribed to uncertainty about the requirements for a voting system. (See Section 2.1.2 on page 7.) Taking the Ballot Creation System as an example (see Section 5.2.1, page 16, and Section 11.2.1, page 48), what are examples of reasonably possible requirements that would double the development cost of that component?

6. Per Election "Support" costs in Section 5.4 (page 22) are for the "Support of the technology and machines used during elections." What was the basis for estimating these costs and how do they differ from the "Maintenance and Licensing" per election costs listed in that section?

7. Per Election "Maintenance and Licensing" costs in Section 5.4 (page 22) reflect estimates based on similarly labeled costs in the current Dominion contract. However in the Dominion contract, those costs are annual costs, not per election costs. What is the rationale for that difference in frequency and to what extent is that difference in frequency reflected in the cost estimates?

8. The example development schedule in Section 8.1 (the graphic towards the bottom of page 37) shows the Certification activity happening immediately after Development activity for each component, with no allowance for independent project acceptance testing of a development deliverable, for example from a vendor, or integration testing with other components in various states of development / certification.

    a. How would such acceptance and integration testing be accomplished within such a schedule?

    b. Who would be responsible for specifying and creating the testing needed to assure that a development deliverable for a component meets RFP requirements, is ready for project acceptance, and/or is ready for submission for certification?

    c. Is adequate handling of these testing and scheduling issues reflected in the delivery option estimated costs and estimated elapsed times?

9. As proposed, the Discovery phase will create requirements that are only high level? (See the description of Phase 1, Discovery, in Section 8.1 starting at the bottom of page 37.)

    a. What level of requirements would be reflected in each RFP for a system component?

    b. How are the costs of developing RFP requirements for specific components reflected in the report's cost estimates?

10. a. How would the one and only RFP for a system component (see Sections 2.1.11 on page 10 and the example schedule in Section 8.1 on page 37) be different for an agile development approach for that component rather than a waterfall development approach for that component?

    b. How would San Francisco's conventional procurement processes have to be changed, if at all, to accommodate such RFP's for agile development?

11. What are specific statutory impediments and needed legislative changes, as opposed to just changes in Secretary of State practices and/or regulations, that would be needed to avoid certification delays to modifications and bug fixes? (See the last paragraph of Section 8.4 near the top of page 41: "... certification may be delayed unless there are legislative changes to the current process.")