Testimony of Mark Radke,
Director of Marketing, Diebold Election Systems
before the
U.S. Election Assistance Commission
May 5, 2004
Washington D.C.

Commissioners of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission…my name is Mark Radke and I am Director of Marketing for Diebold Election Systems, a subsidiary of Diebold, Incorporated. We appreciate the opportunity to be with you today to discuss the benefits associated with Diebold's touch screen voting solutions.

To highlight the true advantages of our touch screen voting systems, we must first review why the Help America Vote Act was introduced to replace punch cards, lever, and centralized optical scan systems. In October of 2002 the Help America Vote Act was created to provide $3.86 billion to improve the process of voting in America and to better educate the electorate of the country concerning the voting process.

The 2000 Presidential election uncovered a number of major issues that existed within the voting process resulting in inaccuracies and disenfranchisement. These included:

An inability to determine voter intent

A high percentage of overvoting which voided the respective voter's selection within a race

A high percentage of undervoting, when a selection is not recorded within a specific race. Undervoting alone within the 2000 presidential election caused hundreds of thousands of votes to go uncounted.

And a lack of voter accessibility for blind, visually impaired and non-English speaking voters

How has Diebold's touch screen voting system assisted in solving these major issues?

Selections made by each voter are clearly indicated with an X surrounded by a red box, and there is not doubt concerning which candidate has been chosen. Voter intent is clear and concise.

Our touch screen voting solution completely eliminates overvoting, so this severe problem is immediately resolved. The system will not allow a voter to vote for more than the specified number of candidates within a specific race.

Undervoting is significantly reduced as selections are clearly indicated. Once the voter has viewed the entire ballot, a summary screen displays what choices have and have not been made within each race. Simply touching an unvoted race on the summary screen immediately returns the voter to the unvoted race, enabling them to make a selection.

The ability to significantly reduce undervoting was clearly experienced in the California counties using the Diebold touch screen system during the October recall election. During this election, the overall undervote percentage for the state of California on the recall question was 4.63%. Counties using punch card technology experienced a 6.32% undervote. Counties using optical scan technology experienced a 2.68% undervote. This percentage almost equals the 2.9% undervote in Florida during the 2000 election. Counties using Diebold's touch screen solution experienced a 0.73% undervote, by far the lowest of all technologies used. It was also 175% better than its nearest touch screen competitor.

The state of Georgia, which has already conducted over 450 successful elections using the Diebold touch screen system, experienced the same dramatic reduction in undervoting state-wide. During the 1998 Senate race, a 4.8% undervote was realized. During the 2000 presidential election, an undervote of 3.5% occurred. Once the state-wide Diebold touch screen system was deployed in all 159 counties for the gubernatorial election in 2002, the state experienced an undervote of 0.88%.

In 1998, 29 Georgia counties had an undervote percentage of 15% or greater. In 2002, when utilizing Diebold's touch screen systems, 26 of these same 29 counties had an undervote of less than 3%.

Based on input from many blind, visually impaired and physically challenged individuals, Diebold has the most accessible voting stations in the industry. Our voting stations meet or exceed all Section 508 standards associated with the Rehabilitation Act Amendment of 1998. This includes requirements for reach, height, voice guidance and other important capabilities.

Voters with limited vision can magnify the text and target areas of the touch screen ballot, enabling them to vote without assistance. Enlarged target areas are especially important for voters with Parkingsons Disease or other illnesses that disrupt dexterity. This feature, which can be activated at any time during the voting process is also helpful for voters who simply forget their glasses when they come to vote.

The AccuVote-TSX offers the capability to quickly adjust the contrast of the ballot on the touch screen, enabling people with color blindness or limited vision to more clearly view the screen. The simple touch of the High Contrast icon on the screen changes the standard ballot to a very sharp ballot presentation with black letters featured on a white background. This capability is a Federal Election Commission 2002 certification requirement.

Voters in wheelchairs can vote approaching the unit from the front or from the side. The AccuVote-TSX 10 pound voting tablet can be removed from the voting station and manually transported to a physically challenged voter driven to the voting location in an automobile. The voting tablet can also be placed on the tray of a wheelchair enabling a voter with limited dexterity to vote more comfortably on the touch screen voting station.

