

NOTICE OF FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE

OVERVIEW

Federal Agency Name: U.S. Election Assistance Commission
Funding Opportunity Title: 2010 Voting System Pre-Election Logic and Accuracy & Post-Election Audit Initiative
Announcement Type: Notice of Funds Availability
CFDA Number: 90.403
Application Deadline: July 27, 2010, 6:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time

Funding Opportunity Overview

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) announces the availability of up to approximately \$3,000,000 to develop and document processes and best practices for coordinating quality and cost-effective A) voting system pre-election logic and accuracy testing (L&A) and B) post-election audits. The funding will be divided approximately evenly between the two areas covered by this initiative.

Funds will support the research, development, documentation, and dissemination of a range of procedures and processes used in managing and conducting high-quality L&A and post-election audit activities by type of voting method, vendor-specific equipment, jurisdiction size, or other ways to be determined by applicants.

Applicants may respond to either the L&A portion of the *Notice*, the post-election audits portion, or both. Applicants can apply for grants more focused on demonstration of current effective practices at the State or local level or for grants more focused on developing and testing new or alternative methods and processes for conducting L&A testing and post election audits. Depending upon the nature of the application, outcomes for the competition may include tool kits, guides, best practices, published research findings and recommendations) that will be disseminated widely within the election community.

EAC will award grants ranging from up to \$25,000 to \$230,000, depending on funding category and entity applying, for activities that span up to a 24 month period. EAC plans to make only a limited number of awards for projects that focus on research and piloting new or alternative methods for managing and conducting high quality L&A test and post-election audit activities. Matching fund contributions are not required.

Grants will be administered under the Office of Management and Budget uniform administrative requirements and cost principles applicable to the organization that receives the assistance.

This assistance is funded under the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 111-8) and FY 2010 (Public Law 111-117), and authorized under the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002, Public Law (P.L.) 107-252, Section 271.

To be eligible for an award, an applicant must be a state or local government entity; or a nonprofit organization, or an institution of higher education that partners with state or local

government entities responsible for administering election jurisdictions and meets specific eligibility described in Section III below. For-profit entities partnering with an eligible applicant are eligible as partners or sub recipients of the eligible applicant.

Submission Dates and Times

The deadline for receipt of applications is **6:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on XXX, 2010**.

Applicants should send an e-mail by **XXX, 2010**, stating your organization's intent to apply to HAVAfunding@eac.gov. This notice of intent is not required, but it helps EAC better plan the review of applications.

EAC will host technical assistance teleconferences on **XXX and XXX, 2010** to answer questions about this funding opportunity. Applicants are strongly encouraged to participate in at least one of the calls. Instructions for joining the calls are posted at the end of this *Notice*.

FULL TEXT OF ANNOUNCEMENT

I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Background

The U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was established by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. EAC is an independent, bipartisan commission charged with developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines, and serving as a national clearinghouse of information about election administration. EAC also accredits testing laboratories and certifies voting systems, as well as audits the use of HAVA funds.

In 2010, EAC is holding grant competitions to promote improvements to the administration of elections for Federal office and increase awareness of Federal elections by addressing critical issues such as research into voting technology improvements that ensure accessibility for voters with disabilities, the ability to test and audit elections, the shortage of poll workers, and teaching young people about election processes and the importance of civic responsibility.

In FY 2009 and FY 2010, Congress appropriated \$3,000,000 to the EAC to conduct pilot programs for grants to States and local units of government for pre-election logic and accuracy testing and post-election voting systems verification. As a result of a series of meetings with election officials (state and local), scientists, statisticians and other research experts from around the country, the EAC has published this funding opportunity.

Through the Voting System Pre-Election Logic and Accuracy (L&A) & Post-Election Audit Initiative, EAC is seeking to capture and test innovative, high quality processes, tools and effective practices that are cost effective and evidence based, for performing voting system pre-election L&A testing and post-election audits by jurisdictions of varying sizes, locations and equipment configurations.

Approximately \$1,500,000 of these funds will be devoted to each of the two parts of the initiative described in this funding *Notice*. The findings and proposed solutions from the successful applicants will be publicly disseminated for the benefit of election officials and other interested parties across the country. To ensure that analyses and recommendations have a level of consistency in nomenclature and naming conventions, successful applicants will, for existing terminology, use the published EAC glossaries and, for new terminology, propose definitions for the EAC to consider adding to their glossaries.

