Report Date:	March 28, 2022
Meeting Date:	April 5, 2022
From:	Sundance Topham, Chief Administrative Officer
Subject:	UNA Elections – Electronic Voting Background

Background

UNA staff provided an overview of the 2021 UNA election at the February Board meeting. At that time the UNA Board passed the following motion:

> *THAT the UNA Board direct staff to work with the Governance and Human Resources Committee to determine a process to consider whether to introduce electronic voting for the 2024 UNA election.*

Electronic voting was discussed at the February Governance and Human Resources Committee (GHR Committee) meeting, and the following motion was passed:

> *That the Committee recommend that the Chief Administrative Officer collate information from the 2015 Elections Advisory Committee report and from the Special General Meeting 2019 related to electronic voting and analysis and data thereof and bring back to the Committee for review.*

The information requested by the Committee is attached for review and discussion.

Decision Requested

For information

Discussion

Although the UNA does not currently utilize electronic voting for Director elections, as a society it is a tool that is available should the organization choose to utilize it.

Implementing electronic voting for Director elections would require changes to the UNA Bylaws, but rather than moving directly into this process, the Board has provided direction for the GHR Committee *to determine a process to consider whether to introduce electronic voting for the 2024 UNA election*.

A review of the UNA records shows that the Director election process has been a topic of conversation for a long time and discussed pretty-much consistently in one form or another since 2013. This is not surprising based on the fact that the UNA acts in a municipal manner but is governed under the *Societies Act* which leaves the election process pretty much up to the individual society – unlike in a municipal setting, where the procedures are very prescribed.

Initial conversations regarding a review of election processes took place in 2013, when the UNA provided an Election Schedule Reform Discussion Paper (attached as Schedule A) which looked at aligning the UNA election timing with municipal governments. Although the records show that the paper generated some interest from the community, there were no attempts to change the governance practices.

The most comprehensive review of the elections process took place in 2015 with the formation of an Elections Advisory Committee. This group – which was an independent advisory body, did a lot of good work, culminating in a fulsome report with recommendations to the Board (attached as Schedule B).

The report recommended enhanced mail-in/delivery for the 2015 election, along with a second option for in-person voting with an option to vote by mail/delivery for the 2016 and subsequent elections. The report further recommended that the UNA reconsider online voting if and when it is implemented for local government elections in B.C.

The hesitancy regarding online voting as noted in the report was due to concerns raised in relation to security and secrecy of the process, but what's interesting, was although the committee attempted to gather public feedback – and it was noted in the report that there was "significant opposition" to online voting – only a total of 10 comments were received from the public in total during the process. This is of no fault of the committee, who appears to have done their best to consult with the community but brings into question whether the sample size provided enough validity to judge public opinion on online voting.

The Board at the time moved forward with implementing the first two recommendations of the Elections Advisory Committee, starting with enhanced mail-in delivery for the 2015 elections and then moving to an in-person voting method for 2016. There was no motion passed in relation to online voting.

Unfortunately, the move to an in-person system was costly and ineffective (2016 Elections Report attached as Schedule C). A result of this failed experiment was that for elections held from 2017 to 2020 the UNA reverted to the enhanced mail-in system aligned with the Annual General Meeting (AGM) – abandoning any attempts at in-person elections.

An examination of the records shows that there were several attempts during this time to restart an Elections Advisory Committee to review the elections processes, but this never took place. What ended up happening was that the revisions to UNA elections processes ended up tying in with the work of the various UNA Bylaw Review Committees, with the eventual tweaks to the process contained within the new UNA Bylaws (changes to length of term, separating from AGM, etc…) that were implemented in 2021. This culminated with the most recent elections process, which was utilized for the 2021 UNA elections.

The other work in relation to voting that has transpired took place in conjunction with the 2020 Special General Meeting (SGM). The SGM was held during the midst of the COVID pandemic, during which the provincial government passed emergency legislation that

allowed Societies to hold their General Meetings electronically (The *Societies Act* has since been amended allowing societies to hold their General Meetings electronically unless the Society's Bylaws provide otherwise). This gave the UNA the opportunity to use an electronic voting process (combined with hard-copy proxy voting). The staff report that outlined this process, including the proposal from Simply Voting, is attached to this report as Schedule C.

The process worked seamlessly for the given election process – with the majority of votes cast via electronic means. A total of 430 votes were cast, with 242 cast electronically and 188 via proxy ballot (the online and offline totals were combined for the final results).

Because a Director election doesn't allow voting by proxy, holding a Director election using the electronic method used for the SGM would seem to be even simpler.

In terms of next steps, the direction given by the Board was *to determine a process to consider whether to introduce electronic voting for the 2024 UNA election*.

This process could take the form of an Advisory Committee or survey of members, or it could be a smaller, Board driven process, living within the GHR Committee. It may be possible to do some further investigative work in relation to electronic voting up front prior to advancing to the next stage as well.

From a timing and staff workload perspective, it would be preferable to aim to have any proposed changes to the UNA Bylaws ready to go to the 2023 Annual General Meeting – which would mean preparing to move forward in the 2022-23 fiscal year.

Financial Implications

None

Operational Implications

None

Strategic Objective

Community and Stakeholder Relations

Attachments

1. Schedule A – 2013 Election Schedule Reform Discussion Paper
2. Schedule B – 2015 UNA Report of the Elections Advisory Committee

3. Schedule C – 2016 UNA Elections Summary Report
4. Schedule D – 2020 Special General Meeting Update

Concurrence

None

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Sundance Topham
Chief Administrative Officer

Election Schedule Reform Discussion Paper

Should the UNA consider aligning its annual election to coincide with the BC municipal election time table?

Table 1: Summary of differences

Process	UNA	Metro Area A
Frequency	Annual	Every 3 years
Slate	Expiring directors only (5.9)	All candidates, returning & new
Election term	2 years	3 – 4 years
Limit of duty (1)	6 years / 3 terms (5.19)	No limit
Election date	AGM in Sept. 2013 (3.a)	3rd Saturday November, 2014 (3.b)
Appointees	Three	None
Mayor	None	Separate election
Eligible citizen	UNA member	Canadian citizen
Eligible resident	In BC for 6 months	In BC for 6 months
Eligible elector	Local area for 30 days	Municipality for 30 days
Eligible age	18 years	18 years
Vote by mail	Yes (4.26)	Varies
Candidate citizen	No	Yes
Candidate resident	Same as UNA member	Resident in BC for 6 months
Candidate age	Same as UNA member	18 years

(1) Consecutive terms of duties

1. **Advantages of a 3-year term**
a) For newly elected directors, there is a learning curve. A longer term allows more time for directors to become informed on civic procedures and neighbourhood concerns. With a 2-year term, by the time they are up to speed they don't have long before they have to seek re-election.
b) A longer term provides board and staff with longer planning cycle to develop and implement policies. This longer period also allows time for directors to review the effects of the policies they implemented.
c) It takes 3 – 4 months at the minimum for new directors to get up to speed so they may make informed decisions
d) A longer term provides directors with more time to accomplish the platform or goals on the basis of which they campaigned.
e) Annual elections result in board members postponing important decisions until after the election period.
f) Annual elections result in voter fatigue which may be expressed as:
    i. General apathy resulting in a voter's decision not to participate

       i.   Low voter turn-out

      ii.   The need for voters to physically be present to vote

g) Less candidate campaigning time: bi-annual elections increase the time and effort required by candidates

h) Combining Metro and UNA elections may increase voter participation in Metro elections where participation is less than the UNA

i) With all directors elected at the same time, residents could be presented with a slate of candidates who would be in a position, if elected, to implement their platform.

j) Less frequent elections will reduce the administrative burden on UNA staff. This burden includes elections time and resources as well as educating newly elected directors.

k) A November election date provides more preparation time for UNA staff after summer holidays

l) The trend across Canada is to increase municipal terms from 3 to 4 years

2. Disadvantages of a 3-year term

a) Benefit of overlapping terms of office creating a mix of new and experienced board members is lost (by-law 5.9)

b) A completely new slate of directors will require staff or external resources for training & familiarisation

c) The election term overlap currently in place: creates institutional memory and the opportunity for experienced members to guide the newly elected

d) With an overlap there is some protection of directors who are running for re-election because there are others who are not and so decision-making tends to continue in a more regular rhythm.

e) Without a term limit, the re-election of the many directors term-after-term may be unhealthy.

f) October or November election date does not correspond with UNA AGM. The AGM must be held in September. The November election creates the need for a second general meeting

g) Addition of a November election and general meeting to the AGM and the regular monthly meetings may exceed staff resources during the period September-November. Temporary election staff may be required.

h) Metro and UNA polling stations must be separate but for practical purposes, in the same geographical location

i) Voters may become confused between Metro and UNA candidate lists bearing the similar title 'director'

j) Voters may be generally confused between the two elections and the candidates

k) Longer terms create a barrier to getting candidates; people might not want to commit to the extra year(s).

l) Removing the overlap currently in place at the UNA Board reduces institutional memory and the benefits of overlap which are quite high

m) Without overlap and with longer terms, a 'silly season' emerges where elected boards or councils do not want to deal with anything controversial for at least 6 months ahead of the election, and it takes 3 – 4 months at the minimum for folks to get up to speed to be able to make decisions once elected. So you end up with almost a year that is ineffective.

n) Shorter terms provides electors with more frequent opportunities to express their opinion on directors civic performance

3. Relationship of the AGM and Budget approval to UNA elections
a) Fiscal year is April – March
b) The AGM, which in part approves the Auditor's Report, must be held in September
c) Budget development period: October-November
d) Board approval: December

A September election allows the new board time to participate in budget preparation between October and December.

An October or November election does not provide time for board budget participation. On an election year, at the December meeting, the new board will have to adopt and operate with a budget prepared by the previous board. This situation will occur every 3 years.

4. Other information
a) Metro A election space must be physically separated from UNA election space
b) BC may change the local government election to the third Saturday of October.
c) UBCM has also proposed increasing municipal terms to 4 years, though it's not clear if that change will be made.

5. References
a) Local Government Election Task Force in 2010
b) Discussion paper on local election cycles.

Report of the UNA Elections Advisory Committee

TO: Standing Committee on Governance

FROM: Elections Advisory Committee

DATE: May 22, 2015

Formation of Committee and Terms of Reference

In a report to the October 2014 meeting of the UNA Board (Attachment 1), the Governance Committee proposed a review of the procedures for electing UNA directors. The concerns identified in the report related principally to the procedure for voting and also to the signing up of residents as UNA members and having them vote at the same time.

In its December 2014 meeting, the UNA Board approved Terms of Reference for the Elections Advisory Committee (Attachment 2). In its January 2015 meeting, the Board amended the Terms of Reference to increase the number of committee members to eight and it appointed the eight members of the committee (Attachment 3).

Committee's Mandate

The Terms of Reference state that the Elections Advisory Committee (the "Committee") is to conduct a review of UNA election policies and procedures, develop options for improving the current procedure, consult with residents on the options, and recommend the procedure for future elections. The Terms of Reference expressly state that the Committee's mandate does not include an investigation of the September 2014 election.

