Risks of Computers: Voting Machines
Voting Systems and Computers

- There is a long history of problems (or perceived problems) with voting systems
- Technology has frequently been invoked to solve the problems
- Over the years, many different kinds of voting machines
- Elections are process-driven and often highly partisan
Requirements

- Accuracy
- Voter privacy
- Resistant to fraud
- Resistant to error
- Resistant to information leakage
- Usable by voters
- Usable by handicapped voters
- More…
Participants

- Voters
- Election boards (usually county-run, but following state standards)
- Poll workers
- Poll watchers from political parties
- Courts (state and federal)
- News media
Processes (Simplified!)

- Voter registration
- Distribution of the eligible voter rolls
- Zeroing the counting mechanism
- Voter verification at the polls—and must handle challenges
  - Voter must be given the right ballot
- Casting a vote
- “Closing the polls”
- Quick count and reporting
- Preservation of the ballots
- The official count
- Recounts
Voter Registration

• How is registration data stored?
  • Hard copy? (I once had problems voting because the cards were alphabetized incorrectly)
  • Computers? What about software bugs? Backups?
  • What about typographical errors in someone’s name? Suffixes like “Jr.” or “III”? Name collisions?
Zeroing the Count

- Must show that no votes are recorded before the polls open
- Transparent or translucent ballot boxes; sometimes opened and showed to everyone
- Poll workers—and watchers—verify the counters on mechanical voting machines
- Print a “zero tape” on an electronic voting machine
Voter Verification

- How do you find a voter?
- Software?
- What if the software is buggy?
- What if the system crashes?
- What about network links in “vote anywhere” jurisdictions?
- What about exception processing?
Exception Processing

- There are strict—and complicated—processes for verifying and recording each voter
- Sometimes, there’s an exception: someone who isn’t listed but claims to be registered, or perhaps gets a court order allowing them to vote
- What is the process? Does the software support it?
- Example: some electronic polling books produce a magnetic card with the proper ballot for that voter. Can it handle an unlisted voter?
- Computers are inflexible!
Casting a Vote

- Paper—it’s pretty easy, though people can get it wrong
- (There are strict legal requirements for valid ballots)
- Mechanical machines: move levers; move large lever to vote
- Punch cards—but watch out for hanging chads
- Electronic: many different ways...
  - Press physical buttons under ballot labels
  - Use a touch screen, repeatedly
  - Mark paper ballots and immediately feed to an optical scanner
- Internet voting?
- Many problems in this space—more shortly
Closing the Polls

- Must show that no votes are recorded after the polls close
- Seal the ballot boxes in a verifiable way
- Lock the actuating mechanism on mechanical voting machines
- Run the software that prints the vote totals to paper tapes and disables further voting
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Ballot Box Seals
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Quick Count

- Reporters want the totals *immediately*
- Paper ballots take a long time to count
- (That’s one reason Americans prefer voting machines; another is the length and complexity of the ballots)
- Precincts send the immediate results to the local election board: phone calls, faxes, dial-up modems, more
Errors in the Quick Count

- It’s easy to misread the numbers
- Handwriting errors in manual processes
- Data entry errors
- Arithmetic errors
- Buggy tallying software
Showing That All Votes were Counted
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Preserving the Ballots

- The official count takes longer, and is done with more care
- Goal: try to eliminate the errors in the quick count
- Also: handle absentee ballots and provisional ballots
- This is the count that really matters
- So: recount the paper ballots, reread the mechanical counters, and—for electronic voting machines—use the data recorded on the memory cards
Errors...

- The quick count printouts from some voting machines should be the same as what’s on the memory cards.
- Not always...
- In 2008, Ed Felten found a precinct where the tapes showed 280 Democratic voters, and 95 votes for Obama
- The memory cards showed 279 and 94
- But the tapes should just be a printout of what’s on the memory card!
- The discrepancy was never satisfactorily explained. There was no independent investigation.
- (The vendor attributed a previous discrepancy to operators pressing buttons they shouldn’t have. There are other errors that can’t be explained that way.)
Recounts

- With paper ballots, a recount makes lots of sense
- With mechanical machines, you can eliminate errors in reading the counters or transcribing the figures
- With electronic machines, you’re just running the same software again—there’s no independent check
Englewood Voting Machine Tape

- The per-candidate totals show 84 Democratic votes and 22 Republican votes
- The ballot selection totals show 83 Democratic votes and 22 Republican votes
- Why the discrepancy?