Most U.S. elections today are counted using electronic voting systems such as, optically scanned paper ballots, or direct record electronic machines. Such voting systems can produce result-changing errors through problems with hardware, software, and/or procedures. Errors can also occur in the hand counting of ballots or in the compiling of results. Errors can go undetected if results are not audited effectively. Well designed and properly performed L&A tests and post-election audits can significantly mitigate the threat of error and should be considered integral to any vote counting system. The benefits of such testing and auditing include:

- Preventing the deployment of malfunctioning equipment,
- Detecting configuration errors in ballot layouts or equipment,
- Revealing when recounts are necessary to verify election outcomes,
- Finding error whether accidental or intentional,
- Deterring fraud,
- Promoting independent audits possibly using common data formats,
- Providing for continuous improvement in the conduct of elections, and
- Promoting public confidence in elections.

There is a need for the research, development and demonstration of tools, processes and effective practices that document the kinds of testing and audits that serve to ensure smooth, accurate operation of voting systems and processes, and validate the results of elections.

Successful applicants will propose the further development and documentation of existing high-quality tools and processes or be forward looking and focused on developing and piloting new or alternative processes, policies and procedures that will advance our understanding of reliable, cost effective methods for testing and verifying voting systems.

With election practices, laws, administrative structures and voting systems varying widely, no single model for testing and audits is best for all jurisdictions. Nonetheless, there are guiding principles that can generically apply across all states within the processes that are written more specifically for a jurisdiction's size, location and equipment configuration. There can also be further standardization in the electronic data formats for the election and ballot data, audit logs, and reported results to facilitate more efficient data generation, collection, analysis, and interoperability.

For example, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) is assisting in efforts to develop a common format for election related data used in all U.S. elections. Utilizing a common data format nationally would provide a benefit for optimizing data transfers between systems and the tools for testing and auditing election systems.

For purposes of this competition, EAC is defining pre-election L&A testing as a comprehensive, documented review of all components of an election system, including (but not limited to); hardware, software, election data, ballot layouts (visual, audio, multilingual), test decks, marking instruments, results generation and reporting. Effective testing of an election system prior to an election can greatly reduce the risk of technical errors on Election Day.

EAC is defining post-election auditing as a documented review of all aspects of the conduct of an election that could affect the election's accuracy. These elements include (but are not limited to); ballot accounting, chain of custody records, audit logs, cast vote records and results reports. Post-election audits differ from recounts. Post-election audits routinely check voting system performance in contests, regardless of how close margins of victory appear to be. Recounts repeat ballot counting in special circumstances, such as when preliminary results show a close margin of victory. Post-election audits that detect errors may lead to a full recount.

Although jurisdictions may perform some or all elements of a post-election audit, for the November 2008 Presidential Election, only approximately a third of U.S. states had plans for conducting a post-election audit (state-wide) that involved manually reconciling a portion of the votes cast against voter verifiable paper records. Over half of U.S. states had no plans for conducting such an audit.

Recent studies have indicated that statistical confidence in the accuracy of election results may be gained more efficiently through the use of risk-limiting audits than through the use of fixed percentage or tiered audits. However, these benefits are more apparent when the election results can be reported in a smaller batch size (ideally one ballot per batch) that can be reconciled to that specific batch of cast vote records. Although current voting systems may not accommodate the granularity of these results reporting requirements, the methodology can still be used on larger batch sizes and the research will result in recommendations for new voting systems to better facilitate this aspect of post-election audits. For current voting systems, other innovative tools, processes, and best practices should be able to demonstrate similar benefits.

B. Initiative Description

This initiative will provide competitive grants to research, demonstrate, document, and recommend improvements to the elections processes and best practices for 1) pre-election logic and accuracy testing of voting systems, and 2) post-election audits. A separate project description will be provided for each of the two areas covered under this *Notice*. The successful applicants will be expected to deliver a set of agreed upon outcomes and recommendations by March 30, 2012 for use by election officials and other interested entities.

Funds will support the development and documentation of a range of tools, procedures and processes used in managing and conducting L&A test and post-election audit activities by type of voting method, vendor-specific equipment, jurisdiction size, or other ways to be determined by applicants. Applicants will have the opportunity to respond to either the L&A portion of the *Notice*, the post-election audit portion, or both.

Deliverables for the competition will be materials (e.g. tool kits; documented processes and best practices; recommendations) that will be shared widely with election officials and other interested parties.

To ensure that analyses and recommendations have a level of consistency in nomenclature and naming conventions, successful applicants will, for existing terminology, use the published EAC glossaries and, for new terminology, propose definitions for the EAC to consider adding to their glossaries.

Applicants must indicate in the Title of their application if they are applying for funds for pre-election logic and accuracy testing or post-election audits or a combination of the two.

Applicants should also indicate early in their application narrative if their project's primary focus is on demonstrating current effective practices, or on research and piloting new or alternative practices, tools and techniques.

Part A: Pre-election Logic and Accuracy Testing of Voting Systems Initiative

This part of the initiative calls for short and long-term solutions to provide the election communities with processes, tools, best practices, and recommendations on pre-election L&A testing of election systems.

