**Appendix**

**2016 GPP Feedback Survey**

# Survey Overview

A survey was sent to all DPCA Leaders and Voting Center Managers. All questions about the GPP allowed free format inputs.

# Responses

There were 46 responses to the survey. Responses were received from the following countries:

|  |
| --- |
| Australia |
| Austria |
| Belgium |
| Canada |
| Costa Rica |
| Czech Republic |
| Denmark |
| France |
| Germany |
| Guatemala |
| Hong Kong |
| Hungary |
| Ireland |
| Italy |
| Japan |
| Mexico |
| New Zealand |
| Philippines |
| Portugal |
| Singapore |
| Spain |
| Sweden |
| Switzerland |
| Thailand |
| United Arab Emirates |
| United Kingdom |

The following sections outline the questions asked and all the responses (as written).

# Communications

## What went well with Communication?

|  |
| --- |
| * Sending press release to local news paper (Augsburger Allgemeine), find out the editor responsible for local affairs, talk to him twice and remind him to please post the news. Besides printing a notice on the upcoming event they also passed it on to the local radio station and the event was announced over the radio. |
| * There was quite a bit of communication which was good, but some of the essential things (i.e. getting our members' numbers to put on voting center ballots was either lost in the shuffle or received late). |
| * Paid ads on Facebook brought in many new members for Thailand |
| * good GPP remote vote and in person guide, although a bit lengthy |
| * Social media communication was excellent. We did postal mail, email and telephone comm, as well as posters/flyers in town, and this produced a high turnout - and we doubled our membership! Getting students to join DA and vote increased our numbers. Also new and excellent were the articles about DA in the US (NPR, ABC, Washington Post...); Clinton's address to us, etc. Essential was Bob Vallier's good organisation. |
| * Plenty of Information |
| * GPP team followed up very quickly with all queries |
| * GPP Team prepared extensive guidance on the GPP process. GPP web sessions close to the voting week gave VCMs the opportunity to ask any final questions. |
| * The national procedural communication was good. Information was clear and provided early.  There was local press interest - phone and in-person interviews were conducted. A reporter visited the voting center and interviewed staff and voters. Several local newspaper articles were published. |
| * There was plenty of it, and lots of means to ask questions. |
| * Conference call answered relevant questions in personal manner |
| * some access to local media, a volunteer came forward to handle press |
| * Inge and Alan were fantastic about streamlining the technical issues to simplify the problem cases, and it was incredibly useful speaking to Stan to gain a more holistic understanding of Nation Builder and how to best utilize it |
| * We placed announcements on our FaceBook page and many of us informed our various contacts by personal email. We experienced many new members, mostly young ones. We also posted posters at places where expats gather (condos, markets, etc.) to inform the largest possible audience. We also sent emails to all members more than once. |
| * we had a group call before the primaries in addition to a lot of emails. so all in all the communication was good. plus Jenise Treuting was available to answer any questions. |
| * The documents were quite long, but very thorough - very detailed and good. |
| * Press and posters |
| * We did phone banking which truly went very well |
| * 1. Targeted advertising of our voting center events on FB, 2. Creating paid posts and encouraging people to share (to help them get a lot of organic traction) and then keeping up with the posts and answering questions from potential voters, 3. Messaging current members via FB 4. Asking all event responders to invite their friends, 5. Creating relationships with press via twitter and elsewhere, 6. Sending out a variety of press releases to make sure at least a few "took". 7. Setting up the Global Town Hall ahead of the GPP to start the buzz cycle. 8. 1 to 1 communication. |
| * Facebook outreach and email outreach went well |
| * There was a lot of it, and it was comprehensive. The GPP team got us all the info needed, broke it into digestible bits. |
| * We were able to use the DA website successfully to communicate with our members and DA Global sent out just the right amount of notices, instructions, and forms to assist us in our voting processes. |
| * Social Media announcements and communications |
| * Lots of great advice, with the Town Hall Q&A's being extremely valuable |
| * Communications were good |
| * I appreciated the webinar Q&A to understand the thinking of DA with how to handle certain issues. It helped that I skimmed the voting center manual first. |
| * Having the FAQs and the video about GPP were very helpful. The global media coverage of the GPP was excellent. |
| * Very effective use in all communications of the GPP r/w/b block-letter logo, customized for Switz and its 2 voting centers; an attention-grabber that was immediately identifiable in print, email, social media.. Regular emails to members. Catchy design of emails. Pretty good exploitation of social media. Paper mail to members with no/bad email. |
| * Final instructions clear and complete |
| * Once I got into the loop, I felt that there was a lot of communication and it was very well coordinated and thorough. |
| * Very clear where and when voting would take place. The communication around the email voting issues was also timely and helpful |
| * The polling place had a constant flow of voters, along with outside local press. |
| * press |
| * All my questions were quickly answered. |
| * The Press Releases from DA were very helpful |
| * I thought that DPCA did an excellent job communicating how the primary would be run. |
| * The immense success of the GPP participation shows communication to the voters went well. |
| * no comment |
| * I especially appreciated attendance by the GPP team (primarily Will) at our monthly regional calls leading up to the primary. Having that one-on-one communication was invaluable. |
| * No problems with communication |
| * The special webex calls about the GPP and running a VC were very useful. The FAQs on the website were also handy.  What did not go well with Communication?  |  | | --- | | * I had wanted to hang little posters in supermarkets. Could not be done due to lack of time and resources. Augsburg had hardly a support network to mention before the event. | | * The sheer volume of communication sometimes made it difficult to sift through (or just required a lot of patience!). | | * nothing of which I am aware | | * too many emails to too many people not directly concerned | | * New website, although a fantastic improvement, created some confusions on our membership list, but this should not be a problem for next time. | | * Had to figure a lot of stuff out | | * Too much written stuff. Confusing. | | * The VCM guide was published too late. It should have been released prior to December 31, 2015. VCMs were unaware of voting center rules when the venues were selected. | | * We had some miss-communication about our voting center details (wrong date/location) on the DA online information but it was corrected prior to the voting. Missed some local press opportunities by not contacting early enough. | | * The manuals and information came very late in the process. | | * Communication to voters on what they should bring, ie member number, was very absent. | | * local media too interested in Trump, also, Philippines has their own Presidential elections which understandably take Philippine media attention | | * In the beginning I was unaware of how the entire process worked, and there was confusion as to what needed to be prioritized because of the lack of overall understanding. | | * Perhaps next time, it would have been good to post more posters in advance, although we were quite happy with the response we received. The map and name of our GPP voting center on 2 March (at the Old Chiang Mai Cultural Center) were a bit difficult to find by some voters. The google map was incorrect. | | * nothing that I can think of | | * Timing - the emails and guidelines should have come out much, MUCH earlier. | | * Confusion on procedures | | * Don't know | | * Emails fell flat. In the end I did not rely on them in my CC except in very broad strokes to make sure the message was out there. | | * Media outreach was not very well coordinated, which led to some confusing information | | * Too much towards the end. Understandable why, but towards the build up, there was too much to act on. For example, by the time the excellent recommendation to place localized Facebook ads went out -- which probably would've had a much greater impact than other tactics I was pursuing -- it wasn't possible for me to shift and add another item to my agenda. | | * Nothing | | * Would have liked more press coverage | | * The Guide was fabulous but a bit difficult to search. After reading it a few times I would go back to it looking for something thinking "I know it is in here somewhere" buy struggling to find it. But maybe that's just me. The Guide was great, 95% complete and indispensable. | | * The webinar was unstructured. | | * Had Bob Vallier in France not created the FAQs (which at first were France specific), we would not have had critical information to share with members/potential members in the lead up to the start of the GPP. People who submitted their ballot via email had no way of knowing their ballot was received and I received emails (particularly on the final day when the bandwidth was temporarily exceeded) if their ballots had been received. | | * Social media and organizations with Americans could have been exploited better to inform many more Americans. (At the voting center I spoke to people who heard about the GPP just that afternoon due to last-minute re-postings.) | | * Too many partial communications along the way...it was difficult to keep up with all of the emails | | * Lots of details -- so much information that it was hard to sift through sometimes. Also it felt like the communication process and planning started off later than it could have. | | * COMMUNICATION WITH LEADERS [Pam, Hamburg] Hats off to the Global team who did all the work! I had no inclination of what all was involved - and they did an excellent job. Now that they have laid the groundwork for all future GPPs, it would be a lot easier for all chapter chairs and volunteers if dissemination of information about the organizational part began 4 months earlier (August 2019). [Hilary, Berlin] Big countries need to have some kind of internal GPP organization before submitting their events, etc. to the international committee, thereby preventing oversights and errors before submission deadlines. [Beret, NRW] Communication was good, only thing I missed was an overview for Voting Center Managers and Remote Voting Assistance Centers for who they can contact how and when, if issues / urgent need for clarification occur. [Niki, HD] Germany did a great job getting helpful documents out to us ahead of time. Only problem was Shari for some reason had a false email address for me (combination of google/yahoo email) so I missed some of the emails, but Gwendolyn updated me :) Also, the calls beforehand were very helpful!  