Comprehensive performance audits

Evaluating Elections:

Elections are about data!

How can we use all of that data to evaluate the overall performance of the election ecosystem?

- Outcomes data (turnout and voting data).
- Polling place performance data.
- Voting system logs and data.
- Registration data.
- Auditing data.
- Observational data.

Examples in the book from New Mexico efforts.
Comprehensive auditing issues

Costly for election officials who are focused on planning, implementing, then reconciling and finalizing an election.

- Timeliness? How can comprehensive auditing be done in real-time, so as to be relevant when concerns about the integrity of an election arise?
- Transparent? How can we make the results of comprehensive performance audits available to stakeholders and the public?
- Low cost? How can election officials conduct comprehensive performance audits easily and without a large investment of resources?
- Relevance? How do we make comprehensive performance auditing actionable for election officials?
Orange County pilot project

Collaboration with Orange County (CA) Registrar of Voters, Neal Kelley.

Goal: test approaches for comprehensive and real-time performance auditing using data from the 2018 primary and general election in OC.

Why OC?

- Large and diverse county.
- Expected (and got!) highly competitive congressional elections.
- OCROV collects a lot of evaluative data.
- Election administration in CA is changing quickly, so this election helps establish a baseline for evaluating future changes.
- Neal is a great collaborator.
Monitoring the Election

- Developed a project website (https://monitoringtheelection.us).
- Project launch April 16, 2018.
- Used the June and November elections in OC to pilot test a number of different methods to monitor the elections.
- Some of these methods involved direct data feeds from OCROV.
- Goal was to put onto the project website, as quickly as we could, short reports that summarized the results of each method.
- Solicit feedback from OCROV.
Pilot project components

- Continuous social media monitor: election day voting, voter fraud, remote voting, voter ID, and polling places.
- Voter registration database auditing: daily anomaly detection.
- For each election:
  - Mail ballot overview tracker.
  - Early voting observation study.
  - Election day observation study.
  - Post-election precinct turnout forensics.
  - Post-election candidate vote forensics.
  - Voter surveys.
Twitter monitoring
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- Election Day Voting
- Voter Fraud
- Remote Voting
- Voter ID
- Polling Places
Voter registration database monitoring

- Developed a process to securely obtain daily “snapshots” of OCROV database.
- Developed a methodology to link the snapshots, and scan the linked files for changes: records added, records removed, duplicate records, and records where fields have changed.
- After we accumulated a time-series of linked snapshots, we began to implement statistical anomaly detection.
- Detailed reports provided to OCROV; public summaries provided on the project website.
- The ”events” we have detected have all been correlated with OCROV activities.
## Evaluation and scaling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media monitoring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter registration auditing</td>
<td>Yes**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM tracker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early voting observation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election day observation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout forensics</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV forensics</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter surveys</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *s in table indicate caveats for discussion.
Next steps

● Continue the analyses of the primary and general election data we have collected, and produce performance audit and project report.
● Continue working with OCROV moving forward.
● Recruit other jurisdictions to test scale in 2020.
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