The Committee has interpreted its mandate to be limited to the procedure for voting for UNA directors. Matters that the Committee considers outside its mandate include: the timing of elections; the term for which elected directors are to serve; the staggering of directors' terms (i.e., the election of approximately half of the resident directors in each election); and candidates' conduct during the election period.

Options for Reform of UNA Voting Procedure

The Committee developed three options for reforming the UNA voting procedure:

- **Option A: Enhanced mail-in/delivery**. A continuation of the current mail-in/delivery procedure, but with a three-envelope voting system—secrecy, certification and return envelopes—and a declaration to be signed by the voter.

- **Option B: In-person voting**. In-person voting at one or more polling stations, with the ability to request a mail-in ballot instead.

- **Option C: Online voting**. Voting online using a secure third-party software platform.

These options are described in more detail in the consultation paper which the Committee released on April 16, 2015 (Attachment 4).

Recommendations

Based on its consultation with residents and the considerations described below, the Committee recommends that the UNA:

1. Adopt Option A (enhanced mail-in/delivery) for the 2015 election.

2. Adopt Option B (in-person voting with option to vote by mail/delivery) for the 2016 and subsequent elections. Anyone who wishes to vote by mail/delivery of ballots should be permitted to do so.

3. Reconsider Option C (online voting) if and when it is implemented for local government elections in B.C.

The Committee decided not to make recommendations regarding the operational details of Option B, such as the location or locations of the polling stations, the days on which voting would occur, and the hours of operation of the polling stations. These details are more appropriately determined by the UNA Board in conjunction with UNA staff, having regard to cost and other considerations.

Consultation

As a basis for consultation with residents, the Committee prepared a consultation paper (Attachment 4) which was made available on the UNA website. The paper describes the Committee's three options and it also provides context, namely the UNA's current voting procedure and the voting procedures used for B.C. local government elections and the Metro Vancouver transit funding plebiscite. In addition, it lists criteria to assess the options and it contains a table identifying pros and cons of the three options.

The Committee held a town hall meeting in MBA House on May 7 at which Committee members gave a PowerPoint presentation followed by a discussion with residents. Six residents attended this meeting. A comments form was distributed (Attachment 5) which most participants completed, in whole or in part.

Residents were also invited to provide comments by email to the Committee. The deadline for doing so was May 11.

The consultation paper, town hall meeting and invitation to provide comments were publicized on the UNA website, in the weekly myuna announcements email, and prominently on pages 1 and 2 of the April issue of The Campus Resident. The Campus Resident included the table from the consultation paper.

What the Committee Heard

Six residents provided comments in emails and four residents indicated their preferences on the comments form distributed at the town hall meeting. There appears not to have been any overlap between those submitting comments in an email and those submitting comments on the form.

The following summarizes the comments:

1. No one supported retaining the current voting procedure. Those who commented on it are opposed to it.

2. Only one person indicated support for Option A, but that person's support for Option B was stronger (agree vs strongly agree). One person strongly disagreed with this option. Two people indicated support for this option only as an interim reform.

3. Seven people supported Option B. One person was opposed to it because of the inconvenience for UBC employees at a time (September) when they are intensely busy.

4. Three people supported Option C (one of whom also supported Option B). Three people expressed opposition to it, two because of security concerns and one of the two also because of the lack of secrecy when casting votes (potential for coercion). One person indicated a neutral position on this option.

5. One Option C supporter said that there should be a choice to obtain a mail-in ballot and expressed concern about ballot packages with PINs left in mailrooms.

6. One of those opposed to Option C is a UBC computer science professor who strongly warned against it and sent a link to an article about security issues with online voting.

Discussion

Current Voting Procedure

The current voting procedure is considerably less formal than that for the election of mayors and councillors in municipalities. It lacks adequate safeguards to ensure the integrity of voting and it permits practices (such as the photocopying of ballots) that create the perception that the procedure is open to abuse or falls well below the norms for voting in a democracy. Furthermore, there is less assurance of secrecy on the counting of ballots than there is with mail-in ballots in local government elections and referenda. The UBC neighbourhoods have reached a size such that, in the Committee's view, the UNA should adopt a voting procedure that adheres more closely to the standards underlying the voting procedures for local government elections.

The outcry after the 2014 election and the lack of any support for the current procedure in the consultation demonstrate that a significant number of residents are dissatisfied with the current procedure. This is a further reason why the Committee has concluded that the current procedure should be replaced.

The Committee recognizes that there is a trade-off between the degree of formality of the voting procedure and the extent of participation in elections. The Committee's view is that a balance should be struck between making voting as easy as possible and at the same time ensuring the integrity of elections.

Option A: Enhanced Mail-In/Delivery

One of the concerns with the current procedure is secrecy on the counting of ballots. The three-envelope system under Option A is a widely accepted method for ensuring secrecy. However, it does not help with secrecy on the completion of ballots.

Another concern with the current procedure is the opportunity for fraudulent voting. While the requirement under Option A to sign the statement on the certification envelope would act as a deterrent, it would not prevent fraudulent voting. The Committee notes that greater security could be achieved by a variation of Option A: for example, preprinting a voter's name and address on the certification envelope along with an identification number and requiring the voter to mark on the envelope some personal information (such as birthdate) that would have to be known to the UNA. The current Metro Vancouver transit funding plebiscite uses this approach. The Committee has been advised by UNA staff that this variation is not possible for the 2015 election but may be possible for subsequent years.

The Committee does not feel that Option A goes far enough to address the concerns with the current voting procedure. This is also the view of those who provided comments during the consultation. Thus, the Committee recommends against the adoption of this option, except on an interim basis for the 2015 election.

Option B: In-Person Voting with Mail-In/Delivery Ballot on Request

The procedure under Option B is similar to that used in B.C. local government elections, as mandated by the *Local Government Act*. In-person voting provides secrecy on the completion and counting of ballots. It provides a high degree of protection against voter fraud. A further, intangible advantage is that going to the polls to vote gives a sense of participation in a democratic process that is not experienced to the same extent with the other options.

Option B received the most support in the consultation. Only one person expressed opposition to it and that was for a reason having to do with the timing of the election, not with the voting procedure itself.

The Committee does not think that the ability to request a ballot for mail-in/delivery would leave the door open for fraudulent voting. A record would be kept of those who request ballots and only ballots from those people would be accepted.

For these reasons, the Committee recommends the adoption of Option B.

However, the Committee takes notice that the implementation of Option B requires amendments to the UNA's bylaws, which will require the approval of UNA members at a general meeting (by a

75% majority of those who vote). The Committee recognizes that the adoption of the amendments and implementation of the option may not be possible in time for the 2015 election. Therefore the Committee recommends the adoption of Option A for the 2015 election, and Option B for subsequent elections.

Option C: Online Voting

The Committee was particularly interested in Option C, which it discussed at some length. The advantages touted by proponents of online voting include its appeal to young voters and voters with mobility issues, it does not require physical presence in the community on election day, it provides flexibility for voting times, it is not particularly expensive to implement, it minimizes spoiled ballots and ballot errors, and it is used by other organizations such as the AMS and GSS. For the reasons outlined below, however, the Committee concluded that it cannot recommend online voting for UNA elections at this time.

Internet voting for B.C. provincial and local government elections was studied recently by the Independent Panel on Internet Voting, a panel appointed by B.C.'s Chief Electoral Officer. The panel submitted a 115-page report to the B.C. Legislative Assembly in February 2014. [www.internetvotingpanel.ca/docs/recommendations-report.pdf] The panel recommended against the adoption of universal internet voting at this time because it considered that the risks outweighed the benefits. The report states: "There are significant risks to implementing Internet voting that can jeopardize the integrity of an election". It found that the presumed benefit of increased voter turnout was typically not realized in those jurisdictions that have used internet voting.

The security and verifiability concerns with online voting were of particular concern to UNA residents and Committee members. Another concern was the lack of secrecy when voting.

While the consultation showed that there is support for Option C, it also showed that there is significant opposition. Thus, this option would be more controversial than Option B.

As with Option B, implementation of Option C would require amendments to the UNA bylaws. In view of the opposition evident from the consultation (admittedly based on a small sample of residents), there is a material risk that UNA members would defeat the amendments.

Implementation of Option C could require an investment of time to investigate and select appropriate voting software and develop the details of the election procedure, including how to provide voters with PINs or other authentication credentials to enable them to vote online.

Although Committee members generally support Option C in principle, the Committee does not recommend Option C for UNA elections at this time. The Committee suggests that online voting be reconsidered if and when it is adopted for local government elections in B.C.

Acknowledgment

The Committee would like to acknowledge the able assistance provided by Jan Fialkowski. Jan kept the Committee organized and aware of its deadlines, and was there to help whenever anything

needed doing. Also, she was a valuable source of information regarding the UNA's current voting procedure.

Attachment 1

University Neighbourhoods Association
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Proposal: Public Review of UNA Elections and Election Policies

D.2

Date: October 10, 2014

From: Charles Menzies, UNA Secretary and Chair of the Governance Standing Committee

The UNA is a society under the Societies Act of BC. The UNA also, via the Neighbours' Agreement, manages some of the services (as delegated by UBC) that a municipality might also deliver. Residents have an expectation that the UNA manage it's affairs in as open and democratic a fashion as possible.

Since being create by UBC in 2002 the UNA has slowly grown in membership as the overall residential population of the University Neighbourhoods have developed. Prior to 2002 Hampton Place was governed by a joint UBC Properties Trust – Council of Strata Chairs process that seemed to meet their needs. Hampton Place, at full build out, had just over 1000 units of housing. In 2001 the first residential units in Hawthorn Place were occupied. These buildings were all, initially, faculty staff rental buildings, and the Hampton Place governance model was inadequate and unable to accommodate the needs and interests of the new members of what came to be the UNA Area. As a consequence a democratic residents association was created, the Hawthorn Lane Residents Association, to advocate on behalf and to represent the interests of Hawthorn Place residents. The university eventually responded by setting up a majority appointed University Neighbourhoods' Association, registered under the Societies Act of BC, to deal with the emerging concerns and governance issues of the non-institutional residential areas.

Over time the UNA has slowly added elected resident directors (as per a formula tied to number of residential units built). The early elections were small, involved few voters, and took place primarily at the Annual General Meeting. As the UNA governed area has increased to include Chancellor Place, Westbrook Place, and East Campus Neighbourhood, the number of potential and actual ballots cast has increased. Over this same period of time the voting process has developed into one in which ballots are mailed to registered UNA members, candidates are provided with a membership list of UNA members, candidates' are allowed to reproduce ballots, candidates (or others) can solicit and hand in completed ballots, balloting is then closed at the start of the AGM which has now become regularly scheduled for the month of September (in the past the AGM was held during the late spring/early summer).

The current model of voting used by the UNA is consistent with that of a society or public enterprise but not with local area governments in BC. During the course of the past election for resident directors a series of community concerns have been raised. These concerns highlight practices that could undermine the legitimacy of the UNA electoral process and thereby undermine the UNA's capacity to effectively conduct its business and to effectively represent UNA area residents. Concerns include: the standard practice of candidates reproducing their own copies of the ballots, direct solicitation of potential voters, simultaneously signing residents up as UNA members and soliciting their vote, and collecting discarded mail in ballots (found in AGM packages) and allegedly submitting them without the knowledge of the addressee. These are serious concerns. The UNA has an obligation to ensure that whatever electoral process is used it is one that is beyond reproach.