COMMUNICATION WITH MEMBERS/VOTERS [Beret, NRW] I found it disappointing that there was only one reminder email for the GPP 3 days before the end of the GPP. Many members didn’t understand that the GPP ended March 8th 24:00 CET, so that one could still vote last minute. I sent out an email the last day as another call and made a last minute call to action for our fb page. But it would make more sense for the international level or national level to do this and these last minute calls to action can be prepared in advance, so newsletters / social media doesn’t have to be written / edited on last busy days. I also found disappointing that there was only one hashtag (and a long one that didn’t work well to get attention) and no “twitterbombs” or other global social media campaigns or worldwide real-life PR stunts or photo/video campaigns to create awareness. Also there was no last minute action plan to GOTV for the primary - a plan for volunteers and members with here’s what you can do now to support the GPP (with 2 min of your time, 5 min, 15 min, 30 min, 2h, … or similar with donation). Esp. since there were so many new people signing up and delays in approval, I forwarded the last newsletter to each new member manually on my blackberry the 2 weeks before march 8th and during the gpp I sent out a newsletter almost everyday to my members to ensure everyone has the newest information - which turned out was needed. It would be better, if every approved member got a automated welcome message including local / national information, so that chapters and/or country committees can include their up to date information for new members in there (if that worked via nation builder, would be great). [Niki, HD] I agree with Beret’s comments. Think we should have a Best Practice Google Doc where people can add how the chapters individually mobilized voters in addition to what happened at the international level. I bet there were a lot of great ideas out there that can be captured for 2020.  [Ron, Kaiserslautern] There was some confusion in Germany for mail-in ballots because the worldwide address and local address were both in Germany. Few voters understood that the DPCA chair was in Germany. | | * The local press had a greater interest in the Republican candidate Donald Trump than in our Democratic candidates: Sanders and Clinton. | | * competing with local elections | | * Nothing | | * Would have liked more press! | | * Maybe we should have done more to encourage people to vote earlier. It all happened at the very end. Of course, this is par for the course - such as people writing the 1st Tuesday of November asking how to register to vote. | | * There was virtually nothing that I saw about Affirmative Action | | * Clearly some CCs did not get the messages. That falls on multiple levels (regional, international, GPP team). | | * Not applicable | | * From another viewpoint, many voters were still confused about what they were voting for and how their votes would count (many wrote on the remote ballots which district they vote in back home so we could send a vote home...?) They are now sharing their confusion with their local election officials.  What recommendations do you have for improvements in 2020 for Communication?  |  | | --- | | * Now that we have contacts to the local veterans network in Augsburg, we should be able to set up more in the future. | | * It would have been nice as well to have some deadlines or estimates as to when things would be communicated/need to be communicated. | | * n/a | | * exclamation point if something is essential reading | | * Make sure the press (NPR, ABC, Washington Post...) keeps talks about us again - before and during the GPPs. Postal mailing worked well in Marseille, might be repeated elsewhere. | | * A simple packet with the forms, various ballots, etc. etc. with simple booklet "simple booklet" to set things up. Did I mention "simple?" | | * Have one elections manual that covers voting centers and remote (and/or online) voting. Keep it simple. | | * The GPP Team should be a standing committee. Serious preparation should begin at least 1 year prior to the GPP. Relevant documents (or at least drafts of the ballot etc.) should be released two month's prior to the selection of venue. The GPP Team can use non-election years to draft model language for the Delegate Selection Plan, research and consider how to reach the pool of overseas voters, propose marketing strategies to be considered by the Comms Team, etc. This way, after the December 31st deadline passes, the GPP Team can focus on work that cannot be done until after the deadline, as well as focus on training of VCMs and handling emergencies that will inevitably occur. | | * Voting center coordinators double check all local information published in national DA messages to ensure everything is correct. A more targeted local communication plan could have been developed further in advance to take into account local news organizations publication deadlines. Need to have a plan and timeline at least 3 months prior. | | * Start work earlier and get information out as soon as possible. | | * Communicate better to voters in what they should bring to the centre. | | * I am not sure anything could have been done differently | | * For clear roles to be determined at the outset, and for everyone to have a better understanding of what needs to be done and when | | * More posters spread far and wide, perhaps an event close to the GPP events to encourage voters to come out. | | * mandatory pre-meeting explanation at least two, in addition to a buddy system (mentoring system) teaming veterans with first timers. | | * Honestly, the documents for March GPP voting centers should have been finished in early October, with the dates and times and locations having a deadline of mid-November, not the end of December. Then we could have gotten a lot more problems out of the way - inappropriate venues, wrong dates and time, incorrect info - well in advance of any "real" deadlines. That data collected in the google form should have been sent out - for corrections - to the CC Chair or GPP leadership team of every CC well in advance of any real deadlines. The "problems" I had to help fix at the last minute were things I had no idea about until the email actually popped into my mail box. Some of our chapter chairs had put the wrong email addresses in there (their OWN emails!), and some went a little wild with wanting to do 10 different polling stations in their chapters... ugh... Anyway, a lot more time would have been better to get it done properly, and we have decided to replicate the international GPP Team on the CC level next time. We didn't really have anyone in charge of the whole mess - my bad. | | * clearer explanations | | * Start earlier | | * As always, keep up with the trends. In 2020 FB and Twitter might not be the correct channels to work with. Spend time 3 to 6 months out making sure you know what the best channels are. Expect comms channels to be more fragmented in 4 years. Email may even be completely not useful by then. | | * A clear set of talking points and guidelines for media outreach | | * It's completely understandable that new ideas were communicated when they materialized and the momentum contributed to that: but it felt like so much of the info was off-the-cuff rather than long-thought-out plans. I would've loved to have a communications strategy and tactical action plan from the start. | | * Nothing. The preparations that went into this process were more than adequate for our purposes. | | * Recruiting more volunteers than we had for phonebanking | | * Maybe more communication about discussing the platform at voting centers as described in the dsp | | * Perhaps a presentation for running a voting center from start to finish and let people ask questions as it pertains to each issue. | | * The Communications strategy for the GPP and resources for country committees should be developed much earlier. It needed to clearly articulated why people should vote in the GPP rather than their home state. There was a fair amount of confusion if voting in the GPP affected a voter's registration in their home state. People were still confused if they could also vote in their home state and the GPP. People were confused if voting in the GPP meant they would then vote through DA for the general election.  With so many new members joining, we need to better explain at the time of the GPP what DA does. We received handouts and the website refers to DA advocating for change to FBAR and FATCA, but assuming people had knowledge of what these issues were. | | * Really plan out and work your social media channels. Find and exploit all networks with Americans. Paper signs in population centers large & small; this takes advance planning. | | * I'm not really clear what's covered by communication, perhaps next time you want to make this clearer? I had written down lots of suggestions (lessons learned) immediately after the GPP and, looking at them now, almost all fall into Voting Center and a few in Training. | | * Better (or better summarized) documentation. Also getting everyone in the loop as early as possible, maybe start planning earlier. I know this time there were some issues due to all of the changeover activity to get to NationBuilder. | | * None. I think a great job was done on communication | | * Hire an outside team of professional IT and PR consultants especially for this task. | | * Nothing that I can think of now | | * nothing in particular | | * We should probably make a really clear set of FAQs and make them available already around October 2019 | | * Improve affirmative action outreach | | * More work by RVCs/dRVCs is needed to reach out to all CC leaders earlier to make sure everyone is clear on requirements. | | * None | | * Communication to CCs and VC managers seemed to work if those people took an interest. I'm not sure how to improve communication to voters -- more FAQs on the website and social media? | | |

# Training and Documentation