Applicants applying for demonstration grants focused on documenting high-quality, effective practices that are currently in use should discuss:

- a. A plan and timeline that includes proposed strategies, or processes for developing proposed strategies, that address:
 - i. Evidence that the current practices that the applicant is proposing to demonstrate and document are high-quality;
 - ii. How the applicant's high quality processes, tools or best practices are efficient, cost effective, and innovative;
 - iii. The types and sources of equipment and data needed to carry out the demonstration, including but not limited to, live and past elections, voting system to be used, number of polling places and machines covered by the effort, and the scope of machines possibly benefited (regionally or nationally) by the effort;
 - iv. Development of evidence-based findings for the measures of cost/benefit, usability, effectiveness and efficiency of the tools, processes and best practices;
 - v. Development of documentation and guides, including the use of video, web and technology based distribution media designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance);

Applicants applying for demonstration grants focused on piloting new or alternative methods that are not currently being used, or used in a limited fashion by election officials, should discuss:

- b. A 24 month research plan and timeline that includes proposed strategies, or processes for developing proposed strategies, in the following areas:
 - i. How the applicant will define the research problem(s) and develop a research agenda, including identifying and gathering input from key stakeholders and beneficiaries;
 - ii. How the applicant will practically demonstrate and test effectiveness of any proposed methods or practices by working in an applied setting with State or local election officials;
 - iii. The types and sources of data needed to carry out the research, including but not limited to, live and past elections, voting method or voting system to be used, and the scope of machines possibly benefited (regionally or nationally) by the effort;
 - iv. Detailed description of the research methodology and distinctive phases of the project including, but not limited to, data gathering, testing and review of equipment, tools, processes and practices, development of findings, recommendations and deliverables, and dissemination of work products;
 - v. Proposed staffing configuration to support the research agenda that includes expertise in U.S. local election administration, current practices and state requirements for L&A testing, data format protocols, and statistical measures;
 - vi. Development of pilot programs to generate evidence-based findings for the measures of cost/benefit, effectiveness, efficiency, and usability of the tools, processes and best practices;
 - vii. Documentation of findings, tools, processes and practices, including the use of video, web and technology based distribution media designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance);
- c. Possible collaborations to review and field test technological solutions based on research findings and how those collaborations will be developed.
- d. Possible dissemination of material through regional conferences or user groups associated, for example, with a particular voting system.
- e. Possible dissemination of material through web sites using automated, customizable electronic media designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance).

- f. Strategies to identify control measures that can be used by election officials to monitor and evaluate the ongoing effectiveness, efficiency, usability, and cost benefits of the process, tool or best practice.

Applicants should discuss realistic project outcomes, appropriate for their application, in areas that can include:

- g. Development and documentation of comprehensive testing procedures for each type of voting method, as well as user checklists, examples of test deck patterns, methodologies for determining test deck patterns, and separation of duties that could contribute to a library of procedures, by voting method, designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance).
- h. Development and documentation of comprehensive testing procedures for each type of vendor-specific equipment, as well as user checklists, examples of test deck patterns, methodologies for determining test deck patterns, and separation of duties that could contribute to a library of procedures, by vendor-specific equipment, designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance).
- i. Development and documentation of end to end testing procedures designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary that includes the planning, preparation, execution, reporting and results archiving.
- j. Development of Tool Kits—generic testing kits tied to specific voting methods that can be easily modified and used by other jurisdictions.
- k. Development of Tool Kits—testing kits tied to vendor-specific equipment.
- l. Development and documentation of processes for L&A testing of audio ballots.
- m. Development and documentation of processes for L&A testing of alternate language ballots.
- n. Development and documentation of tools, processes and best practices for usability evaluation and testing of ballot layouts.
- o. Documentation of current L&A test practices and tools used by states/jurisdictions, and by voting method and vendor-specific equipment.
- p. Travel and convening funds for a post-2010 election official grantee meeting to discuss lessons learned and finalize materials/tool kits based on experiences of the election.

2. Initiative: Post-Election Auditing

This part of the initiative calls for short and long-term solutions to provide election communities with processes, tools, best practices, and recommendations on the post-election auditing of election systems.