Attachment 1

University Neighbourhoods Association
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Proposal: Public Review of UNA Elections and Election Policies

D.2

To this the following recommendation to the Board is offered.

Motion

Moved by   , that the UNA Board of Directors delegates the Chair of the Governance Committee to set in place an ad hoc public review of UNA Elections and Election Policies; that this review will consist of a panel of responsible individuals with experience in the study and development of democratic governance models elections, and election procedures; that this panel of responsible individuals will take public input and comment in relation to improving the UNA Elections and Elections Policies; that notice of this review shall be placed in the October Edition of the Campus Resident, on the UNA web page and social media sites, and distributed via the UNA email notice system; that the panel of responsible individuals will consider written submissions and oral comments at at least one public forum, and; that this panel of responsible individuals shall report to the Governance Standing Committee with recommendations by November 25, 2014.

ELECTIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2015

Terms of Reference
Approved December 9, 2014

1. **Purpose**
   a. The Elections Advisory Committee 2015 (Committee) will conduct a review of UNA election policies and procedures, consider reforms to these procedures, and recommend procedures for future elections.
      i. The Committee's mandate is not an investigation of the September 2014 election, for example, allegations of canvasser or voter irregularities.

2. **Reporting**
   a. The Committee will
      i. Report directly to the Board;
      ii. Present options for Board consideration in March 2015;
      iii. Allow for changes to be presented at a June 2015 special general meeting.
   b. The committee will issue monthly progress reports so as to allow the Board to assess its interest in pursuing certain procedural or policy changes.
   c. Timeline 2015
      January - April committee work
      April 28   Governance Standing Committee
      May 12   Board approval
      June 2   Special General Meeting

3. **Membership**

   a. The Chair of the Committee will be determined by the Board.
   b. A list of potential members with expertise in Governance models and election procedures will be compiled by the Governance Standing Committee for submission for Board approval.
   c. The Chair of the Committee may also propose potential members.
   d. The maximum number will be seven (7) persons.
   e. Members may participate at different stages of committee work.
   f. Once the committee members are approved, the Terms of Reference will be updated to reflect the member names.

4. **Budget**
   a. A budget of up to $25,000 is provided for consultant or other expenses. No extraordinary internal expenses are anticipated other than up to two (2) town-hall meetings. Expenses must be pre-approved by the Board.

5. **Scope of Work**

   a. Review current policies and procedures including such areas as membership processing and identification, ballot delivery (mail, in-person), voting opportunities (in public, daily frequency, AGM).
   b. Review UNA Bylaws, the 2010 UNA Election Manual, and related Board policies and decisions.
   c. Develop options for improving the current voting procedures.
   d. Each option shall include, to the extent relevant, enforcement mechanisms for violations of procedures under that option, which mechanisms shall take into account the limited powers of the UNA as a society.
   e. Consult broadly with the residents on these options.
   f. Refine the options and present them to the Board.
   g. The Committee Chair or delegate will present the options at the General Meeting.

6. **Committee procedures**
   a. The Committee will follow UNA procedures and policies for committees.
   b. Staff will draft the necessary changes to UNA by-laws and procedures.

Report received.

4. **Alma Mater Society**
   Verbal report received.

5. **Electoral Area A**
   Report received.

C. **OLD BUSINESS**
   1. **Proposed Membership: Elections Policy and Procedures Advisory Committee**
      MOVED BY Charles Menzies, THAT the UNA Board of Directors supports the recommendation of the Governance Standing Committee and appoints the following to the Elections Policies and Procedures Advisory Committee:
      - Max Cameron, PhD, Hawthorn resident; UBC Professor of Political Science, and Director of the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions, as Chair;
      - Alan Craigie, PhD, Hawthorn Resident, Post Doctorate Teaching Fellow in Department of Political Science, UBC;
      - Mike Feeley, PhD, Hawthorn resident, former UNA Elected Director and UNA Chair;
      - Bill Holmes, Hampton resident, retired Tax Lawyer;
      - Sandra Song, Hawthorn resident;
      - Pierre Cenerilli, PhD, University & Government Relations Advisor, AMS Student Society of UBC;
      - Chris Fay, Policy Analyst, UBC Campus + Community Planning;
      - Michal Jaworski, UBC, Office of University Counsel.

      CARRIED UNANAMIOUSLY

      MOVED BY Charles Menzies, THAT the UNA Board of Directors, on the recommendation of the Governance Standing Committee, amends the approved Elections Advisory Committee Terms of Reference to include an eighth member (section 3.d).
      CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

   2. **Neighbourhood Signage and Lighting Guidelines**
      MOVED BY Ying Zhou, THAT the UNA Board of Directors, on a recommendation by the Operations and Sustainability Standing Committee, supports, in principle, the proposed solutions to neighbourhood wayfinding and temporary commercial signage.
      CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. **NEW BUSINESS**
   1. **Annual Parking Survey**
      Report received.

Reform of UNA Voting Procedure

Consultation Paper

UNA Elections Advisory Committee

April 16, 2015

Reform of UNA Voting Procedure

Contents

1. Introduction

The UNA's current procedure for the election of its resident directors is less formal than the procedure for the election of mayors and councillors in municipalities. Now that the population of the UBC neighbourhoods is around 9,000—more than the population of about 100 of B.C.'s 162 municipalities—and is expected to reach 24,500 on completion of all the neighbourhoods, the UNA Directors have decided that it is time to consider reforming the voting procedure.

In January 2015, the UNA Directors established the Elections Advisory Committee and appointed the following as members:

Max Cameron, Committee Chair	Hawthorn Place resident
Allan Craigie	Hawthorn Place resident
Mike Feeley	Hawthorn Place resident Former UNA Chair
Bill Holmes	Hampton Place resident
Sandy Song	Hawthorn Place resident
Pierre Cenerelli	AMS University & Government Relations Advisor
Chris Fay	UBC Campus + Community Planning
Michal Jaworski	UBC Office of University Counsel

The Committee's mandate is to conduct a review of UNA election policies and procedures, develop options for improving the current procedure, consult with residents on the options, and recommend the procedure for future elections.

The Committee has interpreted this mandate to refer only to the procedure for voting for directors and has developed three options for consideration:

- **Enhanced mail-in/delivery**: A continuation of the current mail-in/delivery procedure, but with a three-envelope voting system—secrecy, certification and return envelopes—and a declaration to be signed by the voter.

- **In-person voting**: In-person voting at one or more polling stations, with the ability to request a mail-in ballot instead.

- **Online voting**: Voting online using a secure third-party software platform.

In addition to describing the options, this paper provides some context: the UNA's current voting procedure, and the voting procedures used for local government elections and the

transit funding plebiscite. It also lists several considerations that can be used to assess the options.

Please note that the Committee's mandate does **not** include: the timing of elections; the term for which elected directors are to serve; the staggering of directors' terms (i.e., the election of approximately half of the resident directors in each election); and candidates' conduct during the election period.

2.   Invitation for Comments and Next Steps

The Committee invites you to provide comments on the options described in this paper. Do you think that any of the options are better than the current procedure? If so, which option do you prefer?

You can provide your comments by email to consultations@myuna.ca**.** The deadline for doing so is Monday, May 11.

The only option that can be implemented in time for this year's election is the enhanced mail-in/delivery option. If you prefer the in-person or online voting option, but would like to see interim reforms for the 2015 election, you should note this in your comments.

The Committee will be holding a town hall meeting on Thursday, May 7 at MBA House (in Wesbrook Village) from 7 to 9 pm. This meeting will include a presentation from Committee members and a discussion of the options.

The Committee will review the results of the consultation, and will present a report to the UNA Standing Committee on Governance (a committee of the UNA Board of Directors) in time for its May 26 meeting.

Based on the report, the Governance Committee will decide whether to recommend to the UNA Board that it proceed with reforming the UNA's voting procedure. The final decision rests with the Board and may be made at its June 9 meeting. If the Board were to decide to implement in-person or online voting, amendments would have to be made to the UNA Bylaws. The amendments would be subject to the approval of UNA members.

3.   Current UNA Voting Procedure

The current procedure for voting for UNA directors is as follows:

- The UNA mails out a voting package to all UNA members with the material for the September Annual General Meeting (AGM).

- Voters can obtain ballots in any of the following ways:

    o Use the ballot in the voting package mailed to all UNA members.

    o Download and print a ballot from the UNA's website.

    o Photocopy a ballot.

- Ballots are returned to the UNA in a single envelope:

    o Any envelope may be used; it does not have to be the envelope supplied by the UNA.

    o Voters are required to write their name and address on the envelope.

- Voters may return their completed ballots in either of the following ways:

    o Mail the ballot to the UNA.

    o Deliver the ballot to the UNA office or other designated location. A voter's ballot can be delivered by any person, including a candidate.

- Ballots must be received by the start of the AGM.

UNA staff count the ballots while the AGM is underway. They first check names and addresses against the list of UNA members. After confirming that a voter is a UNA member, staff remove the ballot from the envelope and deposit it in a box. After all ballots have been removed, they are counted.

Since the confirmation that each voter is a UNA member is made when ballots are counted, a resident can vote first and then join the UNA.

4.   Other Voting Procedures

a. Local Government Elections

In considering options for the reform of the UNA's voting procedure, it is helpful to be aware of the voting procedure used in local government elections. Such elections include the election of the mayor and councillors in a municipality, and the election of the director who represents the UBC neighbourhoods and the other parts of Electoral Area A at Metro Vancouver.

The primary method of voting in such elections is in-person voting. Voters must go to a polling station where they are given a ballot. They complete the ballot behind a secrecy screen and deposit it in a ballot box.

In order to receive a ballot, a voter must provide suitable identification. If there is a voters list, an election official checks that the voter is on the list. If not, the voter is entitled to register on

the spot. For jurisdictions that do not have advance voter registration, all registration takes place at the polling stations. A person applying to be registered as a voter must sign a declaration that they meet the requirements to qualify as a voter.

A local government is required to provide advance polls on at least two days before the general voting day (if the population exceeds 5,000).

A local government may, but is not required to, allow voting by mail ballot. Only certain voters are permitted to vote by mail ballot, including those who expect to be absent from the municipality or regional district on the general and advance voting days. A voter must apply for a mail ballot package. Among other items, the package contains the ballot and three envelopes:

- a secrecy envelope, in which the ballot is to be placed;

- a certification envelope, on which is printed specified information and in which the secrecy envelope is to be placed; and

- an outer envelope, in which the other envelopes are to be returned.

The certification envelope contains a printed statement, to be signed by the voter, declaring that the voter is entitled to be registered as a voter, is entitled to vote by mail ballot, and has not previously and will not afterwards vote in the election. In addition, the voter must write their full name and residential address on the certification envelope.

There are many detailed rules regulating the voting in local government elections. However, for the purposes of this consultation paper, this general description is sufficient.

b. Metro Vancouver Transportation and Transit Plebiscite

The transit funding plebiscite currently underway provides another example of a voting procedure. Voting in the plebiscite is solely by mail-in ballot.

The procedure for voting in the plebiscite is generally similar to that for mail ballot voting in local government elections. Again, a three-envelope system is used. The certification envelope contains and requires the following:

- Preprinted on the envelope are the voter's name, address, and an identification number.