## What went well with Training and Documentation?

|  |
| --- |
| * Our Munich Chair did a GREAT JOB! Thank you Meghan. |
| * There were quite a lot of of detailed documents and materials. |
| * all ok |
| * It was all quite clear. The Q&A's online were a very good resource for a quick answer to a question. Organizers were available for our questions (such as Will Bakker). Checklists worked well. |
| * Training and Documentation were adequate |
| * It was very specific |
| * Not aware of the training other than that for NationBuilder which was good. See previous comment re: documentation; there was too much. |
| * Great content. |
| * Training support was good and the online option was convenient. |
| * The manuals contained a lot of useful information. The online training sessions were also very helpful. |
| * Conference call to answer relevant questions. |
| * Very comprehensive |
| * I did not work at a voting center, though it was very useful having emails outlining what to send to members requesting ballots |
| * Just about everything; no problems recruiting volunteers or with downloading support and other materials sent by DA |
| * The voting center managers kept everyone informed of what their roles were using the documentation provided. Everyone seemed to understand their duty and carried it out well. We registered many voters on-site via computer rather than using paper forms. |
| * i passed so i can't complain. |
| * Everything was fine |
| * The Manuel was very helpful |
| * Lots of super training. The check lists were extremely helpful. |
| * The reporting system was very well set up and instructions were clear |
| * It was excellent. Lots of info, very comprehensive, broken into small pieces to make it digestible. |
| * Again, the preparations were more than adequate. We had all the documentation, forms, access to assistance, and training material that allowed us to run a successful primary. |
| * Documentation was great; I referred back to it more than once. |
| * Documentation and training were fine for me |
| * Voting center manual was quite comprehensive. All documents were sent out ahead of time. |
| * The guide for voting center managers was very comprehensive and our regional call in which we could address questions just before the start of the voting centers was very helpful. |
| * Tips on running a VC, and requirements for ballot handling, given in DSP and its summary documents were indispensable. |
| * Lots of detail in the documentation which was great. I felt that once everything came together I did have the information I needed, and Julia provided great training. |
| * Mostly very detailed, especially with what was available. |
| * easy to distribute |
| * I had served as Voting Center manager several times before, so I didn't pay too much attention to training, just read some of the documents to see if anything had changed from previous years. |
| * The HUMAN side went well - a member of the GPP team was always available, kind and as clear as they could be in the circumstances. |
| * no comment |
| * I appreciated the multiple training sessions available immediately before the primary. And the entire GPP team was extremely knowledgeable and willing to help answer questions. |
| * No problems - Our trainer was well informed and able to transmit info to volunteers |
| * We had very detailed guides for VC managers and instructions for remote voting.  What did not go well with Training and Documentation?  |  | | --- | | * No issues or problems occured. | | * Again some of the issues or FAQs we had were either not covered in the training materials or not communicated as to when or where we could find them. Sometimes there were inconsistencies in information or stuff that wasn't necessarily relevant to our CC, but no frame of reference for figuring out what was or not. | | * nothing | | * A heck of a lot of documentation, a lot of formatting, copying and learning what to plan. | | * It was very specific | | * See above | | * Not much time for VCMs and volunteers to fully understand the process. | | * It was a bit complicated to work the software initially. | | * The manual for polling places would have been better if their point of view was more from the managers themselves. The information on what to do was a bit scattered rather than being a how-to at every step. | | * No one-one training at all. | | * Too many potential volunteers could not join in since the first training was during the pre-Christmas holiday period. | | * Everything went smoothly | | * No problems here. | | * there was a lot of materials so it was difficult to stay up with everything. i did not realize that certification was based off the video. | | * Timing - much earlier next time | | * The voting center manual was not very clear, and convoluted. Many voting center staff ended up not reading it, leading to confusion. | | * No real criticism. Maybe in the future training should be more formalized or mandatory, to be sure we are up to the task before us, like what y'all did for NationBuilder. | | * N/A - can't think of anything | | * Some confusion about documents and where they were with other members. (If the mail was buried in inbox it was hard to find.) | | * Sometimes it took weeks for questions I sent to the primaryvoting email address to get a reply. I understand the team was inundated with requests. I was unsure if I should pose my questions to the DPCA listserv. Perhaps we all had similar questions which could have been collectively addressed. | | * I don't recall much "training" beyond the documents and WebEx Q&A sessions. | | * We hadn't trained sufficiently. After two voting days at one VC, a volunteer who'd been very involved asked, how is it possible that people can vote with us and yet they have their own primary or caucus in their home state. I was dumbfounded. | | * Summaries -- there was lots of information ... overwhelming amounts sometimes. I couldn't easily pass it on to our members and volunteers. | | * TRAINING AND DOCUMENTATION [Beret, NRW] Training should occur way before deadline to hand in Locations / dates, to ensure people choose venues and schedules, that will be doable. Even though both I and my Voting Center Manager attended the training + FAQ session it turned out, when actually going to the process, that many things were confusing and unclear / different than understood from talking online. In future training sessions there should be a virtual walk through step by step with documents / sample data. Also in order to make things more clear and easy to look up, the voter center manual should have an overview of a ballot/documents used with arrows and comments (if needed warnings for crucial points). We tried to search the voter manual for keywords, when unclear, and didn’t find any answers to our questions - there was no index for keywords, no paragraphs with buzzword titles to quickly find information, a glossary or a quick FAQ on any of the issues that we had (first issue we tried to clarify was which is the correct membership number, since there were different numbers - we used a backwards search in the database to solve this issue for clarification. Another one was, we didn’t know whether we should report two voting center results, since it was open for two consecutive days. We couldn’t find any info on this in the manual, so decided, since this was one polling place, simply open two days in a row, we should only report one result and then that turned out to be wrong) [Niki, HD] need more clear follow-up on verifying a member who voted provisional ballots. Also, maybe a sign with an explanation of why some people have to vote provisionally would help for the voting centers. | | * I think the documents need to be more concise. There was a little confusion over a few things and finding the answers on the larger document was difficult. I also feel voting centre managers were not as knowledgeable as I'd have expected, but I'm also unsure what training they attended. | | * our older members not too computer savvy; we need more volunteers | | * This is a growing process, so I know this was not exactly possible, but the FAQ could have been a little more detailed. | | * went very well | | * Although I was mainly involved on the IT side, as VC I did hear from the VC people a lot of frustration about the complicated instructions, found in disparate sources. One person at least said they wouldn't have organized a VC if they had known (well, actually they had no choice, but the emotion was real) | | * no comment | | * I would have appreciated earlier training sessions, or at least earlier sessions to discuss the plan. Maybe Nov/Dec town halls touched on the topic but those are never going to be at a time when everyone can attend. Perhaps two dedicated sessions at times covering all regions in November to make sure everyone is on the right page would have been good. Sorry, I hate criticizing when I know I was one not attending town halls on a regular basis so this may have been covered. | | * N/A | | * The guides were a bit too long and some of the documents were ready too late. |  What recommendations do you have for 2020 for Training and Documentation?  |  | | --- | | * Make sure Meghan is around. | | * It might have been relevant to have more of a "Dummy's Guide to the GPP" that could be directly communicated to volunteers who weren't as familiar with DA official workings or proceedings. | | * nothing more | | * More of the same. Possibly make a step by step list for each stage: Steps for Communicating the GPP, Steps for the Center set-up, and Steps for the Tallying and for Communicating results (these last two were given to us). These would be like checklists, for each stage of the GPPs. | | * Not sure what to do here. Perhaps part of a GPP packet that could be sent to each of the Chapter Chairs with some "read me" files for what to do and what to expect. | | * If possible to simplify? Although I see that it was carefully edited and presented. It was designed to cover all contingencies I think and so not everything was equally applicable. | | * Less documentation; training for GPP first timers is helpful and needed. | | * Start earlier | | * Suggest that if there is an experienced user of the software available they should assist at training meetings so that individuals do not have to puzzle it out on their own. Our group had this and it was a big help. | | * Organize the information to be more hands-on. The logic behind the rules is fine, but using that as an organizing principal not the best way to present what must be done. | | * Making sure there is time to one-on-one train managers. | | * Train earlier in the year, if possible | | * A comprehensive FAQ would be helpful. I was getting many queries about what ID was needed to vote in the GPP and had difficulty finding out how to respond to members | | * GPP: Start planning early; read all the material from DAA (esp the manual) ahead of time; familiarize self with the documents; book venue as early as possible; visit venue to familiarize organisers with set-up. Volunteers: have a good number of volunteers on hand; train them early; keep them up-to-date with information relevant to GPP; buy them a drink or two afterwards | | * The voting ballot was a bit confusing where it asks for the physical residence overseas. I think the word "overseas" caused the confusion because all voters were living overseas. It might be better to just ask for "Current physical address" and leave it at that. | | * a pre-meeting (previously mention) to go over the materials. I could have gotten a greater turnout if I could have promoted earlier. | | * Just send it all out much, MUCH earlier. | | * Provide information earlier | | * Potentially make documentation a bit simpler. | | * Clear and accessible documentation, as well as troubleshooting guides, and a one-hour mandatory training session for all voting center staff, not just the center manager. | | * I know this is a product of an all volunteer organization, but sometimes I felt overwhelmed by the responsibility and the lack of resources. I felt Switzerland suffered from a dearth of volunteers and so those of us who were working on the GPP (lead by our amazing Chair, Vice-Chair and Immediate Last Chair, and then a half dozen others) were moving mountains to pull it off. I've voted stateside, and the polling stations I went to in New York had very clear procedures and seemed extremely well organized and managed. While on the surface our Swiss polling stations (and remote voting) appeared fine, I didn't feel particularly confident that most people involved knew exactly what to expect. I would love it if we could publish a handbook following this year's experience that codifies how to run the GPP and a polling station. | | * More of the same! | | * More emphasis on what is not acceptable regarding voting centers (campaign material, etc) | | * Investigate the use of apps such as Yammer or Slack to see how we could better facilitate communication among country chapters and the global team in addressing the same questions. | | * Planning the voting center was a daunting prospect. Would have welcomed a sequenced, A-Z guide to doing so. However I realize that's a lot of documentation work for someone, plus it's questionable whether a "1-size-fits-all" guide would be the answer for everyone. It would need to account for the different scales of events from 3 to 300 voters. Our two VCs were big events with talks, diversions, campaign tables, swag sales, lots of decoration. I didn't know we could make them simpler, as eg. Sweden and Thailand did, just simple polling places for few voters. I recommend making CCs aware of that range. | | * The Guide for VC Managers could have been slimmed down considerably -- without losing any detail -- by eliminating redundancies (which were abundant) -- and THAT would have allowed and encouraged us to get more volunteers to read it. As it was, it was overwhelming. (I'd be happy to help.) | | * Eg. For in-person voting centers a one page sign so that people could easily confirm they were eligible, and what documentation they needed to have with them. I meant to make one myself and then didn't have time ... but next time if there isn't one I will definitely make one.  