(From https://freedom-to-tinker.com/blog/felten/nj-election-discrepancies-worse-previously-thought-contradict-sequoias-explanation/)
What’s the Problem?

- Software can be buggy
- Vendors consider their source code proprietary, and have often blocked investigations
- There is nothing else to check on a recount: the software is the software
Errors!

- There is a long history of errors with DRE voting systems
- The NJ election tapes
- “Fleeing voters”: voter who don’t press the ”cast my vote” button
- Cuyahoga, OH: none of the vote-tallying counts agreed
- NC: a 12-bit counter overflowed in a large precinct
- Many more...
Counting Software is Also Buggy

- Bernalillo County, NM: in-person voters used DRE machines; absentee ballots used optical mark cards
- On Election Day in 2000, the absentee ballots appeared to go for Gore
- That was odd—in that jurisdiction, absentee ballots tend to skew Republican
- The problem: the counting program didn’t handle the “straight ticket” option
- The elections supervisor: the software was buggy
- The vendor: he programmed it incorrectly
Why Use DRE Machines?

• They’re cheaper and mechanically more reliable
• Blind voters can cast ballots without assistance
• Other handicaps are also more easily accommodated
• They report results very quickly
Evaluations

• To my knowledge, *every* independent evaluation of DRE machines has found serious flaws

• Bad crypto, poor design, no voter privacy, buggy software, susceptibility to viruses, and more

• California even decertified many
Physical Security

- If voting equipment isn’t properly safeguarded, tampering can occur
- *Chain of custody must be maintained throughout the election process*
- Paper ballot boxes can be stuffed, before, during, or after voting
- Tamper with the gears and cams on mechanical machines
- Reprogram electronic voting machines
- There are supposed to be security seals, but they’re easy to bypass
- It’s much easier to introduce subtle, unauditable flaws
Pacman!

- These machines are generally have their programming on a compact flash card
- There’s supposed to be a security seal—but those are easy to bypass
- Alex Halderman and his students reprogrammed a voting machine to be a Pacman game
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https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TpMDCArdzwA

(Photos courtesy Ed Felten)
Current Standards

- Most places are moving to optical mark ballots that are scanned immediately
- Voters can verify that their ballots were read correctly, and there are pieces of paper for hand recounts
- But: do voters actually check the scan results? Not really...
Other Ideas

- Internet voting
- Cryptographically verified voting
Internet Voting

- It’s software, with all that implies
- It’s running on ordinary PCs with ordinary Web browsers
- (Washington, DC, ran a trial election that way, and challenged people to break it. Halderman and his students made it play the U. Michigan fight song when people cast ballots.)
- Imagine an electoral virus
- Imagine one written by a country that wanted to influence another country’s elections
- What about authentication? Coercion? Usability?
Cryptographic Schemes

- Use fancy cryptography to cast and tally votes
- Anyone can look at the published (cryptographic) vote totals and verify that their vote was counted
- No one else can tell who voted for whom
- But—it’s still all done with software
We Can Build ATMs; What’s Different About Voting?

- ATMs have audit logs, cameras, etc.—but for voting, we need privacy
- Consumers get bank statements—but there’s no receipt for your votes
- Transactions can be checked and (if necessary) rolled back—but we rarely rerun elections
- Banks will spend more money than elections boards will...
Breaking News: Virginia Decertifies AVS WinVote DRE Machines

- Runs Windows XP Embedded, but with no patches since 2004
- (The system was too old for some standard security tools!)
- Uses WiFi with WEP—and an unchangeable password of “abcde”, and you can’t disable WiFi without disabling the voting software
- Lots of ports open—including disk-sharing. It’s a WiFi file server!
- Administrator password hardwired to “admin”
- The database password is hardwired to “shoup”, the previous company name
- The USB ports are only marginally protected

Conclusions

- With current technology, DRE machines are not nearly good enough
- We need a voter-verifiable audit trail
- We also need one that people will actually check
- The security and correctness of a voting system is a systems problem: you have to get them all right
- Very few security or software engineering people have any confidence in today’s electronic voting systems