- The voter must sign a declaration on the envelope that reads: "I declare that I am the voter identified on the certification envelope, that I am resident in the transportation service region and that I have not previously voted in this plebiscite."

- The voter must write his or her birthdate on the envelope.

5. Reform Options

The Committee is proposing three options for consideration by the community:

- **Enhanced mail-in/delivery**: A continuation of the current mail-in/delivery procedure, but with a three-envelope voting system—secrecy, certification and return envelopes— and a declaration to be signed by the voter.

- **In-person voting**: In-person voting at one or more polling stations, with the ability to request a mail-in ballot instead.

- **Online voting**: Voting online using a secure third-party software platform.

Each option is described in detail below.

a. Option A: Enhanced Mail-In/Delivery

Option A retains a mail-in/delivery method for voting, but with a tighter procedure than at present:

- A three-envelope system would be used, with a secrecy envelope, a certification envelope, and a return envelope. This is the system described above under Local Government Elections for those local governments that permit mail ballot voting.

- The certification envelope would contain spaces in which the voter is to write his or her full name and residential address.

- The certification envelope would contain a printed statement to be signed by the voter, declaring that the voter is the person identified on the envelope, meets the eligibility conditions to vote (which conditions would be listed[1]), and has not previously voted in the election.

- Ballots and envelopes supplied by the UNA would have to be used.

- The UNA would mail out a voting package to everyone on its membership list as of a specified date.

- A person who becomes a UNA member after the specified date and before the close of the election would be entitled to receive a voting package, either by mail or in person.

---

[1] Currently, the only condition is that the voter be a UNA member. The two residency conditions in section 4.13 of the UNA Bylaws apply only with respect to voting *in person at general meetings of UNA members.* Those conditions are that a UNA member must have been a resident of B.C. for at least 6 months and a resident of one of the neighbourhoods for at least 30 days.

- Ballots (in the three envelopes) could be returned by mail or by delivery to places specified by the UNA. As at present, there would be no restriction on who can deliver ballots to the UNA.

As a variation of this option, the certification envelope could have the name and address of the voter preprinted on it and possibly also an identification number. This would make fraudulent voting more difficult. However, it would significantly increase the UNA's administrative burden and would necessitate a cut-off date for receiving voting packages that is well before the close of the election.

b. Option B: In-Person Voting with Mail-In Ballot on Request

Option B is similar to the procedure for local government elections:

- The main method of voting would be in-person voting at a polling station.

- One or more polling stations would be set up and voting would take place on several days. Details of this option–such as the location or locations of the polling stations, the days on which voting would occur, and the hours of operation of the polling stations–would be determined by the UNA Directors.

- The procedure for voting at a polling station would follow that used in local government elections.

- Each voter would be required to sign a statement similar to that described above for the certification envelope in the case of mail-in ballots.

- Residents would be able to join the UNA at the polling stations.

- Voters would be entitled to vote by mail or by delivery of ballots to the UNA, as under Option A. There would be no conditions for doing so. A voter wishing to vote in this manner would have to request a ballot from the UNA. The procedure would be the same as for Option A.

c. Option C: Online Voting

Option C involves online voting and is similar to the voting procedure used by UBC's Alma Mater Society (the undergraduate student society) and Graduate Student Society (GSS):

- A third-party software platform would be used for voting. This might be the platform used by the AMS, which is called Simply Voting. Information about Simply Voting is available from www.simplyvoting.com.

- Each voter would receive a unique PIN (personal identification number). In order to vote, a voter would have to be authenticated by entering their PIN together with other identifying information such as the voter's name.

- Voting could take place from any computing device. In addition, a physical voting station could be established at which voters could vote using an available computer or tablet.

- The voting software would allow each voter to vote only once.

6.   Assessing the Options

The following are criteria that can be applied in assessing the three options. Several of these criteria require judgement calls. The Committee is not in a position to provide information on costs and staff time, as this information depends on details that have not been determined for the purposes of this paper.

- *Aggregate voter participation*: Is it likely that more or fewer residents will vote than at present?

- *Participation by specific groups*: Are specific groups of voters—e.g., younger voters, older voters—more or less likely to vote?

- *Secrecy on the counting of ballots (ballot anonymity)*: Is a voter's ballot secret when it is counted?

- *Secrecy on completion of ballots*: Can any other person see how a particular voter is voting and hence be in a position to coerce the voter to vote in a particular way?

- *Voter authentication*: Is the voter the person they claim to be (i.e., no voter fraud)?

- *Technological uncertainty*: What is the risk of technological problems, initially and on an on-going basis?

- *Implementation*: What is the cost and staff time for implementation?

- *Administration*: How costly is it to administer the voting procedure?

The table at the end of this paper contains the Committee's comments on the application of some of these criteria to the options.

7.   Implementation

Option A (enhanced mail-in/delivery) is permitted by the UNA Bylaws and so could be implemented in time for the election of directors this September. The only formality required is a resolution of the UNA Directors approving the use of this procedure.

Options B (in-person voting with mail-in ballot on request) and C (online voting) would require amendments to the UNA Bylaws. Such amendments would have to be put to a vote at a general meeting of UNA members and would require a 75% majority approval to be adopted. The timing is too tight for Bylaw amendments to be made in time for the 2015 election.

Option C (online voting) also requires a significant investment of time to investigate and select appropriate software and develop the details of the election procedure. It would not be prudent for this work to commence before the necessary Bylaw amendments have been approved by UNA members.

Even though Options B and C cannot be implemented for this year's election, they should be considered for future elections. If the consultation shows that there is a preference for either of these two options, Option A could be implemented for 2015 as an interim reform.

	Options – UNA Voting Procedures		
	Option A **Enhanced Mail-In/Delivery**	**Option B** **In-Person +** **Enhanced Mail-In/Delivery**	**Option C** **Online**
Description	• Mail-in ballot sent to all members • Secrecy envelope for ballot, certification envelope signed by voter, return envelope for whole package • Voters signs to attest they meet voting requirements and have not already voted	• In-person voting at designated places and times • Voters must request mail-in ballot • Voter signs to attest they meet voting requirements and have not already voted	• Online voting via third-party platform • Voters authenticated by mailed-out or emailed PINs • Could be combined with in-person voting at designated locations (e.g., via iPads) • Voter electronically attests they meet voting requirements and have not already voted
Pros	• Secret ballot • Incremental change to status quo • Comparable resource needs to current practice • Closer to municipal practice than status quo	• Secret ballot • Reflects municipal practice • In-person voting may provide an opportunity for community engagement • Limiting mail-in to those who request ballots encourages in-person voting • Mail-in allows voting for members who are away or have mobility issues	• Secret ballot • Allows voting for members who are away or have mobility issues • Provides flexible voting times • May reduce resource needs over long term • Eliminates spoiled ballots and errors • May increase turnout in certain demographics
Cons	• Less ballot secrecy compared to in-person voting • Change to current practice may lower turnout • May provide less opportunity for community engagement than in-person voting	• Requires additional resources • Requirement to vote in person or request ballot may decrease turnout • In-person voting may be inconvenient for certain voters	• Less ballot secrecy compared to in-person voting • Higher resource needs in short term • Departure from BC municipal practice • Technical uncertainty • Change to current practice may lower turnout • May discourage turnout in certain demographics

UNA UNIVERSITY NEIGHBOURHOODS ASSOCIATION

VIBRANT, DIVERSE, SUSTAINABLE

Comments Form

REFORM OF UNA VOTING PROCEDURE– TOWN HALL MEETING

Thursday, May 7, 2015 │7:00pm-9:00pm │ MBA House

Thank you for attending this Town Hall Meeting; your comments are important to us.

1. Please select ONE response for each statement:

	RESPONSE				
	Agree Strongly	**Agree**	**Neither Agree Nor Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Disagree Strongly**
I prefer Option A: **ENHANCED MAIL-IN / DELIVERY**					
I prefer Option B: **IN-PERSON VOTING WITH MAIL-IN BALLOT ON REQUEST**					
I prefer Option C: **ONLINE VOTING**					
I prefer the **CURRENT UNA VOTING PROCEDURE**					

2. Do you have any comments on the options or the current voting procedure?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

please turn over →

UNA UNIVERSITY NEIGHBOURHOODS ASSOCIATION

VIBRANT, DIVERSE, SUSTAINABLE

3. Is there a different voting procedure that you would recommend for consideration?

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

4. How are you associated with the UNA? *(please check all relevant boxes)*
    ☐ UNA Resident ☐ UNA Member ☐ UBC Faculty ☐ UBC Staff ☐ UBC Student
    ☐ No direct association ☐ Other:_____

5. Where do you live?
    ☐ UNA neighbourhood: _____ ☐ UBC (other than UNA neighbourhood) ☐ City of Vancouver
    ☐ Other:_____

6. How did you find out about this event? *(please check all relevant boxes)*
    ☐ MyUNA Announcements Thursday email ☐ UNA website ☐ Ad in The Campus Resident
    ☐ Friend or Colleague

Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments.

If you would like to drop off, email or mail in this form after the meeting, please return it by end of day,
Monday, May 11, 2015 to:
UNA Office #202-5923 Berton Ave, Vancouver, BC V6S 0B3
Attention: Jan Fialkowski, Executive Director
OR email: consultations@myuna.ca

If you would prefer to provide your comments in an email rather than
on this form, please send the email to the above address.

Date: October 31, 2016

From: Tanner Bokor, Chief Returning Officer

Executive Summary

In July 2016, the UNA Board of Directors approved sweeping changes to the UNA's electoral system for the fall general elections. The UNA utilized a new ballot scanning and electronic poll book system to automate and streamline the elections process for the UNA. The UNA contracted ES&S Canada to provide the equipment and technical expertise to use this new voting method.

On September 28th, 2016, the UNA held its annual general meeting and elected three (3) new resident directors. These directors are:

- Richard Alexander
- Raymundo Escalona
- Rose Wang

The total turnout for the 2016 General election was 287 votes of 4783 eligible voters, or roughly 6% turnout. 94 votes were cast as part of the advanced polling process, while the rest were cast in the general elections process. There were no absentee ballots cast in 2016.

This report will provide you an initial analysis of the UNA's 2016 general elections.

Metrics Analysis

The UNA Board reviewed at the July board meeting a number of qualitative and quantitative metrics that the 2016 elections would be evaluated against. These metrics are re-produced below with an analysis on whether they were met, not met or whether they are still in progress.

Quantitative Metrics:
- Voter Turnout: 35% overall voter turnout
  - Turnout for the 2016 General Elections was 6% (or 287 total voters), which is roughly 19% less than the projected turnout, and also presents the lowest turnout in a UNA General Election since 2002. This metric was not met.
- Expenditures: No more than 5% variation on budgeted expenses.
  - Overall election expenditures came in on budget. Summary of the elections expenses is attached as B.5.1
- Tabulation: Less than 2% of ballots overall spoiled/disputed
  - There were no spoiled or disputed ballots in the 2016 General Election, and although there was a reconciliation discrepancy between the poll books and ballot scanners, no ballots were determined to have been spoiler or improperly cast. This metric was met.