Also ... maybe a recorded training for vc and remote voting managers that can be reviewed at any time ... similar to the membership and email management trainings that we had. | | * More concise documentation or a fact sheet to go with the formal large document | | * more time | | * Learn from our encountered problems and provide more indepth solutions | | * After the fact, even though everyone read them it was a lot of information to absorb. I think a short list of the most common questions asked and answers to give plus important reminders of things that can make a vote invalid would have been helpful for those volunteering for the first time. Emphasize checking votes before they go into the box, for ex. | | * Hopefully there will be no need to change the DSP in 2020, and time can be spent distilling the information into some easy to read and easy to find pages, available way ahead of time. | | * no comment | | * I hate "tests" but some kind of test for VC managers and ballot wardens to make sure that they have the basics of the DSP down would reinforce the key points. No approval for CCs until the test has been passed. I think there were enough CCs caught out by certain requirements that, yes, were spelled out in the DSP but that were not absorbed or reinforced. | | * None | | * Somehow make the wording about residence address and voting address clearer, so voters will not include the same information in both boxes (esp. on in-person ballots). Change the wording on the remote ballot, so people will not vote without joining. The "optional" after membership number seemed to confuse some voters. |  Remote BallotsWhat went well with the Remote Ballots?  |  | | --- | | * n/a | | * Ease of use and clarity of communication. | | * lots of people voted this way, especially at the last moment after publicity | | * Julia's one on one training & availability to answer questions I had as they came up | | * Only had a few & most of this was done by members on-line | | * the worked | | * For those with access to printer and scanner infrastructure the process worked well. | | * Overall, the process went well. No one in Japan asked for a ballot to be mailed to them. | | * I did not personally deal with these. | | * The manual was clear, and the process ran smoothly. | | * No contact with remote ballots. | | * Mostly went well | | * There were a lot of them! | | * I can't say as we had no Remote Ballots for the state of Victoria | | * We had no remote ballots | | * everything flowed fine. i had a lot of people who did not register with DA prior to voting. Luckily Jenise was there to check the database. | | * Most everything was fine | | * We got many | | * I received very positive feedback regarding the remote balloting | | * A super way to reach out to study abroad programs! | | * n/a | | * Our amazing Vice-Chair, Peter Butterfield. Not only did he manage almost all of the remote ballots for our CC, he was also part of the IT team that found and fixed the PDF problem. | | * We only had one remote ballot so we don't have any comments. | | * Didn't see any problems in receiving/processing remote ballots | | * Easy and fast to fill in. | | * Relatively straight forward | | * N/A | | * The ease in which people could download them. | | * Half or more of GPP votes were remote! (I don't have figures.) All communications about the GPP made clear how easy it was to vote: Download, print, fill out, email in. Very easy, and consistent messaging. | | * We definitely got out the vote, that's for sure. It was easy to vote remotely. | | * ease of voting | | * It was pretty clear how to print them out. | | * nothing to report | | * thought that it was great that voters could bring the ballots off line and scan them, FAX them, or mail them. | | * They were simple for the voters to use | | * should have been Internet voting | | * Based on the mailed ballots I received, people generally seemed to fill them out properly. But... | | * I did not deal with the remote ballots so I cannot comment on this phase | | * I think we made it really easy to vote remotely by allowing voters to return the ballot by email attachment. |  What did not go well with the Remote Ballots?  |  | | --- | | * n/a | | * N/A/ | | * Remote ballots were wrong to prohibit PO boxes for abroad addresses. One's voting address -- last legal residence is USA -- cannot be a PO box. No problem with PO boxes for abroad address. See FPCA and VFA. | | * voters sent them to me if they were just visiting Brussels even if they lived in another country and belonged (supposedly) to another cc | | * Again not much to mention. A couple of people required remote ballots as they were from other chapters. No real | | * people didn't follow directions, brought them to the centers | | * People in outlying areas with Internet but not printer/scanner facilities could not vote. Mail worked, but was slow, taking three to four weeks to arrive. | | * Some problems with locating "missing members" in the database. Although it caused inconvenience, I believe that all of the missing members were ultimately found and properly assigned. | | * I did hear from those voting in person that they preferred to actually physically cast their vote - "felt more real". Some older people felt in person use would be easier to do - were concerned about their internet/email expertise in this instance. | | * Members were a little confused as to whether they should bring those ballots to the polling places. I think some people didn't realize that printing out a ballot for a friend was not enough; that friend needed to join DA. | | * No contact with remote ballots. | | * Too many asking if their ballots were receieved | | * See above | | * no remote ballots were received | | * no complaints | | * We should have gotten LOTS more - and would have if we had done phone banking properly | | * The address template does not work for Costa Rica | | * Respondents confused by methods of submission fields + "Country of residence" even with explanation. | | * n/a | | * The PDF problem. Really horrible that we lost the link published around the world to the ballot because it needed to be re-uploaded | | * Nothing | | * Confusion over Country of Residence (not sure why.... A lot of people put USA! Tsk!) and address (also not sure why). "Voting address in the USA" and "Address in your country of residence" might make these clearer. I'm sure I'm the 900th person to point this out. (Sorry) | | * N/A | | * I think some people were confused that they had to mail in their ballots to the remote ballot warden rather than send the ballots in directly via email or post. I'm not sure this could be avoided. Also, lack of confirmation that a ballot was received. | | * The downloadable ballot printed out badly on certain platforms, with garbage characters. It was replaced with a fixed ballot, but that broke earlier links to the download page. Bad. | | * Processing. Sorting and counting the things was rough. | | * REMOTE VOTING [Hilary, Berlin] There needs to be an auto-responder email for online voters that says, “Your ballot has been received. Thank you for voting. Go request your Nov. ballot here.” [Beret, NRW] I agree strongly with Hilary! People didn’t seem to trust the remote voting system. It should be communicated more clearly to members, that all ballots count the same and that not being able to come to a voting center shouldn’t discourage you from voting. Also some people don’t have printers/scanners and some elderly members have told me they didn’t vote because they find having to use electronic devices to much a hassle (Printing, scanning, email). Perhaps one should offer a service to send people their remote ballot in exchange for a small donation. [Niki, HD] +1 with Hilary. Just make sure there is a link inserted for how they can request their November ballots. So many people asked us this question! [Ron, Kaiserslautern] It would be good if remote voters got an email that their ballot was received. I was asked why not? [Cortnie, Berlin] Perhaps it could be recorded as a tag in the database who voted via remote ballot. This information is also helpful for updating expired entries. Furthermore, it would be great to have a team solely responsible for updating member information that is given on the remote ballot, for example if a new address or email is listed. | | * no compliants | | * The instructions were a bit confusing regarding filling in the information, specifically what was critical to include. Despite having the caveats of "\*required", many seemed confused. | | * no issues | | * I have a lot of software recommendations (saving mouse clicks for example) | | * ... of the emailed ballots I counted, quite a few were missing info and I deemed them invalid. Whether they were ultimately counted, I don't know, and whether the invalid ballots were in line with invalid ballots in the US, I also don't know. But there seemed to be a higher than expected number of people who simply couldn't read instructions. But you can't make these things fool-proof.   An unauthorized individual handed out remote ballots as in-person ballots at an unapproved and unannounced voting center. I don't know how to prevent this in the future, and too much verbage could clutter the ballot, but there needs to be some way of reinforcing that a remote ballot cannot be cast in person or collected by anyone. | | * Unknown | | * It's not easy to count that many ballots. Also, we didn't understand in advance how much responsibility the Remote Ballot Warden would have when we were asked to choose one. We might have chosen someone else if we had known. |  What recommendations do you have for 2020 for Remote Ballots?  |  | | --- | | * n/a | | * More communication gudielines on remote ballot validity (i.e. voting in centers and sending in remote ballots as we had a few members who sent in remote ballots and then showed up and voting centers or showed up with their remote ballots to try to vote in the voting centers). | | * remind people emphatically to vote via their own country if they are sending in remote ballots by post | | * 1. brain storming how best to avoid multiple "same" ballots due to voters not knowing if we had received their emailed/faxed ballots 2. deadline for remote ballots to be 1 - 2 weeks prior to voting in person, thereby giving enough time for members to be tagged as well as counted | | * Remote ballots came with instructions (attached) and were pretty simple to give out. Most of this was already on-line and members that elected to vote "on-line" with remote ballots were pretty much already informed. | | * nothing, it was great. Voters have to read the instructions for all ballot types! | | * Offer online voting as an option. People fearful of hacking can use email, fax or post. | | * Eliminate the procedure for ballot requests. These days, the Internet makes it too easy to download ballots. Instead, encourage those who have any difficulty downloading a ballot to contact the designated official in country. | | * Continue to offer an in-person option. The other options of course should be continued as well. | | * Be sure to be super-clear with instructions. Someone will always misunderstand, of course, but try to keep things simple for voters. | | * No contact with remote ballots. | | * Maybe, is there a way to create an automatic reply so that the voter knows it was received? | | * More assistance needed in approving members who join in order to vote remotely. This applies to people who voted on the day as well - it is nearly impossible to keep up with the number of people who needed approval | | * See above | | * We could alert more of our members what remote ballots are and how to use