Applicants applying for demonstration grants focused on documenting high quality, effective policies, practices and procedures that are currently in use should discuss:

- a. A plan and timeline that includes proposed strategies, or processes for developing proposed strategies, in the following areas:
 - i. Evidence that the current practices that the applicant is proposing to demonstrate and document are high-quality;
 - ii. How the applicant's high quality processes, tools or best practices are efficient, cost effective, and innovative;
 - iii. The types and sources of equipment and data needed to carry out the demonstration, including but not limited to, live and past elections, voting system to be used, number of polling places and machines covered by the effort, and the scope of machines possibly benefited (regionally or nationally) by the effort;
 - iv. Development of evidence-based findings for the measures of cost/benefit, effectiveness, usability and efficiency of the tools, processes and best practices;
 - v. Development of documentation and guides, including the use of video, web and technology based distribution media designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance);

Applicants submitting applications focused on piloting new or alternative methods that are not currently being used, or used in a limited fashion by election officials, should discuss:

- b. A 24 month research plan and timeline that includes proposed strategies, or processes for developing proposed strategies, that discusses:
 - i. How the applicant will define the research problem(s) and develop a research agenda, including identifying and gathering input from key stakeholders and beneficiaries;
 - ii. The types and sources of data needed to carry out the research, including but not limited to, live and past elections, voting method or voting system to be used, and the scope of machines possibly benefited (regionally or nationally) by the effort;

- iii. Detailed description of the research methodology and distinctive phases of the project including, but not limited to, data gathering, testing and review of equipment, tools, processes and practices, development of findings, recommendations and deliverables, and dissemination of work products;
 - iv. Proposed staffing configuration to support the research agenda that includes expertise in U.S. local election administration; current practices and state requirements for post-election audits, data format protocols, and statistical measures;
 - v. Development of pilot programs to generate evidence-based findings for the measures of cost/benefit, effectiveness, efficiency, and usability of the tools, processes and best practices;
 - vi. Documentation of findings, tools, processes, and practices, including the use of video, web and technology based distribution media designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance);
- c. Possible collaborations to review and field test technological solutions based on research findings and how those collaborations will be developed.
 - d. Possible dissemination of material through regional conferences or user groups associated, for example, with a particular voting system.
 - e. Possible dissemination of material through web sites using automated, customizable electronic media designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance).
 - f. Strategies to identify control measures that can be used by election officials to monitor and evaluate the ongoing effectiveness, efficiency, usability, and cost benefits of the process, tool or best practice.

Applicants should discuss realistic project outcomes, appropriate to their proposals, in areas that can include:

- g. Development and documentation of tools, processes and best practices for comprehensive post-election auditing for each type of voting method, including but not limited to, ballot accounting, chain of custody, and reviews of audit logs, election data, cast vote records and reported results that could contribute to a library of procedures, by voting method, designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance).
- h. Development and documentation of tools, processes and best practices for comprehensive post-election auditing for each type of vendor-specific equipment, including but not limited to, ballot accounting, chain of custody, and reviews of audit logs, election data, cast vote records and reported results that could contribute to a library of procedures, by vendor-specific equipment, designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance).

- i. Development of methods and tools for defining the data statistically necessary for conducting post-election audits by voting method or vendor-specific equipment.
- j. Development of formats for data output utilizing, where appropriate, common data formats that best serve auditing purposes, and immediately post-election, for the purposes of data gathering, consolidation, analysis, publishing and archiving.
- k. Development of tools, processes and best practices for analyzing election system audit logs, including but not limited to, equipment logs, system logs, and event logs whether in electronic or paper format.
- l. Development of simple-to-follow rules for triggers and escalation including the expansion of audits based on the type of problem found.
- m. Development of methods for generating and reporting vote counts which correspond to the way the physical batches of paper records (ballots and VVPATs*) are stored, including those records for central count, absentee, provisional, overseas and early voting. This activity includes the documentation of existing capabilities for machine readability, usability, reporting batch size, and comprehensiveness of the required data elements, as well as evidence-based recommendations for methods that better facilitate more efficient and cost effective post-election auditing practices.
- n. Development of recommended audit result reports incorporating details on discrepancies and resolution, findings and conclusions, data items to include, and recommended standard definitions, types of analysis and report format. In developing such report formats, grantees should consider how such documentation helps election officials improve elections, helps researchers analyze elections, and allows comparisons across jurisdictions.
- o. Documentation of current post-election audit practices and tools used by states/jurisdictions, and by voting method and vendor-specific equipment.

Please Note: Applicants may submit blended proposals that focus on both A) Pre-election Logic and Accuracy Testing and B) Post Election Audits; however, award funding amounts for blended programs is capped as described in section II. As such, programs should take care to develop proposals whose scope can be realistically met by the amount of funds made available.

Note: EAC plans to make only a limited number of awards for projects that focus on research and piloting of new or alternative methods that are not currently in use, or used in a limited fashion by election officials, for managing and conducting high quality L&A test and post-election audit activities.

* Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trails

C. Performance Measures and Deliverables

Applicants should clearly describe anticipated outcomes and deliverables for the findings in the narrative section of the application. EAC requires applicants to propose performance measures or deliverables that address, but are not limited to:

- a. Mapping of the grantee recommended process flow, which includes the personnel and technology requirements necessary to implement the recommended processes in addition to control measures to monitor the ongoing effectiveness of the process;
- b. Analysis of the data, including but not limited to, illustrating the effectiveness, efficiencies, usability, and cost benefits of the tools, processes and best practices;
- c. Recommendations, from evidence based findings, for modifications to existing election systems, guidelines, tools, and practices to support more efficient, usable and effective processes;
- d. Documentation designed with a user-centered focus and accessible where necessary (Section 508 compliance); and
- e. Dissemination of effective tools, processes, and practices.

