



A Glossary of Voting Terminology





- Terms from actual elections
- Requirements
- Attacks
- Cryptography
- Determining the winner
- Some academic systems of renown

Voter credentials







Ballot



Ballot box





Booth / Voting Booth / Pollbooth



DRE = Direct Recording Electronic (voting machine)



Diebold (USA)



Nedap (NL)

VVPAT = Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail







HAVA = Help America Vote Act



chain of custody





eligibility

only individuals belonging to the group may vote.

democracy

only eligible voters may vote, and they may only vote once.

accuracy

- result depends on *all* cast votes,
- result depends on nothing more than cast votes,
- result depends on cast votes as they were cast.

fairness

no intermediate results.

universal verifiability

given the set of cast votes, anyone can verify that the announced result is correct.

Individual verifiability

a voter can verify that her vote counts for the correct candidate.

eligibility verifiability

anyone can verify that the set of cast votes originates only from eligible voters.

Requirements - privacy

anonymity

no observer can learn how a voter voted.

receipt-freeness

the voter cannot prove how she voted.

coercion-resistance (JCJ05)

receipt-freeness + resistance to:

- forced randomised voting,
- forced abstention,
- voting in the voter's stead.

End-to-end verifiability:

- cast-as-intended a voter can verify that her input to the process matches her intent.
- recorded-as-cast a voter can verify that the record of her vote matches what she gave as input.
- tallied-as-recorded anyone can verify that the announced result matches the public records of votes cast.
- counted-as-cast a voter can verify that her vote counts in favour of the candidate for whom she cast it.



- ItalianLuxembourgian attack.
- chain voting.



gerrymandering.







Family voting.



SecVote 2010, 3 sep 2010

Hugo Jonker - p. 17/27



chain voting.



blind signatures:

 $deblind(sign_A(blind(msg,k))) = sign_A(msg).$

homomorphic encryption:

 $enc(msg_a,k) \otimes enc(msg_b,k) = enc(msg_a \oplus msg_b,k).$

- RSA78
- ElGamal85
- Paillier99

- . . .



- commitments.
- proofs:
 - (interactive) Zero Knowledge Proof (ZKP)
 - Designated Verifier Proofs (DVP)
- Fiat-Shamir heuristic:

Make interactive proofs non-interactive.



- Plaintext Equivalence Test: $enc(msg_a, k) \stackrel{?}{=} enc(msg_b, k).$
- Plaintext Inequivalence Test: $enc(msg_a, k) \stackrel{?}{<} enc(msg_b, k)$.



Mixnets



adapted from [HS00]

Cryptography

Randomized Partial Auditing / Checking [JJR02]



How to fill in the ballot / determining the winner

- Plurality voting (single winner)
- FPTP = First Past The Post winner = candidate with most votes.
- Instant Runoff / Alternative Vote
- Approval voting
- Range voting
- Condorcet Winner = pairwise most preferred candidate.
- Borda count rank candidates, most preferred wins.

Determining the winner

Arrow's Theorem

No system such that:

- if every voter prefers A to B, then the group prefers A to B.
- if no voter's preference between *A* and *B* is changed if *C* is added, then the group's preference between *A* and *B* also remains unchanged.
- no single voter can determine the group's preference.

Some influential systems



SecVote 2010, 3 sep 2010

Hugo Jonker - p. 26/27



Thanks for your attention!