AccuPoll

The AccuPoll voting system was re-examined in Austin on January 5, 2005. The release number for the entire system is 02.04.05. It is made up of the following sub-systems:

AVS - AccuPoll Voting Stattion - a DRE voting machine

VAW – Voting Administrative Workstation

CVC - Central Vote Consolidator

CCS - Central Count Server

The vendor has addressed the issues which were noted from the May 2004 examination:

- There is now real-time logging to the audit-log printer during central-count tabulation.
- The write-in votes are tallied and reported correctly.
- The straight-party choice is now displayed on the ballot review screen.
- The straight-party tallies are included in the reports.
- The part affiliation is now displayed next to the candidates name on the ballot review screen.
- An under-vote is now indicated on the ballot review screen.
- A provisional ballot that is accepted in error can now be removed.

Findings

The system does not have the capability to handle the early-voting requirements for a jurisdiction. The vendor stated that it is under development.

The paper receipt generated after a voter casts his ballot is an excellent start for what may become a requirement for all voting systems. However, the bar-code on the receipt was not validated, so it should not be used for a recount. Additionally, the printer (it appeared to be an off-the-shelf Lexmark printer) has not be tested for robustness.

The CVC allowed a results CD to be loaded twice during accumulation but it was not added to the database in the CCS. Instead, a message on the real-time log was printed for each duplicated ballot on the CD. This is unacceptable since it could seriously delay tabulation if this accident happened for a large precinct. A single line stating the precinct's number and any identification for the specific CD would suffice.

A "Precincts NOT Counted" report is needed. This would benefit a large jurisdiction with hundreds of precincts.

Conclusion

The system worked flawlessly and has many safeguards to prevent deliberate or accidental manipulation of the ballots and results.

The duplicate CD log message noted above can be fixed easily. I believe this is all that is necessary for the system to meet the requirements of the Texas Election Code. I recommend certification for the system after the log fix is verified.

Tom Watson Examiner