

July 18, 2018

Contact: Garland Favorito  
(404) 664-4044

## **SAFE Voting Commission: No Plan, No Activity after 5 Weeks Was 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting Timed as Campaign Publicity Stunt?**

ATLANTA GA – Members of the new [voting system commission](#) tasked with studying options for Georgia’s next voting system have confirmed **they have received no plan and have been inactive since their initial three hour meeting five weeks ago**. Secretary of State (SOS) Brian Kemp announced the creation of the 18 member Secure, Accessible, Fair, Elections (SAFE) commission in April. He and Rep. Barry Fleming co-chair the commission that held its first meeting on June 13<sup>th</sup> in Marietta.

Members confirmed they have received **no work plan or activity timetable** for completing their study of options, which are expected to finish by the end of the year. Their anticipated schedule of meeting once every other month for three hours appears **wholly inadequate** for the commission to meet its stated objectives.

Secretary Kemp has consistently resisted attempts to update Georgia’s voting system despite claiming he would “**lead the charge**” at a 2010 Georgia Christian Alliance SOS debate. Three weeks after that debate he reversed his position and refused to support Rep. Tim Bearden’s [HB1215](#) that would have led to a new voting system. [[www.Voterga.org/history](http://www.Voterga.org/history)]

Secretary Kemp has focused on his gubernatorial campaign since establishing the SAFE commission and co-chairing it. The lack of a work plan, timetable and activities has rekindled original speculation that the initial commission meeting was timed as a **campaign publicity** gimmick.

VoterGA members quickly [urged](#) commission leaders and members to adopt Information Technology (IT) Systems Development Life Cycle (SDLC) **best practices**. A standard SDLC would first analyze the current system, define new requirements, and evaluate alternatives such as decentralization. Instead, commission leaders seemed poised to schedule vendor demonstrations. That raises concerns among IT professionals and Election Integrity (EI) advocates of allowing incumbent vendor ES&S to drive requirements for their own **self-interest**.

At the first meeting, VoterGA submitted a [request](#) to make a presentation to help the commission identify current system improvement opportunities and define new high level system requirements. After 5 weeks there is still no response.