them. It may have resulted in an increase in ballots because not all members came to vote. Possible time conflicts and a remote ballot would have solved this. | | * early promotion. | | * We should do phone banking of all our members, starting in early January. Many had already voted in their state primaries before they were even knew about our GPP. The first emails about it should also start going out in Nov/Dec of the previous year - so, for 2020, they should start going out in Nov 2019. - More importantly, some of our ballots were not counted because people voted (for the same person) more than once... BECAUSE they were not sure whether their ballot had been received and WAS actually valid. There should be a system in place to confirm this, so people don't vote twice and have their ballots not counted. | | * If they are downloaded from the internet, try to set up a system that allows them to be filled in directly from the internet to make machine based scanning a possibility. | | * n/a | | * I've been in the IT business long enough to know the drill: we need to reduce the number of clicks required for a visitor to get to their destination. I was thrilled when y'all added that fabulous red VOTE link on the website, and I think it would be great if we did some usability testing to find out how random people find stuff on the website. I also believe that the 404 error from the PDF change could've been avoided: I understand that a CMS front-end can't change the file name, but the system admins can!!! A server-side redirect, a command-line level filename rename, and lots of other solutions come to mind. Preventing 404s for an official voting ballot should be one of the top concerns and this is when any kind of band-aid solution should be implemented. I guarantee there were lots of unnecessary 404 errors around the world. Speaking of: I'd love it if some of the more technical volunteers could have access to the web analytics and server logs to monitor this kind of thing and offer an insight into user behavior to help make our work more efficient. | | * None | | * See above. | | * I wish we could make it easier for non CC's to hold remote voting centers efficiently using remote ballots | | * N/A | | * There should have been an automatic confirmation when people submitted their ballot vial email. There should have been two email addresses - one for submitting ballots and one for general help questions. There were no instructions for remote ballot wardens to acknowledge the ballots sent to them by members. In my capacity as warden, I acknowledged all of them. It should be standard practice that all remote ballots are acknowledged, even if an automated reply. | | * I wasn't involved. | | * Look into the possibility of full on-line voting -- the results go into a database and poof. Easy to tabulate. Votes sent by email, fax, or mail could be entered by the remote voting coordinators into the database. Votes cast in person could also be entered into the database by the voting center "staff".  Possibly auto-routing of faxed ballots into folders by country of origin (phone number it was faxed from, maybe?) to be processed by the remote voting coordinators of the individual regions/countries.  Same with emailed votes -- if the country was part of the email subject it could be automatically routed to a folder for that country.  Each country/region remote voting coordinator can be responsible as votes come (entering them into the database, for example) in using these methods and then we aren't counting so many at the very end. | | * reply that ballot was received | | * The technology needs to be updated to allow for electronic signature. | | * no comment | | * There was some confusion in Germany because of the two addresses (both in Germany) to which ballots could be mailed. That resulted from having the DPCA Chair in Germany. | | * Hopefully by then the system will be more electronic than reading scanned pdf files. We should also clearly state that people will not receive a written confirmation that their vote was received and counted, other than the automatic confirmation on Submit. | | * Internet voting | | * Some way to handle electronic signatures. I understood after the fact that remote ballots "signed" in a different font were acceptable, but that was not indicated anywhere. Several voters reached out about this. | | * Not able to comment on remote ballots |  Voting CentersWhat went well with the Voting Centers?  |  | | --- | | * Great location, well known among former military in Augsburg. (Former casino of Reese casern in Augsburg). Good parking, good food, enough space, people get together. | | * Camaraderie and enthusiasm of everyone involved! Lots of excitement to be there and to have the opportunity. | | * everything | | * Our decision to have two Voting Centers in two different places and on two different dates probably doubled our voting turnout. Organizing the screening of a political film also drew in many people. | | * Our "pre-registration" killed three birds with one stone: 1. updated current members 2. identified new members who were sent a link to join DAA and 3. reduced long waiting lines | | * We organized things for "check-in, verify members and retrieve member numbers & hand out the ballots - 2 people," then "one person checking the ballots for completeness, legibility, signatures and putting in the ballot box". | | * People were patient | | * They're always well attended. People prefer to vote in-person when they can. | | * Great turnout, volunteers, voting process, excitement among voters, press coverage, etc. | | * Ours was in a public library and I also assisted at one in a church. People attending to vote seemed to enjoy the chance to meet and talk with other Democrats Abroad and discuss issues and the candidates.. There was a nice social aspect to it. Almost all expressed appreciation to the volunteers for making voting centers available. One thing that went over very well was having a large laminated U.S. map that attendees could mark their home voting state on with a small sticky note. We also had a supply of DA pins that we gave out to voters. We had two large stand up signs promoting DA & voting which aided location visibility. Voters were taking their pictures with them. | | * The voting process went well. The steps to follow were clear. | | * They were personal and a good opportunity to interact with locals. | | * Really, all went well | | * N/A | | * The venue: centrally located and easy to get to via car or public transport; friendly and very cooperative staff who met our every need; plenty of room which meant people could get easy access to their ballots, ask for and receive help from our volunteers, vote privately; have their picture taken submitting their ballot. And get their pic taken with Mr Obama (cardboard version). Afterwards: we'd booked space in a nearby pub and had a great turnout; especially good for recent arrivals to meet fellow Americans | | * We had sufficient (Plentiful) volunteer help and we had no difficulties at the voting centers. | | * it was my first time, so i felt that everything went well. Voters expressed gratitude that we were holding the voting centers. | | * Almost everything | | * We were so appreciated - it was wonderful | | * Good venue,good decorations, friendly environment | | * Fantastic opportunity for Americans to get together and vote. Lots and lots of enthusiasm! Everyone loved the US flag decorations, our space was ideal (and the venue owners extremely welcoming), and thanks to the check lists we had everything organized and ready to go! | | * Promotion and reporting requirements went well. | | * Our fantastic Immediate Last Chair new exactly what to do. | | * We had an adequate number of volunteers and the process was smooth. | | * Very busy; lots of new people voting | | * Good advice suggesting VC managers to expect big numbers and be prepared to manage lines/waiting queues. | | * Great enthusiasm and turnout | | * The cheery volunteers and great locale we picked! | | * The voting centers were a great way to bring people together, generate enthusiasm and media coverage. | | * 1. The structure mandated by the DSP was a big help in ensuring the venues/dates/times/managers were set early. Forced us to carry out key steps early (a good thing). 2. The VCs were fun, vibrant events, buzzing with positive energy. 3. MANY voters thanked us sincerely for putting them on and providing the opportunity to go downtown and vote. Many more were obviously enthusiastic. | | * We had a lot more voters than we thought we might. After awhile we started using computers to find membership numbers for people who had joined DA after the voting list was printed (of whom there were A LOT). | | * We were able to get a decent turnout at the centers we had. | | * almost everything | | * not involved | | * great atmosphere | | * not involved personally | | * no comment | | * Generally they went well and were very well-received. Lots of great face-to-face contact. | | * Nothing other than initial chaos soon resolved | | * Things went fairly smoothly in the VC, even with the overwhelming number of voters who showed up. We had the forms and ballots that we needed. |  What did not go well with the Voting Centers?  |  | | --- | | * n/a | | * The UAE had A LOT of new membership registrants that created some backlog in people filling out the registration form and then their ballots. | | * despite many signs and directions people still were confused about the November ballot requests | | * not asking people if they lived in Austria - some we caught ahead of time, but we had to spoil two ballots due to other than Austria overseas address | | * Perhaps a few more people with computers to "check-in" voters and assign ballots. | | * 1- We were overwhelmed with new memberships, the printed membership lists were almost useless. 2- Observers protocol not suitably clarified | | * We only had one. It is best to have VCTRS in areas where Americans are concentrated, but volunteers are needed to staff them, which is often a sever limitation in most small CCs. | | * Problem of "missing members" in the database was an issue that took up unnecessary time and attention at the voting center and caused frustration to some voters. Also, due to long lines and new joins on the day of voting, our voters had some confusion between Vote from Abroad and joining DA on March 1 in Tokyo. This was our fault because we had a volunteer passing out VFA cards to people waiting in line. We changed our process on subsequent days and put our VFA guy at the ballot box to check ballots and then remind voters to request their ballots for the general election. | | * It all went pretty well. We had people coming in waves so at times were very busy verifying and assisting the voting process and new or corrected registrations. Some of the volunteers had to be trained/refreshed as they arrived which took some time. | | * Getting member numbers was difficult. A lot of people signed up at the last minute, and we had more than 100 voters per hour on Super Tuesday, so we had to rely on them looking up their numbers on their phones. That worked, but was cumbersome. | | * People who had signed up before the centre did not have their member numbers. | | * In the Philippines, I wish we had more centers throughout the country in the larger cities. Since we are an archipelago, and very Manila-centric, we lose potential voters not have chapters in the larger cities outside Manila. | | * N/A | | * There was internet / WiFi access but accessing it at the start (while we were still setting up) was a bit of a hassle; the centre's staff were very helpful and once they had it up and running there were no problems. I think in the future I'd go for a venue that didn't have stairs (we were on the first floor); we didn't have anyone who needed wheelchair access, but that was due more to luck than anything else. We need to be more thoughtful of people with special needs next time. Then again, this wasn't the Voting Center's problem, but our negligence | | * There were no real problems experienced. In one or two situations, where we weren't certain of the voter's eligibility, we used Provisional Ballots and let those in Germany figure it out. | | * it was held in a bar so people were inclined to be more social. I had to move people to other areas if they wanted to stay and chat with friends. | | * Some of our people were brand new and had NO idea what was going on | | * New sign-up same problem the address template does not work for Costa Rica | | * Only one computer | | * We did not have I voted stickers, causing much dismay :-). Also, I found out that some volunteers will fight to sign people in, so have learned that it is necessary to have strict shifts to give every interested volunteer a chance to participate. | | * Our voting center was a an active cafe, which led to overcrowding during the after-work rush. | | * I would've like more volunteers. We had an amazing Volunteer Organizer who seemed to magically find enough people for all stations. But it didn't feel like there was any leeway. | | * Many voters asked for "I Voted" stickers but we didn't have any. Next year we will order some. | | * Nothing | | * Registering new voters was a little slow | | * Registering for DA on the computer took a bit of time. For example, selecting date of birth from a drop-down menu. If too many were waiting then they filled out a paper application. The questions on the paper form were more detailed than what is needed online. | | * It was not made clear when we had to submit the list of voting center locations times and dates by 31 December the severity of the consequences of making any changes once the list was published. Fortunately, the changes we made to our voting centers was addressed before the list went public.  