- o Communications: At least 250 conversions online
  - o There were 2,373 conversions through the Election social media channels, and through direct email blasts. This metric was met.
- o Candidate Registration: At least four (4) candidates registered to run as Directors
  - o Four (4) candidates registered to run in the 2016 General Election. This metric was met.

Qualitative Metric:
- o Survey Responses/Exit Polls: Overall satisfaction with the voting process
  - o This metric is still in progress, pending further discussion by staff and the Board of Directors.
- o Impediments: Reduction of impediments to voting, access to voting material.
  - o Though three voting methods were provided (including absentee balloting, advanced polling and general voting), there are a number of policy, reactive and administrative decisions made that could have impeded accessibility to voting. These included responding to the Canada Post work stoppage threat, the lack of direct mail outs and lack of translation services. This metric must be further evaluated.
- o Multicultural Engagement: Increased engagement and outreach to of ethnic communities within the UNA
  - o This metric requires further evaluation. While no direct translation services were provided, there was notable activity within the ethnic communities in the local neighborhoods that did mobilize during the election period.
- o Engagement: Increased engagement at UNA election events and with candidates themselves.
  - o While three elections open houses and one all candidates meeting were held, there was feedback from residents that more could have been done to engage residents on the elections topic. Given the turnout percentage and other resident feedback, this metric will be evaluated.

Recommendations

In light of the lessons of the past UNA Election, I recommend that the UNA Board review the following recommendations to ensure that future elections provide a strong democratic mandate and engage the community in a tangible way.

- Re-evaluate the voting method used for the 2017 election.
  - o Through the process of designing the election process, it became apparent that the UNA does not have the infrastructure or structural sophistication to mirror municipal best practice for its elections. Given numerous policies that had to be created (including re-count percentages, polling procedures and identity verification processes) and difficulties with internal communications, the UNA should consider creating solutions for future elections that are UNA-community specific in line with its own capacity. While the voting method this year was received positively from residents, the complexity and cost of the ballot scanning system does not seem the most appropriate for the UNA. Furthermore, the amount of staff resources used to manage this process were excessive and unnecessary. In future, the UNA could work with a professional service provider, such as ES&S, to determine a more suitable voting system that is

appropriate for the UNA.

- Re-evaluate communications methods to residents.
  - The UNA should reconsider the communications report provided to the Board last year to build a stronger communications infrastructure that can be put into action during the election period. In the same vein, the Board should review the recommendations on how to better engage with the community and create a sense of connection between the Board and residents.

- Conduct a Residents Experience Survey
  - The turnout percentage in 2016 was the lowest of any UNA Election to date. There may be a number of reasons for this that are directly relatable to the elections process used this year, however, from anecdotal feedback from residents throughout the process, the issue of low turnout may also be associated with broader issues of communications and understanding between the UNA Board and its membership. The UNA could conduct a Residents Experience Survey, mirroring the AMS's Academic Experience Survey, to determine residents' perceptions of the UNA on whole and other areas that may help the Board to understand the low turnout this election cycle.

- Re-strike an elections review committee to evaluate the structure of UNA Elections
  - The UNA's most recent review of the electoral process in 2015 was conducted on the basis that the UNA should emulate municipal best practices. Through the process of conducting the 2016 general elections, it became apparent that the UNA has a very specific context that neither falls under the typical realm of a non-profit or a municipality, and attempts to graft practices from the latter did not yield a strong result. The UNA should re-constitute an electoral committee to review a voting method and elections process for the UNA that takes into account the uniqueness of the community, and ensure that committee members are included in the administrative process of running the election for the following general election.

- Remove UNA staff from the elections process
  - The intention to create an independent electoral body was to ensure separation between the political and democratic aspects of the UNA. Though there was a semi-functional electoral committee in existence through the process, staff ultimately made a number of electoral decisions that may have been more policy oriented than staff should reasonably be expected to address. In future, the UNA should have a standing electoral committee with representation from the UNA Executive Director throughout the year, however, prior to the general elections being held, it should retain staff that report directly to the committee to avoid potential conflicts of interest and ensure a clear reporting structure.

- Plan a more significant events calendar
  - A clear piece of feedback from residents was that there needs to be more opportunities to engage with the candidates, and the candidates with the community. Instead of one all

UNA

UNIVERSITY
NEIGHBOURHOODS
ASSOCIATION

University Neighbourhoods Association
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
2016 Elections Report

B.5

candidates meeting and a series of elections events, there should be some consideration to holding local debates hosted by a third-party organization and spread them through the election cycle.

Date: November 4, 2016

From: Serena Hayes, Finance Manager

BACKGROUND

On July 12, 2016 the Board approved the report entitled "UNA General Elections 2016 – Report & Recommendations" which included a release of funds of $30,000 to finance the elections and AGM. There was a desire to increase voter engagement through in-person voting and the increased cost is a result of facilitating polling stations throughout the neighbourhoods.

DISCUSSION

The following is a summary of the actual expenses amounting to $29,529. Actual expenses for 2015 amounted to $19,900. While there is a significant difference in these expenses from 2015, it is consistent with elections and AGM costs in 2010, when polling stations were used. The most significant expense in 2016 is the elections systems software rental, accounting for 59% of the overall expenses.

Expense	Actual Cost 2016	Actual Cost 2015	Actual Cost 2010
Personnel	$7,875	$3,444	$11,326
Elections Systems Software	$17,530	$0	$0
Printing/Postage	$362	$3,600	$2,442
Website/Social Media	$558	$0	$0
Promotion	$150	$0	$0
Catering	$1,305	$156	$393
Room Rentals	$449	$0	$260
AGM	$1,300	$12,700	$12,869
Total	**$29,529**	**$19,900**	**$27,290**

RECOMMENDATION

To reduce costs in 2017, it is recommended that the UNA seek out a more affordable solution for elections system software compared to the system used in 2016.

Report Date:	July 2nd, 2020
Meeting Date:	July 6th, 2020
From:	Sundance Topham, Chief Administrative Officer
Subject:	2020 Special General Meeting Update

Background

At the March 17, 2020 Closed Board Meeting the UNA Board passed the following motion:

> *That the Board approve the proposed timeline and Special General Meeting date of September 30th, 2020, as set out in Appendix A of the Board Submission.*

Staff provided the Board with an update on the Special General Meeting (SGM) planning at the June 16th, 2020 Closed Board Meeting – noting that staff could still move forward with planning for the September 30th, 2020 SGM – however, the full impact of COVID-19 wasn't known during the creation of the March SGM Planning memo (Attached as Appendix A), and the impact on the overall timeline, and especially how the voting could take place, needed to be examined in more detail prior to confirming the ability of staff to meet the September 30th, 2020 date.

The report also noted that the June deadline for acceptance of any proposed changes to the Neighbours' Agreement by the University of British Columbia Board of Governors (UBC) had been extended, which would influence overall timing.

At the June 16th, 2020 Closed Board Meeting the UNA Board passed the following motion:

> *That the Board directs University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA) staff to continue the planning process for the Special General Meeting on September 30, 2020, and report back to the Board when relevant information becomes clear.*

Staff have explored overall timing for the SGM, received legal advice on potential voting options for the Board to consider, and have investigated online voting options that would meet the organizations needs. These options and a new timeline, along with the required Board decisions, to meet the September 30th, 2020 date are presented for Board decision.

Decision Requested

That the Board confirm the following items for the 2020 Special General Meeting:

- Date, time (start and stop time) and location for the SGM (in person or electronic for the Board).

- Date, time and location of any Townhall opportunities in advance of the SGM (in person or electronic for the Board).
- Voting format for both regular voting and proxy voting (electronic or hard copy).
- Confirmation of which Directors would be available to receive any proxies for the voting.
- Confirmation of Board availability to hold a Special Meeting on August 4th, 2020 to review and approve SGM materials and confirm the final version of the Bylaws to be voted on.
- Ideally the confirmation of which version of the Bylaws to be voted on should be provided at this meeting as well; however, the mediation process with the AMS that was concluded on July 3rd, 2020 confirmed that the earliest date that a final decision could be made on a confirmed version of the Bylaws is the July 27th Board of Governors meeting. Staff will be required to create communications materials for both Version A and Version B with a confirmation on how to proceed to take place at the Special Meeting on August 4th.

Discussion

The UNA has undertaken extensive work on its Bylaws and Constitution, and the organization has been making a concerted effort to hold a fall Special General Meeting (Extraordinary Meeting) on September 30th, 2020 to vote on potential changes to these important documents.

A significant amount of planning work took place prior to COVID-19, and this work has been updated to reflect the variables that the pandemic and delays in UBC BOG approval have introduced to the planning process.

Staff have refined the original March timeline, taking into account the changes brought on by COVID-19, along with changes to the Neighbours Agreement ratification process, and resulting effect on the Bylaws.

The updated timeline requires the Board to hold a Special Meeting on Tuesday, August 4th, 2020 to finalize the SGM meeting documents for distribution (Noting that the August meeting has traditionally been cancelled in the past – and if this were to happen again, there would not be increased meetings scheduled for August).

Step by step process – September 30th, 2020 SGM

1) UNA Board confirms the voting mechanism for the Special General Meeting (July 6th Special Board Meeting).

2) UNA Board green lights the text version of the SGM materials (July 21st Board Meeting), including:

a. SGM Notice

b. Ballot Questions

c. Restricted Proxy Form

d. SGM Procedures

e. Constitution and Bylaw Amendments Information

3) Staff to update the UNA Membership List (July 22nd to September 2nd) – Including need to find a safe and secure ability to add/confirm new memberships.

4) UNA Board approval of final communication package, including confirmation of By-Laws Package to be communicated, initiating the roll out of the communication plan to residents (August 4th Special Board Meeting – Board to receive package on July 31st).

5) Roll out of communication package which includes website update, FAQ's section, SGM procedures, agenda, and proxy forms. Applicable items will be sent to the printer for printing and envelope stuffing (August 5th – September 2nd).

6) Communication Package sent from printers to Canada Post for mailing to residents (September 3rd).

7) Communication package to be received by residents at least 21 days prior to the SGM (September 9th).

8) Virtual Town Hall: staff suggest that the UNA Board host an event where residents will have the opportunity to ask Board members questions about the by-law changes (September 23rd).

9) Staff and Board execute the SGM (September 30th).

In order for this timeline to be met the following decisions need to be made at this meeting:

- Date, time (start and stop time) and location for the SGM (in person or electronic for the Board).

- Date, time and location of any Townhall opportunities in advance of the SGM (in person or electronic for the Board).

- Voting format for both regular voting and proxy voting (electronic or hard copy).

- Confirmation of which Directors would be available to receive any proxies for the voting.

- Confirmation of Board availability to hold a Special Meeting on August 4th, 2020 to review and approve SGM materials and confirm the final version of the Bylaws to be voted on.

- Ideally the confirmation of which version of the Bylaws to be voted on could be provided at this meeting as well; however, the mediation process with the AMS that was concluded on July 3rd, 2020 confirmed that the earliest date that a final decision could be made on a confirmed version of the Bylaws is the July 27th Board of Governors meeting. Staff will be required to create communications materials for both Version A and Version B with a confirmation on how to proceed to take place at the Special Meeting on August 4th.

In terms of providing communications material to UNA members it is important to recognize that regardless of the voting options chosen by the Board, this is a new process. In the past any Special Resolutions have taken place during the Annual General Meeting either in person or via proxy, and Director election voting has taken place by the traditional ballot and proxy system.

