

Next-Gen Voting Systems for the 99%

Philip B. Stark

Department of Statistics
University of California, Berkeley

EVN Annual Conference
San Diego, CA
5–7 March 2014

So you need a new voting system . . . what are the options?

- Commercially offerings expensive, inflexible, hard to audit
- DIY, like Los Angeles and Travis counties?
- Design: usability, auditability, cost, maintainability, interoperability . . .
- Needs:
 - money
 - design team, functional specs, RFP, procurement process
 - manufacturer?
 - certification?
 - legislation? lobbying?
- Voter-marked paper simplest, cheapest, easiest to audit (if done right—current systems not)

Pre-election tests of equipment or post-election validation of outcomes?

- Need to test anything essential to cast votes on election day: Usability of equipment and ballots, reliability of BMDs, etc. (Much less to test for voter-marked paper!)
- Q1: Performance of new equipment in ideal bench test?
Q2: Accuracy in current election, as maintained, deployed, etc.?
- Need more focus on procedures and conditions of use, esp. creating and curating the audit trail.
- Evidence-Based Elections: auditability + auditing.
Require convincing evidence that electoral outcome is right.

A voting system for the 99%

- LA & STAR-Vote: great, but overkill for most jurisdictions
- Better to vote on office equipment, not voting equipment:
 - open-source ballot design software incorporating UX principles
 - printed ballots or BOD using commodity PCs & printers & open-source software
 - voter-marked paper (BMDs for accessibility)
 - commodity scanners & open-source software to make CVRs
 - compliance audits and risk-limiting audits to base elections on evidence
 - need support ecosystem for jurisdictions w/ little IT expertise
- Cheap and easy to buy or replace, can use latest & best
- Break “vendor lock” and stop the money pump