People were confused what was meant by their Overseas Address on the ballot. People were mixing up putting their US and local (overseas address). Ultimately, this didn't affect the validity of their ballots but we didn't know this at first.   We had many new members either joining on the spot or who had recently joined DA. With most of the voting center volunteers joining DA awhile back, we were not clear about the process for joining DA - for example that an email would be sent to new members to activate their accounts. | | * Planning the big events was stressful for a core group. Our flyers up around town were sporadic and last-minute. The VFA table was jammed, should have doubled the capacity. | | * In Göteborg, where we had lots of voters, we needed more space. Starbucks provided a great location except not enough space to separate voter registration/absentee-ballot request (for the fall) from other activities, and too congested because people hung around after voting. Still it felt good, very "party" like (and everyone seemed to enjoy it).  Before we started verifying new members (who weren't on the voting list) by finding their numbers online, we just took their word for it, but perhaps we should have been giving them provisional ballots? I meant to check that out but was too busy so let it go.  We tried using a computer to help people register/request absentee ballots on VoteFromAbroad.org but it took FAR too much time, we would have needed many more computers to make it work.   Probably it wouldn't have made any difference, but often (I believe) we forgot to check new joiner's IDs, even if only to verify their names. It felt a little chaotic because we were overcrowded, and (I think) would have felt unfriendly to demand ID from people who were obviously Americans and eager to vote (and knew who they were).  The ballot was organized a bit confusingly. | | * 1. We weren't able to have enough geographical spread within our country, with only two centers. We were also limited on open dates/hours.  2. Member lookup -- even with decent internet connection we were often not finding members when we searched and had to leave member numbers off of the ballots until the end when we could look them up if folks didn't know their number.  3. At our sites we also had some confusion about eligibility for in-person voting and what documentation was needed. | | * TECHNOLOGY ON-SITE [Hilary, Berlin] In 2020, we need to make it a priority to have a bank of 5-10 computers where people can fill out the join form themselves. We had so many new people join on election day, it took days for two people to enter all of these new members (then more time for our national secretary to add them). Many can use the phones in their pockets to immediately validate their new accounts. [Beverly, Excom / Wiesbaden] There should be enough computers for each new member to join on the spot. [Hilary, Berlin] We need another bank of computers with printer where people can fill out their VFA ballot request forms for November! This was absolutely a missed opportunity to send people out the door prepared for the general election. We only had one volunteer handling this and it simply wasn’t enough. [Cortnie, Berlin] Many people were confused and asked about the difference between voting in the GPP primary and registering to vote for the general election. If we integrate a station for registering through VFA next time (see Hilary’s comment above), we can direct these people immediately to register and in doing so clear up any confusion while at the same time ensuring that they do register for the general election.  [Beret, NRW] Voting centers should all have database access, if we still need membership number. Paper Lists were not really feasible to work with for my voting center managers. Also entering new members on site as Admin makes much more sense. [Cortnie, Berlin] Absolutely agree with Beret that database access on site is a must! Volunteers often could not locate members on the print-out and they had to all line up at the one computer we had to look them up. This inefficiency caused a bottleneck in the process. [Niki, HD] was confusing to find the membership ID vs. there being a Nation builder ID [Ron, Kaiserslautern] It would be good in 2020 if technology allows more reliable access to the membership list.  BALLOTS [Hilary, Berlin] Why do we include so much information on the absentee ballots? This was really tedious. The ballot should be reconsidered from a design standpoint (the asterisk marking things that were required was too small, for example). [Ron, Kaiserslautern] There should be more care to make sure the ballot asks more clearly for what is needed. Our voters kept writing “US“ as residence instead of Germany.  [Ron, Kaiserslautern] One member said that having “John F.Kennedy” as a sample candidate right above Sanders’ name was unfair to the other candidates. It could be. [Beverly, Excom / Wiesbaden] The ballots should have been 100% checked for correction (for the required fields). We had to reject many ballots because of incomplete or incorrect information.  [Beverly, Excom / Wiesbaden] When counting the ballots, we had to verify that every person voting was indeed a member of DA and if there was an ID number on the ballot (presumably entered by the voting center staff), that was sufficient. But for all the new members, the ID number had to be looked up in the DB and entered on the ballot. That should have been done by the voting center staff or volunteers before sending the ballots off. That would have saved days of work validating the ballots.  DESIGN [Hilary, Berlin] If there’s still a paper join form in 2020, it needs to be in \*exactly the same order\* as the join form on the website.  VOLUNTEERS [Hilary, Berlin] We need to make more clear to volunteers that our “verification” measures are not a voter ID restriction that should stand in the way of someone voting.  [Cortnie, Berlin] The volunteer standing at the ballot box should be making sure that the person filled out all required fields and signed the form. Also, the person handing out the ballot should emphasize this to avoid invalid ballots. | | * need more centers; more locations; or more days | | * not involved | | * rules too complicated -- this is a party election not the federal government | | * Verifying members at times was frustrating, not because of the voting center but because of the way NationBuilder logged people. (e.g. someone had partially signed up but oculdn't be found through any search, but when they tried to sign up again the system said they already existed.) So this is a database complaint, not necessarily a VC complaint. | | * Long lines in the beginning | | * The website join form was a little wonky at times. We had a few voters who we had to contact later to make sure they joined. We also had voters show up from other country committees. In the crush of new members, we didn't realize that voters were trying to vote in a country they didn't live in. |  What recommendations do you have for 2020 for Voting Centers?  |  | | --- | | * Keep the location | | * It may be useful to have iPads set up to register people on-the-spot at voting centers, which by our own admission, is our fault for not making that provision and creating more backlog later in registering new members on the Web site. | | * voters should somehow be reminded that the absentee ballot has nothing to do with the primary or country committee and that we will not be holding an actual vote in November. | | * That large cities propose at least two different venues for their Voting Centers, on at least two different dates.  Also, organizing a social event such as a film screening, an American writers' forum, or a Community Day along with the Voting Center works very well and draws in many people. In this case, the communication needs to rigorously support the GPP Voting Center, not the event, but the event does also help bring people together. | | * 1. we need to ask if they live in the country in which they are voting 2. every volunteer should maybe have an index card of their "duties" as well as "questions to ask each voter" in their role as volunteer at the voting center | | * Probably a couple of computers (iPad worked fine) for checking in people as well was someone to meet people as they come in the door and even take down some basic info. | | * (1) Foresee the Future ;)) Tell us how many voters to expect, how many ballots to print up!!  OK - assume many or most voters will be new members so simplify registration process. New website DA registration requires responding to an email to finalize membership. This was by far the biggest time consumer. Very few had done that, hence did not have their member numbers. It was a courteous and practical decision to ensure as many ballots as possible had actual verified numbers instead of 'new'.   (2) One of the campaigns sent observers. Beyond requiring some form of documentation, the DA protocols for handling this were vague and need clarifying. We suggest: A) Observers wear badges identifying themselves as Official Campaign Observers NOT a partisan support group;  B) Observers sit well apart from volunteers handing out ballots, etc., so as to not be assumed part of the process, confusing voters; C) Observers should not speak or interact with voters, since the voting center volunteers are too busy to oversee and control what may be said. IT IS INAPPROPRIATE.   These two issues were the only real problems at our voting centers, but they were considerable. | | * Encourage CCs to have more than one center, if they can handle them. | | * Overall, no major recommendations for change. The process worked very well. However, VCMs and volunteers need more time to plan and prep. | | * Ensure you have enough volunteers based on past turnout. Have a comfortable and welcoming location. Set up early - people arrive as soon as the center opens. Have festive political decorations and good directional signage. Offer DA pins or "I voted" buttons. Take photos of the center set up for future reference. | | * Expect a lot of last-minute voters. By then, technology will have changed again, and we need to find ways to let it solve our problems. | | * Set up country chapters, so that voting centers will coincide with chapters | | * Be insistent people write legibly on their join forms! | | * Book the venue ahead of time and check it out thoroughly; ensure internet, etc is working and check that there are sufficient power outlets and easily accessible WiFi. Choose a venue that is easy to get to, especially for people who need to travel to reach the V.C. Check out nearby eateries/pubs and book a space for post-voting drinks/meals. Have all paperwork in order, ballots numbered, etc, and all volunteers familiar with the procedure (I sent out copies of the relevant pgs of the Guide to volunteers the week before the GPP). In other words, make sure all Ts are crossed and Is are dotted a good 2-3 days before the GPP. | | * Make voting center arrangements early, get them in writing and then post them on the Website as well as our FaceBook page. Encourage members to vote and advise them about remote voting if they are not able to come to the center. | | * nothing in particular | | * In our CC we will make sure we have experienced people at EVERY polling station, whether from the chapter or not - i.e. travel may be necessary. | | * More computers | | * Remember to provide I voted stickers. | | * Issuing a recommendation not to use cafes unless significant space is available and it is easily accessible. | | * Prioritize stations. I was working VFA, and there was a line of people waiting, not all patiently. I know I lost some people who wouldn't wait. I made a conjecture in advance that most people coming to a voting station would not have requested their ballot yet. And for our mission, getting those ballot requests for the general election is just as, if not more, important as voting in the GPP. Never having worked an event before, I couldn't offer advice in advance to act on this feeling (I'm digital, I do my volunteering behind a computer, also why I'm very comfortable working VFA)... I felt we should've had a sort of assembly line, to give the VFA table a head start completing forms... when someone comes in to vote, ask if they are a member, and if they already requested this year's ballot... if not, get the VFA started while they vote, plus if they are new, can't VFA and new membership be rolled into one process? The way we had it, voters voted, and then came to the VFA table afterwards... I don't think anyone expected to wait in \*another\* line just to get a form filled out, when they probably already gave most of the same info at another table.   