This year, with COVID-19, and the resulting limits on public gathering, as well as resulting government regulatory changes allowing electronic voting/and meetings, the options available to the UNA for holding the SGM have changes.

In order to help Board in their deliberations in regard to voting options during COVID-19 staff engaged UNA legal counsel to review the various options available to the organization, and this information is contained below.

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Sundance,

This email provides a summary of our advice on the options available to the UNA in relation to attendance and voting at a general meeting planned for September 30, 2020 during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Nature of the Meeting

We understand that this general meeting is being scheduled for the purposes of bringing forward a special resolution to make substantial changes to the UNA's constitution and bylaws.

As you know, under section 15 and 17 of the Societies Act,.S.B.C. 2015 c. 18 a special resolution is required to enact changes to the society's constitution and bylaws, and must pass by a majority of not less than 2/3 of the votes cast. Under the legislation, voting may be in person or by proxy. The Societies Act also requires at least 14 days' notice of the meeting be provided to the members. The UNA's bylaws in fact require 21 days' notice of any such meeting.

COVID-19 and Attendance at Corporate Meetings

Pursuant to an order of the Provincial Health Officer, mass gatherings of 50 or more people are currently prohibited in British Columbia. That Order does not have an expiration date.

In recognition of the fact that the prohibition on gatherings would interrupt the ability of corporate entities to conduct business at a meeting, the Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General issued Ministerial Order M116, Electronic Attendance at Corporate Meetings (COVID-19) Order (the "Order") on April 21, 2020.

As its title suggests, the effect of the Order is to permit corporate entities to conduct and members/shareholders to participate in meetings by telephone or other communication medium. Section 3(1) of the Order provides as follows:

> *Despite anything in a corporate enactment, a person who is entitled to participate in, including vote at, a corporate meeting may do so by telephone or other communications medium if all of the persons participating in the meeting, whether by telephone, by other communications medium or in person, are able to communicate with each other and, if applicable, vote at the meeting.*

Under the Order, organizations may arrange to hold their meetings through any method of communication, provided that that the attendees at the meeting are able to communicate with each other. The words in section 3(1) "including vote at" and "may do so by telephone or other communications medium" clearly convey that the Order encompasses both attendance and voting by electronic means. Indeed, section 3 of the Order is virtually identical to section 83 of the Societies Act but for the addition of the specific reference to voting. This indicates a clear intention to permit voting by electronic means.

Under the Order, an organization must provide, with the notice of meeting, instructions for attending at and participation at the meeting, including voting. The organization is also responsible to facilitate the use of the chosen communications method at the meeting.

In Person or Electronic Meetings

The Order does not require organizations to hold their meetings by electronic means (see s.3(2)). However, its effect is to deem a person who attends electronically to have attended in person.

Section 3(4) makes clear that the meeting can, but need not, have a physical location. This means that the meeting can be held entirely through electronic means, or a hybrid meeting can be held to facilitate both those who wish to attend in person and can do so in compliance with the restriction on public gatherings.

Duration of the Order

Originally, the Order was to remain in effect only until the COVID-19 related state of emergency in British Columbia ended. However, on June 22, 2020 the Province introduced Bill 19 – the COVID 19 Related Measures Act, which, when passed, will have the effect of extending the Order for an additional 90 days. This Bill is currently in second reading. If Bill 19 is passed, this would extend the effect of the Order until at least October 5, 2020. Otherwise, the Order will expire July 7, 2020, unless the state of emergency is further extended.

Accordingly, if the UNA intends to rely on the Order in holding its meeting, it may wish to plan for the September 30, 2020 date. If the state of emergency is extended next week for a further 14 days, then it may be possible to delay the meeting until a date in October and still rely on the Order.

Options for Voting

You have specifically requested that we set out the processes available to the UNA for voting at its special general meeting.

Voting at the UNA's general meetings is addressed in sections 4.14 and 4.22 of the Bylaws. Bylaw 4.14 provides that voting will be ballot, but may also take place by "show of hands" or by proxy. It states:

> *4.14 Voting shall be by ballot provided that at any meeting of the Association the members may agree to vote by a show of hands on any issue including a special resolution. Every ballot cast upon a poll and every proxy appointing a proxyholder who casts a ballot upon a poll shall be retained by the Secretary for a period of three months after the meeting and shall be subject to inspection at the office of the Association during normal business hours.*

Bylaw 4.22 provides:

> *4.22 At any meeting of the Association the members
> may vote on any issue that arises by a show of hands,
> including a special resolution.*

Below we set out three possible ways to facilitate or permit voting at the special general meeting.

Option 1 – Electronic Ballot

The Bylaws anticipate that voting will ordinarily be by ballot. While the Bylaws do not specifically contemplate voting by electronic means, the Order is apparently intended to, and has the effect of, validating a voting process by use of electronic means. In our view, this includes by electronic ballot.

However, since the special general meeting is being held specifically to make important amendments to the UNA's constitution and bylaws, it will be important to ensure that any method of electronic voting utilized is one that is credible and will have the confidence of the members, and that the results are verifiable in the event any challenge is raised. It should include a process that provides for the verification of the identity of the voter.

If an appropriate electronic tool can be found, voting by electronic ballot may be the most convenient option for the UNA. However, even if electronic ballots are utilized, proxy voting must still be permitted as per section 4.15 of the Bylaws. In that case, designated proxies could also vote electronically.

Option 2 - Proxy

The UNA could also conduct the voting at the special meeting by ballot, but by means of encouraging all members to participate in proxy voting. This would require that all members be provided with a form of proxy and encouraged to complete it on or before the date of the Meeting.

Under section 4.15 of the Bylaws, any member may vote at a meeting by proxy. Please note, however, that there is no language in the Bylaws that permits the Board to require that any member vote by proxy. Moreover, an argument could be made that such a requirement disenfranchises a member who does not wish to choose between providing an unrestricted proxy or disclosing to their proxyholder how they wish their vote to be cast.

Please also note that:

- *The Bylaws provide that only a Director can hold more than 5 proxies. For that reason, it may be preferable to suggest that members appoint the Chair or another Director as their proxy, provided that the proxyholder is a member.*

- *If the UNA encouraged members to designate a small number of proxyholders (such as the directors), then voting by proxyholder could take place in person or electronically and still permit those in attendance to social distance and comply with the prohibition on group events.*

- *Bylaw 4.18 sets out the form of proxy that is be used, but the Directors have authority to amend the form of proxy.*

- *As one of your directors has already suggested, it may be preferable for the Directors to adopt a modified form of proxy in which the member includes a limitation indicating how their vote is to be cast.*

The advantages of voting by proxy are that:

- *The process provides documented evidence about how the votes were cast, which would be useful if there were any challenge raised about the results.*

- *If the Board is having any doubt about the available tools for electronic voting or the validity of voting by ballot via electronic tools, then proxy voting would permit the Board to hold an in-person meeting at which a small number of proxyholders could attend and cast the ballots.*

However, there are potential drawbacks to holding the vote entirely by proxy including:

- *As noted, the Bylaws do not expressly authorize the Board to require that voting proceed by proxy. Therefore, objections may be raised and some members may still wish to attend the meeting and vote.*

- *The Bylaws (at 4.21) permit the solicitation of proxies up to an including the date of the meeting, which may create administrative issues.*

- *Further since proxies can be provided in advance to the proxy-holder (ie., at any time after the notice of meeting is issued), this method may make any debate or discussion at the meeting itself less relevant to the outcome (although that is a problem with any form of proxy voting that directs the manner in which a ballot is to be cast).*

Option 3 – Show of Hands

While the Bylaws also contemplate voting by "show of hands", we do not recommend the use of this voting method if the meeting is to be held by electronic means.

First, voting by show of hands on a conference or video conference call is cumbersome to administer and prone to errors. Those issues will multiply with the number of participants at the meeting.

Further, there is a potential inconsistency in the Bylaws as to when members may vote by "show of hands" (specifically, while section 4.14 permits voting by "show of hands" only where the members "agree" to do so, section 4.22 permits voting by show of hands whether or not there is agreement by the members). The Bylaws also don't clearly indicate how members are to "agree" to vote by show of hands. This potential uncertainty weighs against voting by this means.

Additional Options – Hybrid Models

In relation to the choice between in-person and electronic attendance, given the size of the UNA's membership and the restriction on group gatherings, the UNA will need to hold its meeting, in whole or in part, by utilizing an electronic means of attendance. The decision about whether it should also host an in-person meeting should involve consideration of factors. including whether there is any practical or administrative advantage for doing so, any public relations implications of holding an in person meeting during the pandemic, and the potential for objections if any members who wished to attend in person were turned away due to group gathering restrictions or otherwise.

Recommendations:

While it is for the Board of Directors to decide how to facilitate voting at the special general meeting, we do recommend that you investigate voting by electronic ballot as an option. If the Board has a strong preference for voting by proxy, this could be expressly encouraged in the meeting notice materials. However, your plans should also make allowances for individuals who do not wish to vote by proxy. If the Board wishes to hold an in person meeting without electronic voting (e.g. in the hopes that most members will elect to vote by proxy), then its plans should also take into consideration the public health guidance and requirements concerning public gatherings and social distancing.

If we can be of any assistance in commenting on options for electronic voting, please let us know.

In regard to options for electronic voting, staff have researched a number of possibilities, with the best option being [Simply Voting](#). Simply Voting is a Canadian based electronic voting platform with customizable and proven voting methods.

Staff have reviewed the platform, and it looks like it meets the organizational needs – including allowing for secure, easily accessible, branded online voting along with translation of key voting guidelines. The system integrates with offline (paper voting), and has been used by organizations as diverse as the Canadian Bar Association to the Town of Deep River. A copy of the Simply Voting proposal is attached to this report as Appendix B.

Online voting through Simply Voting requires an active e-mail address, and as part of the scheduled update of the UNA membership list, staff will be confirming up-to-date email addresses. In order to ensure that no voters are disenfranchised, it would make most sense to combine any electronic online voting with a hard copy proxy, and have a number of Directors designated to receive the proxies. By combining electronic voting with hard copy proxy voting, members will have choices as to how to participate, and can still participate even without an email address.

For any Townhall or electronic meetings scheduled in relation to the SGM, the UNA will be able to host them on our existing infrastructure.

In terms of next steps. Once the Board has provided staff with the required direction, staff will proceed with creating the materials for Board approval. Any Annual General Meeting (AGM) planning will take place parallel to the SGM Planning, with confirming the actual AGM date delayed until confirmation of the SGM results:

Financial Implications

There is currently $30,000 budgeted for a concurrent AGM and election, and $30,000 budgeted for an SGM. Historically, this $30,000 has been sufficient to support the concurrent AGM and elections. There have been no SGMs in past years and we anticipate that the expenses will mirror that of the AGMs. Typical costs incurred include print and mail, minute taking, translation, and parliamentarian services, and other hospitality expenses.

If the elections are held separately from the meetings, we may anticipate an increase in expenditure related to the printing and mailing of materials to residents due to discounts typically applied to bulk purchases within single orders. Another consideration would be additional hospitality expenses and loss of potential bookings revenue as a result of utilizing the space.