Applicants that are submitting proposals for researching and piloting new or alternative methods shall additionally propose performance measures or deliverables that address such things as:

- f. Documentation of the gathered data, including but not limited to, applied research and pilot programs, election systems used, and participants.

Applicants will be assessed for potential impact of outcomes, so measures should be chosen carefully and be fully integrated into the activities proposed in the application.

D. Authority

Support for the activities described in this *Notice* is authorized under Title II, Part 3 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 USC §§155441 – 155443). Funding for the awards made under this *Notice* will be provided from appropriations made available under the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (P.L. 111-117).

II. Award Information

Funding Instrument Type: Competitive Grant

Anticipated Total Funding: up to \$3,000,000

Anticipated Number of New Awards: 15 to 20

Maximum Amount of Award(s):

- Non-profits and Institutions of Higher Education in partnership with State or Local election offices: \$230,000
- State Governments: \$230,000
- Local Government Entities:
 - Voting population 1 million and over: \$125,000
 - Voting population 500,001 and over: \$50,000
 - Voting population 250,001 to 500,000: \$35,000
 - Voting population up to 250,000: \$25,000

Minimum Award Amounts: \$25,000

Blended applications that propose both L&A and Post Election Audits activities cannot exceed the maximum award amounts listed above.

Performance Period: Up to 24 Months

A. Number of Awards and Award Amount

EAC plans to make multiple awards under this *Notice*. EAC plans to make only a limited number of awards for projects that focus on research and piloting new or alternative methods that are currently not in use, or used in a limited fashion by election officials, for managing and conducting high quality L&A test and post-election audit activities. EAC is not restricted to this projection and may deviate from the number of awards and amounts stated in this *Notice* at its sole discretion.

B. Funding Instrument, Award Period and Future Funding

Successful applicants will receive a 36-month program grant, with operating funds up to for the first 24 month program period. Future funds are subject to EAC priorities and availability of appropriated funds.

C. Other Requirements/Limitations

1. Applicants may not use any part of an award from the EAC to fund religious instruction, worship or proselytizing, voter registration, voting support, get-out-the-vote (GOTV) drives or other political activities that could be construed as lobbying.
2. Project funds must be used for tasks and activities carried out without partisan bias and without promoting any particular political point of view regarding any election issue or candidates.
3. Pre-award costs can be requested by applicants approved for funding under this *Notice*, but are subject to approval from EAC per U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidelines.
4. Expenditures for building construction are not allowed under this program.
5. Grantees may recover indirect costs under this grant up to 5 percent of the total Federal share of the grant. If an applicant has an approved Federal indirect cost rate, the remainder of the

indirect costs can be used as a matching contribution. Applicants without an approved indirect rate may not claim indirect costs as a matching contribution.

6. Current and previous EAC grantees must be current on all reporting requirements in order to receive an award under this competition.

7. Applicants requiring human subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval must include a plan for such approval. IRB approval must be readily attainable within eight weeks of informal notification of recommendation for award to ensure continued processing for funding. There are three basic options for human subjects review and approval: 1) establish your own IRB (see Office of Human Rights Protection (OHRP) at Health and Human Services (HHS) <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/assurances/index.html#registernew>); 2) use the review board of a (usually local) university or research institution, either via consultants to the project, a project subcontract, or directly through the applicant's own contacts; or 3) use a commercial service

D. Cost Sharing or Matching

Cost sharing is not required for this competition.

E. Application Selection Criteria

In awarding grants under this *Notice*, EAC will consider:

- Program/Research Design (50%)
- Organizational Capacity (30%)
- Budget/Cost Effectiveness (20%)

1. Program Design/Strategy

EAC will consider the quality of the proposed design based on:

- a. The soundness, relevance, and creativity of the applicant project plan;
- b. The applicant's approach and expertise in using innovative solutions to L&A testing and/or post-election audits; and
- c. The extent to which the proposed program works with and across multiple jurisdictions[†].
- d. The extent to which the implementation of the proposed program will address and balance such factors as overall cost, effectiveness in deterring various types of election problems, and practicability within time constraints such as certification.

[†] For purposes of this *Notice*, 'multiple jurisdictions' is defined as multiple states, statewide, or multiple counties or other local units of government within a state.

- e. The extent to which the proposed program has the necessary documentation to be used or replicated by other jurisdictions and the quality of the plan to for transferring technology and processes to other jurisdictions.
- f. How well it supports transparency and citizens' ability to observe and confirm election processes and outcomes.