Also, a side note about privacy: I felt very uncomfortable about the amount of personally identifiable information for other people that I had on my computer after completing all those VFA forms. Apologies if I've overlooked it, but I wish there were an official process for permanently destroying this info to secure our voters' identities. | | * None. Our voting center ran very well. | | * Stress making sure the manager has enough volunteers, forms, etc. | | * Earlier advice on searching for and locking in a venue that is the right location, size and layout. WARNING that finding the best venue can be tricky and should not be left to the last moment. (That said, we had ours locked in back in November but the venue pulled out on us with just a month's notice. Tsk! Can't always anticipate what obstacles will fly up at you out of nowhere.) | | * Just encourage even more voting centers | | * The ballot design could be a bit clearer so we do not have to explain as much before they go to vote, for example the place to sign and date was a bit removed from the rest. Also, everyone wondered what format the date should be (YY-MM-DD or MM-DD-YY?). | | * Strongly suggest that each voting center have several laptops dedicated for new members to join. We had people joining on their phones, but it would've been much faster on a laptop. Some people didn't want to use their data to join, and/or wifi connections were slow. | | * Make CCs aware that VCs may range from big, multi-featured EVENTS down to simple polling places, and that it's not hard to stage small ones in a lot of cities. | | * In Göteborg, perhaps the upstairs level of Starbucks could be used instead of the little downstairs alcove, so we could spread out more.  We could have used more computers for checking member numbers.  We gave out registration/absentee-request forms from VFA.org (and envelopes) which people seemed to appreciate (and hopefully used). We should have had a print-out of all the addresses so they could write down where to send in their own state.  Improved organization of the requested ballot info: Required info could be grouped together, to make it clearer that the other info was NOT required, and thus reduce anxiety for voters who (for example) couldn't remember their voting street address. Also, first the ballot asked for overseas address, then (in the next column) for country of residence. That info could have been combined -- either with country as part of the address, or country first, then address IN that country -- which would have reduced confusion. | | * Overall good turnour for a 2 hour slot on a weekday evening. Depending on time and resources available, could be worth extended the voting time and/or adding a second date. Then again, interested people can also vote online if they can't make it to the voting center | | * 1. Start planning much earlier. I feel that with more time we could have rounded up some additional volunteers and staffed more centers and more days of in-person voting.  2. Simple signs that can be put up at voting centers (and posted for members on event pages and online) summarizing eligibility for in-person voting and what you need to bring with you. Posting a multi-page document while I understand the necessiting of having it available for detailed review of the rules doesn't really help folks with quick information questions.  3. Plan for big hits to the membership database during voting -- need better and faster response from the site to confirm membership. | | * more days | | * not involved | | * nothing particular, everything was clearly explained and easy to set up. Will be easier next time for those with experience ! | | * I wasn't sure if here would be the place to suggest that 1. having the names in alphabetical order may have given Clinton an advanage 2. having "John F.Kennedy" with an oval (as a sample of how to vote) just above Sanders' name may have given him an advantage. There should be a better focus on ballot design. I'm not sure if the remote ballot had the same format. | | * It would be interesting to know the % of sign-ups at the VC we had. The VC joins caused a lot of problems, but should not be dispensed with because it's a good draw. Maybe there can be a better way than the system adopted in 2016 | | * lighten the rules and give local committees more control | | * CCs must be more prepared for crowds in cycles like this one where there is a real contest. This needs to be reinforced. | | * I felt we needed more space for our Voting Center |  Tabulation ProcessWhat went well with the Tabulation Process?  |  | | --- | | * everything. Quick, expedient, efficient. | | * Forms provided to aid in tabulation. | | * most things | | * The clear documents and the check lists. | | * The organising before hand by Shari & Will, the team work & energy of the group - everyone seemed to fit & this was crucial - we gelled; Katie & Andreas supplying room & board so that everyone could concentrate on the work at hand was a big help as well. | | * Things ran pretty smoothly | | * It was fine | | * We only had one center and held voting on one day only. It was relatively easy to arrange volunteers for the tabulation. | | * In country tabulation worked very well in Japan. | | * We had enough volunteers that we could check everything twice. Also one volunteer was very experienced and ensured everything was done correctly. Reporting results after the fact online worked well. | | * It was easy overall. | | * all went well | | * n/a | | * Everything. This was something I was concerned with, but it went like clockwork. | | * We had no difficulties with the tabluation process. We had three tellers at each of our voting centers who checked and double-checked the ballots while counting them. It is well to review each ballot's personal information before actually making the vote to reduce any possibility of spoiled ballots. | | * no problems | | * Everything was basically fine | | * It was very easy | | * It was easy to do | | * We had 3 people working on the tabulation and it was a very straight forward process. | | * Reporting was easy | | * No idea, didn't participate. | | * Everything. It was an easy process. We counted the votes after we closed the polls. | | * This was not difficult | | * Every vote counted | | * It was easy for us as we had only 14 voters. | | * The form made tabulation straightforward. It was helpful to be able to talk to Katie to get clarification before giving the final tabulation. (For example, we didn't know if people putting the wrong type of ballot counted as a spoiled ballot). | | * In the end all counts were correct, we feel confident. Nobody cared to monitor the count, so no time was lost there. The structure of having to fill in a tally sheet and report results three different ways was comforting, actually. | | * Tabulating the mailed and in-person votes wasn't too bad. | | * all seemed to work well | | * Plenty of information was available, and questions were quickly answered | | * I thought it was well thought out and went efficiently , but we had only 62 ballots to tabulate. | | * When it was over! | | * seemed fine on our end | | * Tally sheet was clear in terms of required information. I had great tellers. No issues. | | * Nothing of any consequence | | * The tally sheets -- for both VC ballots and remote postal ballots -- were clear. |  What did not go well with the Tabulation Process?  |  | | --- | | * Nothing. | | * Again, a lot of information to take in and some lack of clarity on the process which we didn't foresee until we actually started it. | | * spoiled ballots, invalid ballots | | * Mexico - wasted a lot of time by emailing their paper ballots without giving anyone a heads up CCs - would have saved a lot of time if CCs had added their new members, approved them & written their id #s on the ballots | | * No real problems. | | * No problem | | * We did not arrange the membership list by last name. Better to do that than by ID number. Volunteers had to struggle finding members on the list. | | * The remote ballot process was time consuming for all involved. That probably cannot be avoided. However, it would be good to line up more volunteers earlier in the process. Also, I'm still uncertain on our actual practice related to the review of signatures vs. e-signatures. I think we should have had more guidance on that in advance. If we use the same tabulation process for emailed ballots, we need to put those procedures in the appropriate manual. | | * We had no problems. | | * For us, it was just counting and sorting. I hear from Jim Mercereau that entering all that information in Prien was not so good, but you know all about that. | | * all went well | | * n/a | | * Zip | | * We had a few ballots which had been incorrectly completed in that they listed the US as their country of residence. When we caught them before the ballot was cast, we asked the voter to make the change on the ballot. | | * nothing really | | * Voter disenfranchisement: I did not like not counting ballots because this or that information was not given, or not given "properly" on a ballot. IF the information HAS to be ON the ballot, then it should be such that the vote is at the very bottom (below the fold), and the information is all at the top, so people can check everything before it goes into the ballot box. OR - better yet - the information is collected on a sheet at the registration table, and the ballot has the identifying ballot number which corresponds to the info they gave at the registration table. Then, the ballot would only have the name and the signature. One of those two options would have saved 10 ballots in Berlin alone. | | * n/a | | * Nothing | | * No problems. | | * n/a | | * Nothing! | | * Unclear whether some ballots should have been spoiled (questions were answered quickly, though) | | * We were all caught off guard by the volume of participants. The call for volunteers to help verify the ballots was last minute. | | * One of our chapter voting centers was not as rigorous in tabulation procedures as they should have been; treated the procedures casually. We felt obliged to verify the count before mailing the ballots in. In both centers, there was confusion about voters using blue/black ink, vs. ballot handlers using green ink. Wrong colors were used occasionally by both. | | * The process for tabulating remote votes (faxed and emailed) | | * [Beret, NRW] It was not clear to us beforehand, that I as Chapter Chair had to sign all results of polling places. I’m unsure whether we could have named someone else beforehand. But in a very spread out chapter, it is logistically difficult for one person to sign all results personally. It worked out for our “tour”, but could have gone wrong. | | * Took a while. There were many questions about what constituted "spoiled", "valid", etc. Many were placed in the wrong file folders (completely wrong country, for example) | | * was a little confusing as to what votes were truly not acceptable - | | * We didn't foresee the numbers and did not have enough volunteers for the final crunch. | | * glad I was not counting the mail in ballots sent to the chair | | * No issues at the time. (Inconsistent application of the rules to determine the validity of a ballot cropped up later when I worked on remote ballots.) | | * Should have a more private place for the tabulators |  What recommendations do you have for 2020 for the Tabulation Process?  |  | | --- | | * See above. We had only 28 votes to count. | | * More clarity on deadlines and method. | | * we have to look at each ballot before the person puts it in the ballot box next time to be sure they have completed everything AND are in the correct country for voting. | | * Create a one-page checklist for the Voting Process to complement the longer explanations, to quickly clarify and confirm rules and details such as what to do if someone makes a mistake on their ballot and wants a new one, can you vote if you're 17, etc. This might be good especially for large Voting Centers that have several volunteers, where not everyone remembers all the rules perfectly. | | * 1. If remote ballots were to be finished & tagged before the paper ballots arrived, then we need not worry so much about voting twice and maybe the remote ballot volunteers could have assisted with the paper ballots. 