However, if accommodations are needed due to COVID-19, there are several financial considerations that can be explored based on Board decisions:

- Virtual meetings

- Electronic balloting
- Additional sanitation expenses for in-person social distancing measures

A full review of budget allocation and cost scope of the meetings will be conducted following Board decision on meeting (in-person versus virtual) and voting (paper ballot versus electronic) format.

Operational Implications

Running a successful SGM and AGM will require involvement from all levels of the organization, but especially Administration and Communications.

Strategic Objective

Moving forward the Special General Meeting ties in directly with the UNA Strategic Priority of UNA Governance – specifically the goal to review the constitution and bylaws.

Attachments

1. Appendix A - March 17, 2020 SGM Planning Memo
2. Appendix B - Simply Voting - Online voting overview

Concurrence

Although staff input was utilized in the writing of this report, the late finalization of the report and required last-minute changes precluded me from having it reviewed for final concurrence.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Sundance Topham
Chief Administrative Officer

Date: **March 17th, 2020**

From: Andrew Clements: Interim Co-Executive Director and Recreation Manager

Re: SGM Planning

Background:

Management staff met with UNA BOD Chair Richard Watson and UNA BOD member Bill Holmes on Thursday March 5th, to discuss the critical path of delivering a Special General Meeting in 2020.

Decision Requested

That the Board approve the proposed timeline and SGM date of September 30th, 2020.

Discussion

Staff believes it will be helpful for the UNA BOD to understand the step by step process of delivering an SGM, our significant and immediate work plan objectives, as well as highlighting the corresponding approvals that are required to proceed with an SGM. The document below attempts to highlight this.

Step by step process

1) UNA BOD Approves By-Laws Package is ready to begin communication plan – assumes all approvals are in place from UNA and UBC (June16th).
2) UNA BOD green lights the development of the communication package to residents. Staff will need 4 weeks to develop this package for submission to the UNA BOD for approval. This will assume that the UNA BOD will give staff clear guidelines of the following: the voting mechanism to be used, highlights of important changes including UBC appointed directors becoming observers and director's length of term, also the designation of buildings. (June 16th).
3) UNA BOD approval of final communication package, initiating the roll out of the communication plan to residents (July 21st).
4) Staff to update the UNA Membership List (July 25-28th).
5) Roll out of communication package which includes website update, FAQ's section, voting cards, agenda, proxy forms and ballot, items will be sent to the printer for envelope stuffing and mailing. Staff will need 4 weeks to accomplish this. (July 28th-August 24th).
6) Communication Package sent to printers for production and mailing to residents. August 24th-September 2nd).
7) Communication package to be received by residents at least 28 days prior to the SGM (September 9th).

8) Optional Town Hall: staff suggest that the UNA BOD host an event where residents will have the opportunity to ask BOD members questions about the by-law changes (September 23rd).
9) Staff and execute the SGM (September 30th).

Critical Path

SGM: September 30th, 2020	
Work to be done by UNA BOD	**Work to be done by STAFF**
1. **March 2020**: Package of by-law sets – Ready for approval. UNA Board to complete outstanding negotiations with AMS, finalize insurance and decide on procedures for the SGM (voting process, presentation of recommendations, etc.)	• Staff as needed to assist in the finalizing of outstanding negotiations etc.
2. **March / April 2020**: UNA BOD approval. Bylaw Working Group submits recommendations to the UNA Board for approval.	• Pending Approval from the UNA BOD, staff may begin to design the basic template for the communication package to residents. Staff asks the UNA BOD to be considerate of the fact that staff capacity is a concern with major work plan projects being delivered in **May** (PerfectMind and new website launch). Furthermore, any revisions put forth by the Liaison Committee and/or UBC BOG will reduce efficiency.
3. **April/May 2020**: Liaison Committee approval. Outstanding AMS issue is a concern. If Liaison Committee rejects the by-laws, then we will have to begin plan B. TBD by the UNA BOD.	• **April 1st** PerfectMind Staff Training. • **May 13th**: Launch of PerfectMind and new UNA Website. • **May 13th - June 1st** troubleshooting. • Summer Vacations will interrupt work as different members of staff will be vacationing from end of June until the beginning of August.
4. **June 1st** UNA BOD to submit to UBC Committee meetings to make recommendations to the UBC BOG.	• **June 16th** – UNA staff to start preparing SGM communication package.
5. **June 16th Approval** of By-laws at UBC BOG meeting. UNA BOD **Approves** the production/completion of an SGM Communication Package.	• **July 14th** – Staff to submit to the UNA BOD Communication Package for approval. • **July 15th – July 28th** – two weeks buffer period for any revisions etc. Staff to update UNA membership list
6. **July 21st** UNA BOD **Approval** of SGM Communication Package.	• **July 28th** – Communication package roll out begins. 4 weeks needed. • **August 24th** Communication package sent to printer for production and mail out. • **September 2** – All materials to Canada Post.

September 23 – Optional Community Forum with UNA Board and residents for a Q&A session around bylaw amendments. **September 30th** SGM	• **September 9th** Residents to receive communication package.

Revised Proposal For

<u>University Neighbourhoods Association</u>

Attention: Glenda Ollero

June 29, 2020

Victor Chemtob
Onboarding Manager
Simply Voting Inc.
vchemtob@simplyvoting.com
1 (800) 585-9694 ext. 803

Introduction

I am pleased to present the following proposal for the Simply Voting service.

Simply Voting would provide the **University Neighbourhoods Association** with a secure, cost effective, and environmentally friendly solution for voting events. We've already helped many organizations and institutions successfully conduct certified elections, by-law ratifications, and other voting events online. By running elections on our platform, your voters will feel confident that their votes are processed by a neutral 3rd party and in a transparent manner. You can also count on our support team as a virtual part of its elections staff; we are always on the spot and at your side.

Feel free to ask me any questions that you may have regarding this proposal. Thank you for considering Simply Voting for your business. I look forward to serving you in the near future.

Simply Voting Qualifications and Experience

Simply Voting Inc. is headquartered in Montreal, Canada. We currently have seventeen employees and service more than 2500 customers in 58 countries.

We are a full-service provider of the most secure and cost-effective, hosted online elections. Our voting system was launched in 2003 and our first customer was the Student's Society of McGill University. They continue to be one of our many happy, repeat customers. Many organizations such as municipalities, universities, unions and many not-for-profits rely on Simply Voting for safely executing their elections.

We are an agile company and our voting system is constantly evolving with technology and security innovations. Many reputable third parties have audited our product, technical infrastructure, and corporate infrastructure. These audits confirm that Simply Voting possesses the integrity and security which we promise.

Our Mission: To achieve excellence providing secure and efficient voting solutions and to create value for the organizations we serve.

Our People: Dedicated staff who understands that transparency and perfection are a must in this industry.

Our Strengths: Timely customer service, simplicity of design, high security, and the ability to deliver custom solutions quickly.

How It Works

Simply Voting offers a Fully Managed Election experience. With a Fully Managed Election, our staff performs the setup and administration described further below. If you opt to manage your own elections self-service, your staff performs the setup and administration, with technical support from Simply Voting staff as necessary.

Part 1: Election Set-Up

Using our easy-to-use Election Manager, you create an election specifying the dates and times. Voting terms can be anywhere from minutes to months long. You then define the election: you specify descriptions and questions, upload candidate photos if necessary, and upload a list of eligible voters with voting credentials

Voter credentials can be in-part generated by Simply Voting's system, such as unique passwords, or you can specify and upload voter credentials based on existing "Member IDs" you already may have in place.

With the email addresses of your eligible voters, an election organizer can send out a mass email using our Email Blast feature containing a link to the ballot as well as unique, secure authentication credentials to each eligible voter. This email can also contain a Direct Vote link with unique authentication credentials encrypted into it, thus all the voter has to do is click on the link and they will be automatically authenticated and eligible to vote in any ongoing elections.

Part 2: Internet Voting

Voters arrive at your branded voting website and are authenticated. If the voter hasn't yet voted, a tamper-proof electronic ballot will appear. The voter fills out the ballot, and a confirmation form is displayed for review prior to final submission. When the voter submits a ballot, the results are encrypted and kept anonymous. The voter is issued a receipt and is then blocked from voting for this election again.

As voting proceeds, you can send out reminder emails and view reports on mid-election turnout.

Part 3: Results

Once voting has ended; results are available immediately. You can download and view the results in the Election Manager along with various reports on voting activity before choosing to publish the results or not (by default, results are not published). Once published, the results are made available to the public on your voting website and anyone will be able to verify the results by downloading a file containing votes and receipt numbers.

Voter Authentication

This proposal is geared towards our Standard Simply Voting authentication, using our Email Blast Feature and generated or provided voting credentials.

Our Technical Team is happy to coordinate with your IT Staff to see if any remote authentications are possible, such as integrating into any existing databases or members' only portals that you may have.

Advantages & Features

Top-Notch Security

Simply Voting was designed from the ground-up to eliminate the risk of electoral fraud or breach of secrecy:

- Voters who bypass authentication or have already voted are denied access to the ballot.

- One-vote-per-voter is guaranteed by marking electors as voted and storing the vote in a single transaction. Even if a voter submits the ballot simultaneously on several devices, this technology guarantees that only one vote is accepted.

- Ballots are rigorously checked for validity before being accepted.

- All administrator and voter activity is logged with timestamp and IP address.

- Communication between the voter's computer and our website is encrypted with *TLS 1.2* and strong cipher suites to protect against current and future encryption attacks.

- The entire voting system database is encrypted at rest using AES-256 encryption.

- Our servers are "hardened" and are subjected to daily *Trust Guard* PCI Compliance security scans.

- Our voting system is regularly subjected to penetration tests by *Spirent SecurityLabs* and source code security audits by *HP Fortify*.

- Simply Voting adheres to guidelines established by the *Open Web Application Security Project*.

- Any change to the voting system must pass an internal security review before going live.

- All staff workstations are kept up-to-date and protected by access password, firewall, anti-virus, anti-spamware and disk encryption.

- We authenticate our emails with *DMARC* (Domain-based Message Authentication, Reporting & Conformance) to protect voters from phishing attacks.

- Our servers are protected by a very powerful firewall, *FortiGate Unified Threat Management*, which includes an *Intrusion Detection System* and a redundant firewall on hot standby.

- Simply Voting uses *CloudFlare* to protect against Denial of Service (DoS) attacks. *CloudFlare* has the most sophisticated mitigation technology on the market and has successfully blocked the largest DoS attacks seen on the internet.

- We use redundant *Anycast DNS* deployments which protects against DNS-based DDoS attacks.

Fully Hosted & Reliable

Don't worry yourself about servers, IT staff, installing software or taking backups. Simply Voting gives you instant access to the latest technology and is ready to process millions of votes around the clock.

Simply Voting is built on an enterprise-class cloud computing service powered by high performance IBM hardware, with full redundancy across the entire infrastructure (no single points of failure). Our data centre is in a stable mountain zone, away from earthquake, hurricane, tornado, and severe weather zones. The data center contains advanced power, cooling and security infrastructure, and Cisco Data Center 3.0 network architecture. It is staffed 24x7, backed-up by an offsite network operations center. We also use several Anycast DNS clusters to ensure fault tolerance at the DNS level.