Every Diebold voting station offers voice guidance capability, so a voter can vote on any touch screen unit within a precinct. No disenfranchisement. A voter can make selections on the large 15 inch touch screen using virtually any type of object such as a finger, head pointer or tongue depressor.

For several years, Los Angeles County has used the Diebold touch screen solution for early voting. The ability to present over 5,000 ballot styles in seven different languages, including character languages, on each voting station is a capability that is unmatched in the industry.

The numbers from the March Super Tuesday election tell a compelling story -- zero security-related problems at the more than 55,000 Diebold touch-screen voting stations deployed across the country by elections officials; over 9 million voters had the opportunity to use electronic voting solutions, including the entire State of Georgia and virtually the entire state of Maryland; almost 130,000 visually impaired men and women had an opportunity to vote without assistance; 310,000 disabled people could vote more conveniently because the voting booth could accommodate them; 61,000 new American citizens had the opportunity to vote on a ballot written in their native language; and 562,000 older Americans were able to vote easily and intuitively. That's a proof of performance that is strong and irrefutable.

During the recent March primary election, the California Secretary of State conducted "parallel monitoring" testing of touch screen voting stations used throughout the state. The parallel monitoring process included the Secretary of State's staff pulling voting stations from selected precincts before the election began, and testing each unit for eight hours to verify its accuracy. The candidate selection process of the staff was even videotaped to provide an irrefutable audit of all activities. The completion of the parallel monitoring testing process concluded that each and every Diebold AccuVote-TSX voting station provided 100% accuracy.

While there have been questions and doubts raised that generally are theoretical in nature, it is clear that electronic voting systems are a significant advancement over previous voting technologies.

We've heard and read a lot of headline-grabbing references to such things as "Red Teams", Internet voting, security flaws, hacking and numerous other terms. What's been missing from these laboratory-originated critiques has been the real world experience of the voting booth, including the people and the procedures that are in place to conduct the election safely and securely.

In fact, one of the leading critics acknowledged that fact after he served as a poll worker in the March Primary. Professor Avi Rubin wrote the following: "In our paper, we described how the smartcards used by these machines had no cryptography on them, and we made the widely criticized claim that a teenager in a garage could manufacture smartcards and use them to vote 20 times. I now believe that this particular attack is not a real threat." Later in his recounting of his Election Day experience he said, "I started realizing that some of the attacks described in our initial paper were actually quite unrealistic, at least in a precinct with judges who worked as hard as ours did and who were as vigilant."

He also said this: "One thing absolutely amazed me. With very few exceptions, the voters really LOVED the machines. They raved about them to us judges. The most common comment was 'That was so easy.'" Now, I'm not suggesting that Professor Rubin has converted. In fact, he continues to object to electronic voting, but it is instructive that his eyes were opened to some of the checks and balances of our overall voting system.

We have accomplished the system security enhancements recommended by independent testing agencies through the implementation of four "umbrella" changes. First, we have removed all hard-coded encryption keys, passwords and PINs. All of these elements are now selected by each local board of elections and changed by them as often as they choose. Second, we also encrypted and authenticated uploads of election results. And third, we have digitally signed ballot definition files so that any unauthorized changes would be immediately detected. Again, Diebold Election Systems has already responded to the recommended security enhancements, and has submitted those changes for review by the independent testing agencies.

The second major topic has been that of the ability of individual voters to verify that the choices they have made for candidates and issues are correct and will be counted accordingly. I want to stress that this is a matter of public policy, not of technological capability. Diebold Election Systems can and would meet whatever standards are established when this public policy debate is resolved. We will have the capability to retrofit this solution to both the AccuVote-TSX and AccuVote-TS touch screen voting stations.

Diebold's touch screen systems were designed to promote maximum accessibility. There is not another voting station that provides the accessibility of our systems.

In summary, we do believe that Diebold Election Systems can provide voters throughout the country with an election solution that – when combined with the experience, dedication and oversight of state and local election officials -- will provide a safe, secure and reliable election.