



Online Voting – Frequently Asked Questions

Can online voting be as secure as Postal Voting?

The answer is yes, far more so. Internet voting tackles, in a very effective way, many of the most significant vulnerabilities already existing in remote postal voting as outlined in the following table:

| Challenge | Postal Voting | | Internet voting | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Eligibility assurance | Weak/ineffective authentication process susceptible to impersonation – Date of Birth and handwritten signatures are simple to intercept/gain knowledge of and impersonate | ✘ | Robust strong authentication process to verify eligibility of stated natural person using a variety of multi-factor processes including ‘two-step’ verification (similar to online banking) and biometric based systems (facial, voice and fingerprint recognition) | ✓ |
| Fraud prevention | Susceptible to interception/‘farming’ by family/community members, candidates | ✘ | Robust protective measures through advanced multi-factor authentication process and IP address logging | ✓ |
| User experience | Prone to error – Swapping of secrecy envelopes, missing identity statement | ✘ | Intuitive, frictionless and paper free – Eliminates accidental ballot spoils and voided ballots | ✓ |
| Accessibility | Extremely challenging for voters with disabilities – Privacy of secret ballot regularly violated | ✘ | Easy to use. Seamless integration with existing accessibility peripherals (e.g. Screen readers, switches, ‘sip-puff’ tube’) | ✓ |
| Protection of privacy | Paper based – Susceptible to interception, breach of privacy, tampering. | ✘ | Extremely robust physical, logical and procedural protocols. Secured using network and application level cryptographic processes and digital signatures | ✓ |
| Voter Coercion | Exposed to voter coercion | ✘ | Multiple voting sessions offer coercion resistance | ✓ |
| Spoiled ballots | Susceptible to inadvertent mismarking of ballot and/or submission without PV statement | ✘ | Intuitive user interfaces reduce user error and enforce election rules | ✓ |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Accuracy | Prone to miscounting and non-counting | ✘ | All ballots counted with 100% accuracy and 0% ambiguity | ✓ |
| Transparency | Limited transparency – No verifiability | ✘ | Fully auditable processes including ‘end-end-verifiability’. | ✓ |
| Impact on Local Authority | Excessive – Requires significant time, human resource and IT investment to process | ✘ | Reduced time and human resource requirements. Significant cost savings | ✓ |