Simply Voting uses third party offsite monitoring tools to automatically monitor key "vital signs" of our voting system 24x7 and a technical staff member is immediately notified of any anomaly. Simply Voting maintains a Disaster Recovery Plan as well as a Hot Site at a backup data center in a different geographical area. The Hot Site is synchronized with the primary data center using remote database replication. Should the primary data center experience an outage, we have the capability of quickly redirecting traffic of the entire voting system to the Hot Site, minimizing disruption to ongoing elections and avoiding any loss of data. You can rest assured that your election is always protected and available in the case of a disaster.

100% Availability Guarantee

Simply Voting endeavors to provide the most reliable infrastructure possible for our online voting system. We guarantee that all functionality is available 100% of the time in a given month, excluding special planned maintenance. We will credit your account 5% of your election fee for each 30 minutes of unavailability (up to 100%).

Certified Results

Trust is an important advantage of having the experts power your election. With the security of an independently managed server and service, your voters can rest assured that their votes will be counted properly. We display a *certified by Simply Voting* seal on your published results. On request, we also provide a Letters of Certification attesting to the validity of your results.

Skyhigh Enterprise-Ready Rating

Simply Voting received the highest CloudTrust Rating from Skyhigh Networks. Skyhigh performs objective and thorough evaluations of cloud services based on a detailed set of criteria developed in conjunction with the Cloud Security Alliance (CSA). Services designated as Skyhigh Enterprise-Ready fully satisfy the most stringent requirements for data protection, identity verification, service security, business practices, and legal protection.

Confidentiality

Simply Voting takes secrecy of the vote very seriously. It is impossible for election organizers to determine what a particular voter has voted as the results are anonymous. All voter information is removed from our servers if you choose to have the election deleted. We never make use of voter information for anything other than voting and never share such information with third parties. Our privacy policy (available on the Simply Voting website) and voting system have been independently certified by TRUSTe for compliance with their Privacy Certification and Trusted Cloud requirements.

SOC 2 Certification

Simply Voting is SOC 2 Type I certified. The SOC 2 is a widely recognized auditing standard issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). An auditor's report details a service provider's ability to offer adequate controls and safeguards when they host or process data belonging to their customers. The audit focuses heavily in the areas of security, availability and confidentiality. It addresses important topics such as backup and recovery, computer operations, and human resources. The data centers where Simply Voting servers are located are similarly SOC 2 Type II certified. These certifications are an independent validation of the quality, integrity and reliability of Simply Voting's infrastructure and services

Simply Voting is "Green"

Simply Voting is the most eco-friendly online voting system in the world. We've lowered our carbon footprint to a small fraction of a typical website by hosting virtualized servers in an efficient data center powered by Hydroelectricity. Furthermore, we choose clean, pollution-free energy with Bullfrog Power. Bullfrog's generators put green electricity onto the grid to match the amount of electricity we use in our offices.

Simply Voting is Insured

Simply Voting is insured with the Berkley Insurance Company. Simply Voting maintains a $5,000,000 General Business insurance policy as well as a Cyber Liability insurance policy which covers Errors & Omissions for $5,000,000 and Privacy Breach for $2,000,000. This helps protect your organization and your voters.

Flexible Ballot Questions

Simply Voting supports many types of questions to meet your needs. Here's what you can do:

- Specify ballot or question introductory text
- Attach photos & descriptions to each candidate
- Allow for a single winner or multiple winners
- Allow voting for write-in candidates
- Control the minimum and maximum number of candidates that voters are allowed to select
- Control whether voters are allowed to abstain from voting
- Run preferential questions with the Single Transferable Vote (STV) / Hare-Clark / Alternative Voting / Instant Runoff Voting counting method
- Run preferential questions with the Condorcet Ranked Pairs counting method
- Run cumulative voting questions
- Add comment boxes to collect feedback from voters

Mobile Optimized Voting

Thanks to a responsive web design that adjusts according to the type of device being used, the voting website delivers an optimal viewing and interaction experience on a desktop computer, tablet, and smartphone. Voters using a mobile device will not have to zoom, pan or scroll sideways because all the elements on the voting website are properly sized and placed.

Social Media Sharing

Once the voter casts their ballot, integrated Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn and buttons appear, encouraging voters to promote the fact that they voted across those social networks. Voters can post a default message or a personalize it. Social media sharing increases awareness of your election, and encourages more eligible voters to participate thanks to positive social pressure.

Voter-Verified Audit Trail

Once the electronic ballot has been cast a printable receipt is provided to assure voters that their votes have been recorded as intended. Should you opt to publish the final results, anyone will be able to download a file containing votes and receipt codes. This serves as a Voter-Verified Audit Trail (VVAT) - an independent verification system for voting systems designed to

allow voters to verify that their vote was cast correctly, to detect possible election fraud or malfunction, and to provide a means to audit the stored electronic results.

Accessible Ballots

Simply Voting is committed to supporting electors with disabilities and making sure the ballot works with assistive technologies. The interface of our voting websites is regularly audited against Section 508 and WCAG-2 accessibility requirements by the Bureau of Internet Accessibility, which provides a comprehensive compliance and remediation report. This ensures voting websites are compatible with screen-reading technology such as JAWS.

Cross-Browser Compatible

Thanks to Simply Voting's minimalist design and compliance with W3C web standards, our system is compatible with all modern browsers and web-enabled cellphones so that voters can vote on the go. We test across various browser/OS/device combinations using BrowserStack.

Branded Voting Website

Simply Voting provides you with an exclusive website for your elections with a URL like https://*una*.simplyvoting.com/. The voting website is branded with your logo & colours, is easy to use, works with all modern browsers, and looks professional. You also have the option of publishing voting results with the click of a button.

Other features include...

- Multiple Overlapping Elections
- "In Person" Kiosk Voting Support
- Email Confirmation& Voting Changing
- Multilingual Voting Website

- Telephone Voting Support
- Paper Voting Support
- Weighted Voting Support
- "Paper" Audit Trail

Premium Services & Features

Simply Voting also offers a range of Premium Services such as fully-managed elections, managed mailings, customizations to the voting technology, and Premium Features like voter segmentation or weighted voting.

❖ **Standard Weighted Voting**

With weighted voting, election organizers can assign each voter a vote weight that will be applied once their ballot is cast, equally to all selected options. The final results will take into account vote weight, and note how much vote weight was cast in total as well.

This Premium Feature carries with it a onetime activation fee. See the *Pricing* section for more details.

❖ Fully Managed Election

If you desire to be more hands off from the election setup and management process, Simply Voting offers a fully managed election premium service. You can expect the following with a fully managed election:

Your staff will...
- Fill out "Fully Managed Checklist," if provided to you by Simply Voting.
- Provide ballot content (such as what is being voted upon, candidate materials such as statements or photos, explanatory ballot descriptions, email blast wording, etc.) in an editable format, once you have internally finalized the content.
- Provide the elector list in a spreadsheet format, based on the guidance provided to you by Simply Voting in regards to what information is required for your event.
- Continue to have access to the Election Manager tool unless otherwise requested.
- Remain the point of contact for any voter inquiries that come in, though case by case inquiries can be escalated to Simply Voting.

Simply Voting staff will fully...
- Manage the setup of the election event to your previously defined specifications.
- Coordinate with your election organizers to provide previews and samples.
- Coordinate additionally purchased premium services.
- Manage the distribution of email blasts.
- Report on mid-election turnout and report on post-election results.
- Monitor the election as it proceeds to ensure that everything is working as intended.

The Fully Managed Election fee is based Simply Voting's understanding of your requirements and your timeline. Should your requirements change or your timeline be compressed, prices may be adjusted accordingly.

Technical Support

All our customers are backed up by a team of experts committed to helping you run successful elections! If you have a question or experience a problem, we are standing by to give you quick and effective assistance. In case of emergency, we have a support representative on call at all hours. We want our customers to be more than satisfied with their investment, so our support team is always on the spot and at your side.

Company and Server Location

Simply Voting Inc. is a specialized provider of secure, hosted online elections. Our headquarters are located in Montreal, Quebec in Canada, while our primary servers are located in Kelowna, British Columbia and our back-up servers are located in Mississauga, Ontario.

References

Simply Voting has already proven itself with over 2000 customers, including the following organizations and institutions:

- National Breast Cancer Coalition (USA)
- National Contract Management Association (NCMA)
- National Court Reporters Association (NCRA)
- American Society of Trace Evidence Examiners (ASTEE)
- American Dental Assistants Association (ADAA)
- Association of American Geographers (AAG)Canadian Football League Players' Association (CFLPA)
- Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology (CSEP)
- Canadian AIDS Treatment Information Exchange (CATIE)
- Green Party of Canada
- University of Minnesota
- Montgomery College
- Colorado State University-Pueblo
- California State University San Marcos (CSUSM)

- Royal Canadian College for Organists
- Canadian Bar Association
- Canadian Association of Medical Radiation Technologists
- Canadian Society of Zoologists

- Canadian Credit Union Association
- Canadian Dermatology Association
- Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology
- Canadian Treatment Action Council
- Canadian Mental Health Association
- Canada's Accredited Zoos and Aquariums
- Colleges and Institutes Canada
- Canadian Paediatric Endocrine Group
- Canadian Council of the Blind
- Canadian Merchant Service Guild
- Canadian Apprenticeship Forum
- Canadian Society of Customs Brokers
- Canadian Mental Health Association
- Canadian Tire Dealers' Association
- Canadian Coalition for Firearm Rights
- Canadian Housing and Renewal Association
- Canadian Retina Society
- Canadian Society of Landscape Architects
- Canadian Media Producers Association
- Canadian Federal Pilots Association British Columbia Nurses Association
- Manitoba Nurses Union
- Ontario Nurses Association
- Ontario Chiropractic Association

Pricing

Simply Voting's election fees are based on the number of eligible voters. This quote is an example based on the assumption that you would run an election or elections with 5,700 electors. If there are more electors, the cost will fluctuate accordingly.

The discount indicated below is offered based on the Association's historically low turnout rates (reported as less than 10% turnout). Should turnout be higher than expected, Simply Voting reserves the right to re-evaluate pricing for subsequent years. Discount applies to System Fees only.

System Fees	Cost	More / Less Electors
System fees: Single Election	$1,387.00 - 15% ($208.05) **$1,178.95**	~$0.11 / elector
OR		
System fees: 1-Year Plan	$2,316.29 / year - 15% ($347.44) **$1,968.85**	~$0.18 / elector

Additional Items – *optional*	Cost
Fully Managed Election	$650.00 / election
Weighted Voting	$150.00 onetime

Notes
❖ Pricing is in CAD; applicable taxes are extra.
❖ Additional items are billed on top of system fees, as applicable.
❖ Items marked "onetime" carry a onetime activation fee. Once activated, you retain access to this feature indefinitely and there are no additional fees associated with this feature.
❖ If opting for our Fully Managed option, Simply Voting requires a minimum of 5-7 business days with all materials prior to the start of voting.

If you foresee the running two or more elections, the 1 Year Plan is the optimal Plan for getting your money's worth as it covers all elections (up to 10 a year) at or under the purchased election size for 1 year (*in this example, 5,700 or less electors*). You can always upgrade your plan for more electors if you ever need to as well.

Getting in Touch

See cover page.