2. Organizational Capacity

EAC will consider the capacity of the applicant to deliver the proposed services based on:

- a. Demonstrated relationships/partnerships with relevant State or local government entities needed to make the project successful;
- b. Ability to manage a federal grant as evidenced by previous grants experience; and
- c. Experience of the organization and staff as evidenced by brief staff biographies and other past organizational successes.

3. Budget/Cost Effectiveness

EAC will consider the budget based on:

- a. Cost-effectiveness of the proposed activities in relation to the scope of the project (e.g., number of jurisdictions, range of activities, etc.);
- b. Clarity and completeness of the budget and budget narrative.

III. Eligibility Information

A. Eligible Applicants

To be eligible for a demonstration grant award for a project focused on existing high quality practices, an applicant must be a state government or unit of local government, and:

1. Have demonstrated expertise in the election administration field, including L&A testing and/or post-election auditing;
2. Have a track record of collaborating with multiple jurisdictions and other relevant entities; and

To be eligible for a demonstration grant award for a project focused on researching and piloting new or alternative methods, an applicant must be a state government or unit of local government; or a non-profit organization, Institution of Higher Education, that partners with state or local government entities; and:

3. Have demonstrated expertise in the election administration field, including L&A testing and/or post-election auditing;

4. Have a track record of collaborating with multiple jurisdictions and other relevant entities; and
5. Have demonstrated experience in successfully designing and implementing research projects.

Applicants that are government entities are encouraged to partner with non-profit organizations, Institutions of Higher Education, and for-profit entities to enhance their organizational capacity and outreach.

All applications that are developed jointly by more than one organization must identify only one organization as the lead organization and the official applicant.

EAC will conduct initial compliance reviews of applications to determine whether they meet eligibility criteria discussed in Section III A. Applications that do not meet all of the eligibility criteria identified in this *Notice* will not be further reviewed.

B. Other Eligibility Requirements

Lobbying: Any organization described in Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(4) that engages in lobbying activities is not eligible to apply.

IV. Application and Submission Information

A. Submission of Application Package

This *Notice* contains all application instructions needed to complete the application. This *Notice* is available at: www.eac.gov, or may be viewed at <http://www.grants.gov>.

B. Submission Dates, Times and Instructions

The deadline for receipt of applications is 6:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on July 27, 2010.

Please submit an e-mail stating your *intent to apply* to HAVAfunding@eac.gov by **June 15, 2010**. This notice of intent is not required, but helps EAC better plan the review of applications.

Applications should be submitted via e-mail and must arrive by the 6 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on July 27, 2010. Multiple attachments in the email are allowed. Microsoft Word or PDF format is required. Submit applications to HAVAfunding@eac.gov. Applications submitted by fax will not be accepted.

As an alternative to e-mailing the application, applicants may submit a hard copy application via U.S. Postal Service, overnight carrier, or hand delivery to the address below. Submit one unbound, single-sided paper application and an electric version of your application on disk or CD. The electronic version of the application must be an exact duplicate of the paper original. If there are differences between the paper application and the disk or CD, EAC will use the electronic version.

Submit applications to:

U. S. Election Assistance Commission
1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005

Late applications: Applications received after the deadline date and time are considered late and will not be reviewed. EAC will notify each late applicant that the application will not be considered in the current competition.

Extension of deadlines: EAC may extend application deadlines when circumstances such as acts of God (floods, hurricanes, etc) occur, or when there are widespread disruptions of mail service. Determinations to extend or waive deadline requirements rest with the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. **If extended, the new deadline will be posted at www.eac.gov and at www.grants.gov.**

C. Form and Content of Submissions

The applicant must provide a well-designed plan with a clear and compelling justification for awarding the requested funds. The narratives must cover the two-year project period.

Note: No additional information beyond what is requested in this section will be accepted with this application. Letters of support as evidence of partnerships are not allowed at the time of application, but may be requested by EAC during the review process. Applicants should describe in careful detail the nature of their partnerships and how those partnerships will advance the goals of the project in the application narrative.

The maximum length for the Executive Summary (Project Abstract) is 3,000 characters (not including spaces). The maximum combined length for the Program Design, Organizational Capacity, and Budget/Cost Effectiveness is 25,000 characters (approximately 18 double-spaced pages, not including spaces). The application must be typed and double-spaced in Times New Roman, 12-point font size with one-inch margins.

Applications that are incomplete or exceed the mandatory character count limitations will be found out of compliance and will not be reviewed for this competition.