2. Maybe if we staggered each regional (physical) GPP then it wouldn't be so overwhelming to count three regions in 4 days(?). | | * No real problems | | * None | | * Suggest that VCTR managers have membership lists sorted alphabetically and not by ID number, as they were sent out. A simple item, but makes the sign in ballot issuance process more efficient. | | * I think we should research and give serious consideration to Alex Montgomery's proposal to automate the voting process through the DA website, provided that the process requires the voter to sign the ballot using a touch screen. While I am very skeptical about electronic voting, especially when contracted to a vendor, I'm more open to exploring the process if it is something that we can manage ourselves. In principle, this would allow most of our remote voting members to complete the voting process and have instant/running tabulation. Of course, we can double check in any way we deem necessary. | | * If volunteers are new or inexperienced, ensure they have the tabulation procedure check list and understand the process. | | * Maybe some sort of more automatic processing or electronic voting. But again, you know more about that than I do. | | * n/a | | * Have enough people to handle the load because at the end of the day you're tired and just want things to end. | | * Keep a clear table, advise the tellers what is to be done by sorting each vote recipient in a pile and then have more than one teller recount the ballots for each candidate. | | * nothing really | | * see above | | * n/a | | * No further recommendations. | | * n/a | | * None | | * Ask only essential questions on ballot -- if it isn't required, consider leaving it off | | * Set up teams earlier on who can assist with verifying the ballots once they are received. | | * Tabulation rules for voting centers were a bit buried in the DSP, and also spread among a summary document and an email from the GPP team. Recommend a single document just for tabulation and reporting results, so there's no question where to look. | | * No recs; tabulation was fine. Instructions were clear | | * Rather than sorting the votes into folders and counting messages, create a database to be used for tabulation. Processors can then easily handle tabulation when there is more than one vote in a message -- they just enter each vote into the database individually and move on. | | * Streamline the process by beginning to involve volunteers immediately, as soon as voting is opened. Have the call for volunteers early, so that all are in place from the start. | | * make it more clear | | * + See my remarks on software to save time. | | * Internet voting | | * Although I THOUGHT I was doing the right thing by following to the letter the rules for checking that a ballot was valid, it turns out the rules were a lot more squishy. e.g. I invalidated ballots that lacked a voting state, but remote ballots without a voting state were accepted. CONSISTENCY is important. | | * Larger space made available for the tabulators |  Other CommentsWhat other comments do you have?  |  | | --- | | * This was a wonderful experience. Any time! | | * The GPP was extremely rewarding for DA-UAE. We were pleasantly surprised at our voter turnout and enthusiasm for the GPP. Than you to everyone who worked tirelessly to make it happen! | | * hard copy join form should use USA date format mm/dd/yyyy because that what NB has, using the Euro format on the hard copy form invites data entry errors | | * thank you to DCPA | | * You all did a great job, and we are seeing the difference we made in the articles we are getting about DA - in Le Monde in France, on NPR, etc. It's fantastic! We will be ready for 2020. | | * With the numbers of "new members" the membership form seemed to be a consistent problem with people not quite knowing what to enter. Perhaps a bit more details such as "Residential address" change to "Street Address in Germany". Many military members used the APO address in this field and we had to have them cross this out and put the "Street Address in Germany" in the field.   For the Phone, perhaps a bold indication that "this is required."   For e-mail also something that indicates that "this is required".  The Membership Application was pretty simple already, but perhaps just a few clarifications here and there would help a bit. | | * In future, please consider online voting as an option in addition to the remote voting options offered this year. Many of our older, shut in members who live distant from the voting center and/or Internet facilities could not vote this year. And the marginal cost of putting someone in a vehicle to drive around the country during election week seeking out voters is too high. | | * As mentioned earlier, I recommend establishing the GPP Team as a standing committee. In off years, the committee might meet quarterly or as needed. But the importance of the GPP to DA suggests that we should never let the process out of our sight. We can conduct research, draft manuals and procedures, explore technological options, and pass institutional knowledge down to future generations effectively with such a committee. | | * Would be interesting to see pictures of other voting centers and DA activities - do we have a photo archive somewhere? | | * Amazing commitment from all involved, especially the organizers. Thank you for making the process easy - to volunteer, get involved, and most importantly, to vote. | | * As my main role was to verify and approve new members so that their vote could count, the most important thing is simply to have more assistance or develop a clever technological solutions within Nation Builder to working through the enormous backlog of new joins. | | * This was the first time I'd organised a GPP. I had lots of help from DAA Chair, Todd St. Vrain, who filled me in about the event in Sydney. That was 3 days before ours, so it was great to get feedback from someone who'd done it. TSV flew down to Melbourne the night before our GPP (we held the AGM a few hours before the GPP) and it was good to have him with us on the day. In the end however, it was up to us in Victoria to get it right. | | * I think the whole GPP went very well in Chiang Mai. We received many "thank you" comments for providing the opportunity to vote. It is important to choose popular venues to host the voting center and to continue to remind all chapter members of the voting events as well as to offer a remote ballot option. | | * this was my first time so it was an interesting experience. I'm glad to have participated in the process. | | * - The ballot design should match the order of the personal contact data that you have to check in the database (ask Cortnie Shupe). - The ballot for voting centers should have the actual vote at the bottom (below a fold) so that the people guarding the ballot box can make sure that all ballots were signed AND all info was given BEFORE it is thrown in the box. - There should be an easy and MUCH quicker electronic way to enter new members for same-day registration. The paper ones are good as a back-up, but that creates SO much extra work after the fact, and you can't read their chicken scratch, emails are wrong, etc. | | * Mailing on time and having to wait for the mail in ballots date because we couldn't afford to mail twice put a lot of pressure on us and was more than 1/3 our budget for the primary expenses. | | * Received very positive comments regarding our voting center. Felt it was a great success | | * Overall, stunning job by the excom, stunning job by volunteers. Just wish we had more volunteers, and maybe more training for volunteers in advance. But I recognize we are all volunteers and I don't know if anyone could've done more than was done without additional resources. | | * It was my first year operating a polling place. I learned a great deal about the election process and want to commend the Global Exec Committee for their dedication and support throughout this primary period. | | * We could perhaps provide advice on what events would be suitable accompaniments for a voting centre. And it might even be good to recommend that presenters sign a statement that they will not only not endorse any particular candidate but also say nothing about likely outcomes of the nominating process that might discourage participation. | | * Huge thanks to the gpp team! | | * Overall, the GPP was an incredible experience. But very intense. The requirement to have an AGM in the first quarter added to our work load. We held our AGM just prior to the start of one of the voting centres because we would have struggled to get 20 people back another day to meet quorum. Could there be more flexibility on the deadline for the AGM in an election year?  The other lesson was that we were unprepared for the surge in new members. We were getting 30 - 50 people a day. This was way too much for our Secretary to process alone. As country chair, I helped out, but it was a lot for two people. Advise country committees as early as November before the December holidays to start thinking about who can help process new members in anticipation of the GPP surge. | | * Hi Shari - I submitted this form previously, not sure what all I said. I am sure I mentioned Observers. This may be adding to what I said previously but I want to ensure my point is taken. I am referencing what takes place with Elections Canada, per Allenna Leonard's input. These make sense to me, and are my suggestions for DA to clarify in future elections: Observers must present official authorization from the campaig they represent to the voting center manager. They should do this IN ADVANCE so that voting center managers are prepared to accomodate them. They should arrive at the voting center BEFORE voting begins, so as not to disrupt the process. They SHOULD NOT wear any ID that identifies them with a particular candidate, to avoid influencing the voter. They should sit to one side, away from those handing out ballots. THEY SHOULD NOT SPEAK OR INTERACT WITH VOTERS. They can only interact with voters if they feel the voter is not being treated fairly. Then they step outside with them, and advise them re appropriate legal avenues. Actually, I'll just paste Allenna Leonard's comments from her experiences as scrutineer for Canada elections.  This makes sense to me, and this is unfortunately NOT what played out at our voting center. Instead, we had a situation as implied above.  "The rules are that you can sit at the polls and watch as voters are checked in but you must not either wear the colours of a political party or any insignia like a button. You may not speak about the candidate either. If you believe someone is being unfairly prevented from voting, you may go outside and give them the name and contact number of your party's lawyers. During the count, you may observe (and challenge) but not touch the ballots. If there is a question about a ballot (ours are paper) you may discuss whether or not it counts as a spoiled ballot or not and if the question isn't resolved, again contact your party's lawyers. There are often but not always representatives of all three main parties as scrutineers." | | * What an exhilarating process! Re-affirmed by the thrilling turnout and local and global press coverage. Sanders keeps mentioning the Dems Abroad result in his list of primary victories. We matter! | | * I really enjoyed participating and helping with the GPP process. I look forward to the next one and would like to volunteer right now to be on the GPP team. :) | | * Thanks again to everyone behind the scenes for all your hard work! | | * overall well run considering the global challange | | * Y'all did an absolutely amazing job with a mammoth task! I was glad to participate. As it is a learning process, I am sure the next election will go even more smoothly. Well done! | | * none | | * Thanks to the GPP for managing to keep their heads! | | * internet voting | | * Some of my post-mortem notes I jotted down after the primary:  - It terrified me to think of being late (traffic, unforeseen accident) and not opening the voting center. Can an alternate be named to cover such emergency situations?  - Is it possible to automate member ID in messages (similar to how name is populated now)? That way members have very easy access to their member number.  - Country of residence/membership - people got confused by this and put USA because many are not residents of the overseas country. (Work visa, student visa...) Country of MEMBERSHIP needs to be more clear if that's what we require.  - (Already mentioned elsewhere in this survey) Consistency on required fields. I spoiled ballots for not having voting state or with country of residence/membership wrong (US) or missing, but remotes were accepted without.  THANK YOU GPP TEAM!!!!!!!! | | * All in all, I have no criticism of our Board who did a great job under the direction of our GOTV Chair, Tim Whiting. | | * I'm glad we survived it. Thank you, Shari. | |