

From: Douglas G.Towne <dougt@drglobal.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 7:56 AM
To: Al Davidson (Temporary)
Subject: standards

Al,
Unfortunately by the time I was able to get the standards converted to something I could access the deadline was passed. I have included them below for your consideration. You will not that I have used the Automark as an example basis since that is the system I know best. Other accessible systems may have the same issues. Could we meet at some point the week of the 29th?

Req.

ID

UVS Requirement

(The System will ...)

Comments

D-2

When activated for the voter, list the appropriate contests and measures on the first series of screens presented, in order to give the voter the opportunity to verify that they will be voting on the correct ballot.

In my opinion this is likely to cause confusion and frustration on the part of the voter. Some will try to vote on these screens and think the system is not working right. The frustration will come from the added length of time it will take for the voter to go through the screens.

The AutoMARK for example list contests individually, screen by screen where the voter can make selections. It does not list a preview summary prior to displaying the first votable contest screen. This is true for both the visual as well as the audible ballot presentation. The voter however, is not prevented from stepping through all contests before starting to vote.

D-3

Tabulate each voter's candidate and question selections as the ballot is cast.

This standard pre supposes that the system will operate totally as an electronic system with out the benefit of a paper trail. This is not a bad thing in the view of many, but many more will oppose no paper systems. This causes potential legal challenges to such a system.

Obviously, for example since the AutoMARK is a ballot marking device, there is no tabulation. The output is a ballot with the voter selections printed which must then be tabulated.

D-4

Have a public counter that displays the number of ballots cast.

This and the previous standard pre suppose that the system will be an all in one machine that will allow the voter to cast votes and then will count them at the same time. It is hard to see the purpose for each machine to show totals. Such numbers could inadvertently influence voters who are undecided.

Again, for example since the AutoMARK is not a tabulator, it does not display the number of ballots cast. It does display the number of ballots printed. If AutoCAST capability is used (these are ballots that go into a secure receptacle attached to the back of the unit rather than returned to the voter), it does maintain a separate count of the number that have been place in the ballot container.

D-26

Provide a screen response that would allow a voter to request the list of certified write-ins. The list, specific to the voter's unique ballot style, should appear on the screen (pop-up) for the voter to view and select from.

If a list of certified write-ins exist then they should be printed on the ballot as write-in candidates.

The AutoMARK for example has no knowledge of certified write-ins. Thus it does not have this ability. Candidates are either on the ballot or can be written in by the voter by typing any name after selecting a write-in position in a contest. It is up to an election official to validate a write-in selection and either count it or not. This is no different than how hand voted paper ballots are treated.

The standards do not go far enough in my opinion. They do not for example set forth requirements for an accessible absentee voting system. Such a system should:

- * provide access to the voter through the most common technology available to consumers. (telephone)
- * It should secure the voters identity by voice print or a one time numbered code.
- * It should be available to all voters not just voters with disabilities.
- * It should provide a printed paper copy at the election officials end if paper is part of the rest of the system.
- * Votes from the system should be able to be seamlessly and anonymously included in the vote totals.

- * It should be able to audibly present the ballot in multiple languages
 - * It should be an alternative system that a voter can register for instead of a mailed paper ballot.
- Obviously other standards may need to be developed for such a system once development discussions begin.

Appreciatively,
Douglas George Towne (Doug)
Chief Executive Officer
Disability Relations Group

V 727-531-1000
C 727-452-8132
dougt@drgglobal.com
13126 Thoroughbred Loop
Largo, FL. 33773
www.drgglobal.com
Quar Kur Non
Why Not