The application consists of the following components in the following order:

1. Standard Form SF424 (R & R)
2. Project Abstract (maximum length: 3,000 characters)
3. Research and Related Other Project Information Form
4. Project/Performance Site Location(s)
5. Key Project Personnel
6. Research and Related Budget
7. Budget Narrative
8. Assurances, Non-Construction Programs (SF 424B, Rev. 7-97)
9. Project Narrative Statement: (maximum length for narrative: 25,000 characters)

- a. Research Design
- b. Organizational Capacity
- c. Budget/Cost Effectiveness

10. Certification on Lobbying

<http://www.eac.gov/program-areas/grants/certification-regarding-lobbying/>

Copies of all application forms can be found at: <http://www.eac.gov/program-areas/grants/federal-standard-forms>

Should there be any inconsistency between this *Notice* and the application content instructions below, the order of precedence is as follows:

1. *Notice*
2. Application Instructions

1. Abstract Narrative

Provide a concise overview of the proposed project that summarizes the need, the proposed strategy for addressing the need, anticipated outcomes/accomplishments and how the outcomes will be achieved and measured.

2. Program Design Narrative

Background. Briefly describe your organization's mission, accomplishments, and beneficiaries. Describe in detail the community and need(s) your project will address.

Research Design/Plan. Your research plan and strategy should address information discussed in Section I B of this *Notice* and generally:

- a. The target jurisdiction(s) of your proposed project;
- b. How your research methodology is innovative and why it will be successful; and
- c. What the expected outcomes are, and how they will be measured.

Community Resources. Describe your strategy to secure previously untapped sources of private funds to build your program, including how you will use existing community resources including State and local election offices to implement your approach.

Research Participants. Describe the role(s) that individuals such as state and local government, non-profit organizations, Institutions of Higher Education, and other relevant entities will play in the research project including the strategies you will use to recruit participants.

Data Collection. Describe the types of data that will be collected and analyzed. Describe proposed data collection strategies including statistical analysis, participant observation, case studies, etc.

Dissemination Efforts. Describe the strategy for disseminating research findings.

3. Organizational Capacity

Program Management and Oversight. Describe the demonstrated experience and infrastructure your organization has to manage the program proposed in this application. Who are the key staff members responsible for program oversight? Detail the responsibilities of each key staff member and indicate if it is a new proposed position or a position already in place.

Fiscal Oversight. Describe the demonstrated experience and infrastructure your organization has managing Federal grants. What is your current overall organizational budget and what percentage of the budget would this grant represent? How will you ensure that the fiscal management is compliant with Federal requirements? Who are the key staff members responsible for fiscal oversight? Detail the responsibilities of each key staff member.

4. Budget/Cost-Effectiveness

Budget and Program Design. Explain how the proposed program budget reflects the program's goals and design.

Program Sustainability. Describe how the research, findings and recommendations of this research can be used beyond the period of the grant.

Cost Sharing Sources. Detail the amounts and sources for any proposed non-Federal cash matching funds for the grant. Identify the amounts and sources of any other in-kind contributions to this project. Cost share is not required for this grant competition.

5. **Authorization, Assurances, and Certifications.** Carefully read the authorization, assurances, and certifications and sign and return them with your application.
6. **Performance Measurements.** EAC will hold each grantee accountable for achieving the approved performance measures during the period of the grant. Performance measures must cover the proposed performance over grant period.
7. **Budget.** The budget should be sufficient to perform the tasks described in the proposal narrative for the entire grant period. Do not include unexplained amounts, miscellaneous, contingency costs, or unallowable expenses such as entertainment costs. Round all figures to the nearest dollar. Refer to the Federal cost principles at:
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars> for information on allowable costs in Federal grants.

D. Universal Identifier

Applications must include a Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number on the Standard Form 424. The DUNS number is an identifier that helps the Federal government improve statistical reports on Federal grants and cooperative agreements. The DUNS number does not replace your Employer Identification Number (EIN). DUNS numbers

may be obtained at no cost by calling the DUNS number request line at (866) 705-5711 or by applying online at www.dnb.com.

The website indicates a 24-hour email turnaround time on requests for DUNS numbers; however, we suggest registering at least 30 days in advance of the application due date. Expedited DUNS numbers may be obtained by telephone at a cost of \$99 by calling the DUNS number request line. Applications without DUNS numbers or with invalid DUNS numbers are subject to potential rejection.

E. Intergovernmental Review

Applicants under this program are subject to Executive Order 12372 “Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.”

F. Funding Restrictions

Grants under this program are subject to the applicable OMB Cost Principles (see 2 CFR part 220, or 230; OMB Circulars A-122, A-21 (www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/circulars/)).

V. Application Review Information

All proposals will be first submitted to a compliance review for eligibility. All applications in compliance with this *Notice* and the application instructions will be advanced for programmatic review. EAC staff will review all qualified proposals using the selection criteria described in Section II of this *Notice*. An outside peer review process may be used at EAC’s discretion. During the staff review process, EAC staff may request additional supporting documentation from the applicant.

