Kemp Commission Considers Unverifiable Voting Systems

GROVETOWN GA – The voting system commission established by Secretary of State (SOS) Brian Kemp held its second meeting on August 30th at the Columbia County Exhibition Center. Sec. Kemp shifted the 18 member Secure, Accessible, Fair, Elections (SAFE) commission from its initial June 13th meeting straight into vendor solution demonstrations. Unfortunately for Georgia, half of the six systems demonstrated last Thursday are unverifiable voting systems. Those systems tabulate votes hidden in bar codes that the voter has no means to verify.

The Georgia Senate attempted to outlaw that type of system during the last legislative session before its voting system bill eventually expired in the General Assembly. The Senate Ethics Committee amended SB403 with partial prohibitive language at the request of Election Integrity (EI) advocates before passing the bill. Just five months later, Kemp’s SOS office is considering buying the same type of equipment that the Senate and EI advocates tried to ban.

The SAFE meeting featured panel discussions on Voting Rights, Election Security, Voting Accessibility and Intergovernmental Operations. Each panel was moderated by a commission member who invited three guests. However, Sec. Kemp inserted two guest legislators into the Elections Security panel to dilute it and then blocked the moderator, Dr. Wenke Lee, from allowing audience questions. Kemp’s office had already moved to block public comments for the Voting Accessibility panel prior to the meeting while claiming the moderators had discretion.

The afternoon showcased presentations from six vendors who responded to a Request for Information (RFI) from Kemp’s SOS’s office. The RFI was issued as the first order of business of the commission after it was formed. Election integrity (EI) advocates and Information Technology (IT) professionals have continually urged Kemp’s office to create a plan to analyze the current system improvement opportunities and define new system requirements before engaging vendors. They argue that Kemp’s unorthodox approach seeks a solution before identifying the problems to solve and that it favors the incumbent vendor ES&S by concealing current system vulnerabilities and prejudicing members toward their products.

To date, Kemp has excluded EI advocates from the commission, blocked their attempts to make comments to the panels and ignored their requests to make a presentation to the commission for months.