PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 7/17/21 9:00 AM Received: July 16, 2021 Status: Pending_Post Tracking No. kr6-t7b0-c1n4 Comments Due: July 16, 2021 Submission Type: Web

Docket: NIST-2021-0003 RFI: Promoting Access to Voting

Comment On: NIST-2021-0003-0001 Promoting Access To Voting

Document: NIST-2021-0003-DRAFT-0150 Comment on FR Doc # 2021-12619

Submitter Information

Name: Neal McBurnett Address: Boulder, CO, 80304 Email: Phone:

General Comment

All aspects of voting should be made as accessible as possible. But ensuring that the election itself has integrity is also paramount. So voting systems must also comply with the essential elements of the VVSG 2.0 which require software independence. And local procedures must ensure robust transparency, auditability and actual auditing of the voting process.

Some approaches have been suggested to bypass the highly transparent and software independent approach of ensuring a voter verified paper ballot, e.g. via some of the highly insecure private software packages from Democracy Live and Voatz used in some states. These approaches not only fail to secure the privacy of the vote, as documented the Trail of Bits reports on those two systems, but also allow votes to be linked to voters on the server side (severely undermining the "privacy" goal), and put the entire election at risk of cyber attack.

Methods of voting that do not meet the VVSG 2.0 security requirements should not be used.

Near-term approaches for print-disabled voters include taking accessible voting systems to the homes of voters.

But we should also accelerate research into truly accessible end-to-end verifiable voting systems as discussed in the E2E-VIV report (https://www.usvotefoundation.org/E2E-VIV). Research should include techniques like code voting. See Remotegrity (https://eprint.iacr.org/2013/214) and Seventh Estate (https://github.com/seventh-estate/seventh-estate) for some of the more recent research on that end.