VI. Award Administration Information

A. Anticipated Announcement and Award Notices

EAC anticipates announcing selections in August/September 2010 Timeframe.

EAC staff will work with the selected applicants to clarify and finalize their application prior to the grant award. During this negotiation period, any issues or questions identified during the review of the application must be satisfactorily resolved before a Notice of Grant Award (NGA) will be issued. The agreement will also include the standard terms and conditions, general terms and conditions (if any), and special award conditions (if any) that are applicable.

To obtain grant funds, grantees will be required to submit a SF 270, *Request for Advance or Reimbursement*, to EAC.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

The applicable regulations and other specific conditions are incorporated in the Notice of Grant Award (NGA). The NGA also incorporates your approved application and budget as part of your

binding commitments under this grant. The award recipient must comply with the following requirements:

- 1. Access for Persons with Disabilities.** All grant recipients will ensure that all training and technical assistance services and resources including web sites are accessible to persons with disabilities, as required by law.
- 2. Financial Management Systems.** Applicants selected for funding must comply with the requirements of the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 (31 U.S.C.7501-07), if the applicant expended \$500,000 or more in Federal awards in its most recent fiscal year. Documentation must include certification that the applicant maintains internal controls over Federal awards; complies with applicable laws; regulations and contract or grant provisions; and prepares appropriate financial statements; or submits the most recent audit by the applicant's independent public accountant.
- 3. Use of Materials.** To ensure that materials generated with EAC funding are available to the public and readily accessible to grantees and sub-grantees, EAC reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable right to obtain, use, modify, reproduce, publish, or disseminate publications and materials produced under the agreement, including data, and to authorize others to do so. The grantee must agree to make such publications and materials available to the public at no cost or at the cost of reproduction through the EAC's clearinghouse. All materials developed with EAC funds by grantees must be accessible to individuals with disabilities to the extent required by law.

C. Reports and Other Requirements

1. Performance Measurement and Accountability

EAC is committed to accountability and to measuring the performance of all of its grantees. The award recipient for this competition must identify the critical outcomes of their work, indicators of success in this work, and how progress can be judged or measured. The recipient will be required to report annually on agreed upon performance measures. EAC may also require an independent assessment of grantee performance.

2. Reporting Requirements

Progress Report. Annual reports are due October 31 for the period ending September 30. The reports must include:

- a. Budget report for the completed budget period;
- b. Narrative analysis of the budget report, explaining differences between budgeted and actual activities and costs by funding source;
- c. Achievements as related to performance measurements; and
- d. Discussion of any problems observed or experienced and solutions implemented.

Financial Reports. Federal Financial Report SF 425 (FFR) must be submitted annually by October 31 for the period ending September 30. A final FFR is due 30 days after the close of the grant.

3. Other data collection requirements

The award recipient must:

- a. Submit copies of all curricula, handouts, and other materials developed to EAC's Clearinghouse.
- b. As directed, use EAC's logo for materials produced.
- c. Meet as necessary with appropriate EAC staff or EAC designees to review work plans and budgets, monitor progress and exchange ideas and information.

VII. Agency Contacts

For further information or for a printed copy of this *Notice*, contact:

Mark Abbott or Allison Hood
U. S. Election Assistance Commission
1201 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 566-3100
E-mail: HAVAfunding@eac.gov.

VIII. OTHER INFORMATION

Two technical assistance calls have been scheduled to answer applicant questions about this competition.

1. Event address for attendees: <https://eacevents.webex.com/eacevents/onstage/g.php?t=a&d=663531871>

Date and time:	Thursday, June 10, 2010 2:00 pm, Eastern Daylight Time
Duration:	1 hour 30 minutes
Event number:	663 531 871
Event password:	voting
Teleconference:	Call-in toll-free number (US/Canada) 1-866-699-3239 Call-in toll number (US/Canada) 1-408-792-6300 Access code: 663 531 871

2. Event address for attendees: <https://eacevents.webex.com/eacevents/onstage/g.php?t=a&d=662540663>

Date and time: Thursday, July 15, 2010 2:00 pm Eastern Daylight Time
Duration: 1 hour 30 minutes
Event number: 662 540 663
Event password: voting
Teleconference: Call-in toll-free number (US/Canada)
1-866-699-3239
Call-in toll number (US/Canada)
1-408-792-6300
[Show toll-free dialing restrictions](#)
Access code: 662 540 663

Public Burden Statement: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 requires the EAC to inform all potential persons who are to respond to this collection of information that such persons are not required to respond unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. (See 5 CFR 1320.5(b)(2)(i)). This collection is approved under OMB Control #: 4040-0001, 4040-003, 4040-0007, 4040-0010 (Expiration Date: 01/31/2012).

Dated: June 5, 2010