What do national authorities say about verifying electronically tabulated election results?

Brennan Center Task Force on Voting System Security, 2007

"Recommendation #1: CONDUCT AUTOMATIC ROUTINE AUDITS OF PAPER RECORDS. The Task Force has concluded that (paper ballots) without an automatic routine audit are of questionable security value. By contrast, a paper record accompanied by a solid automatic routine audit can go a long way toward making the least difficult attacks more difficult."[1]

League of Women Voters of the United States, 2009

"Generally, (post-election) audits can be divided into two categories: (1) reviews of processes and procedures that contribute to an orderly and fair election and (2) verification of the vote counts. The former can be conducted periodically with follow-up examinations implemented to assure that flaws in the process have been corrected, or when there are significant changes in personnel, equipment or election law. Verification of vote counts should occur after every election."[2]

Common Cause, 2012

"When voting machines fail, the valid outcome of the election is at risk. Software malfunctions combined with human error can lead to the declaration of the losing candidate as the winner. That is why post-election audits are particularly important. A post-election audit is a check on the election process. Good post-election audits check machine results by inspecting some of the paper ballots manually. Well-designed and executed audits can catch and correct errors that make someone other than the true winner appear to win."[3]

Douglas Jones, PhD, Professor of Computer Science, University of Iowa, 2012

"Accountability is a critical aspect of any election. In order to address security concerns, we need to verify after the election that the right person has been declared the winner. Just as businesses routinely conduct audits, so too should elections be routinely audited."[4]

Verified Voting Foundation, 2013

"Well-designed and properly performed post-election audits can significantly mitigate the threat of error, and should be considered integral to any vote counting system... Such audits are arguably the most economical component of a quality voting system, adding a very small cost for a large set of benefits."[5]

Pres. Obama's Presidential Commission on Election Administration, 2014

"Recommendation: Audits of voting equipment must be conducted after each election … to ensure both the vote totals match the votes cast and that any problems related to machinery are reported and resolved." [6]

---

[1] *The Machinery of Democracy: Protecting Elections in an Electronic World,* Lawrence Norden, Eric Lazarus, and the Brennan Center for Justice, 2007, page 212

[2] *Report on Election Auditing,* by the Election Audits Task Force of the League of Women Voters of the United States, January 2009, page 4.

[3] "The State of the Right to Vote After the 2012 Election", Common Cause Testimony for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, December 2012

[4] *Broken Ballots: Will Your Vote Count?* Douglas Jones and Barbara Simons, 2012, page 278

[5] *Post-election Audits: Why Audit Election Results?* Foundation website, *www.verifiedvoting.org/resources/post-election-audits/, accessed August 15, 2015*

[6] *The American Voting Experience: Report and Recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Election Administration*, January 2014