

A PRELIMINARY QUESTION: IS E-VOTING ACTUALLY USEFUL FOR OUR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS? WHAT DO WE NEED IT FOR?

Dr. Jordi Barrat i Esteve
Universitat Rovira i Virgili – Catalonia
jordi.barrat@urv.cat
<http://pagina.de/jordibarrat>

SUMMARY

I – Technical optimism.

Consolidated systems

II – Non updated images.

III – Specific groups.

IV – More consultations.

V – Higher & Better turnout.

Non-consolidated systems

VI – Brazil.

VII – India.

VIII – Concluding remarks

I – TECHNICAL OPTIMISM

- Technical optimism – serious danger
 - a) Legal and social issues
 - b) No enough audits

II – NON UPDATED IMAGE

«modernising how people vote will not, per se, improve democratic participation but failure to do so is likely to weaken the credibility and legitimacy of democratic institutions» (2003: sl. 34).

Remmert, Michael (2003) *Developing a common framework for e-voting in Europe: The Council of Europe's draft recommendation on the legal, operational and technical aspects of e-voting*, ACEEEO – Association of Central and Eastern European Election Officials, Annual Conference / London – October 2003.

www.coe.int/t/e/integrated%5Fprojects/democracy/02%5FActivities/02%5Fe%2Dvoting/04%5FBackground%5Fdocuments/07_Presentation_MR.asp#TopOfPage [August 17th 2004]

- No automatic obligation, but keep aware.

III – SPECIFIC GROUPS

- Useful for some specific groups of voter with traditional and permanent difficulties to participate.
 - residents living abroad
 - a) only Internet voting
 - b) Catalonia 2003 (Mexico, Chile, Argentina, Belgium and USA)

disabled people

- a) blind – audio guides [(Coahuila 2005, Mexico DF 2006 (vid. image))]
- b) others – home voting



IV – MORE CONSULTATIONS

- Less economic costs – more consultations, more voting options
- Is e-voting cheaper? **No clear.**
 - a) touch-screens
 - expensive e-voting machines
 - hardware & software updatings.
 - paper trails / optical ballots
 - b) Internet voting
 - controlled / non-controlled environment
 - hardware & software updatings



V – HIGHER & ... TURNOUT

- Higher turnout
 - a) no precedents → weak results
 - b) complementary voting channel ✓
 - c) e-voting only (*Barcelona Technical Engineering Association / CETIB*) ✕

CETIB		
	2001 (paper)	2005 (e-voting only)
Turnout	9.6% ca.	8.4% ca.

V – ... BETTER TURNOUT

- Better turnout
 - a) geographical distribution of votes (CETIB)
 - b) direct and personal voting vs. delegation of votes (Stockholders Assemblies)

CETIB				
	Members / total census	2001	2005	2005 (only e-voting channel)
<i>Barcelonès</i>	50%	71%	64%	53%

VI – BRAZIL & VII – INDIA

- Brazil
 - a) 100% touch-screen voting
 - b) Images of candidates / digital gap
- India
 - a) very easy system

VIII – CONCLUDING REMARKS

- social and legal issues cannot be excluded from technological innovations such as e-voting systems (the need to prevent outdated political systems, usefulness for specific groups)
- no room for adventurous behaviour
 - a) United States / Diebold
 - b) Spain / Indra & Home Office

THANK YOU!!

jordi.barrat@urv.cat

<http://pagina.de/jordibarrat>