

1 inactive state legislation, some of the printer
2 reliability requirements. We -- we took a look at what
3 was out there. These were available for review as well,
4 and we didn't, to my recollection, get comments
5 specifically on these sorts of requirements. So I feel
6 as if we did our research and we'd stand by it.

7 MALE: Right. John, having said that you did
8 your research, that doesn't preclude a state from
9 raising the bar and keeping it as a should and
10 indicating the shall the coming that's putting everyone
11 on notice, but it's not telling the state that they
12 can't continue to do what they're doing.

13 MALE: And, John, basically, I mean, this is
14 overall very good work product. I think y'all have done
15 good research. These are things that really should be
16 there if you're gonna have voter-verifiable paper audit
17 trails. I'm just concerned that I don't think we really
18 know what effect this is going to have on the systems
19 that Nevada and California are currently planning to
20 rely on for the January -- or the 2006 elections. And I
21 think perhaps we need to determine what that will be.
22 One thing we could do, I think we have engineers from

1 the companies in the audience. We could perhaps on the
2 break which is now 'bout 20 minutes past due, see if the
3 -- the two companies that are particularly affected, see
4 this as being something they can meet or that they
5 already do meet.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: For the break, I'll make a
7 statement and then maybe we can ponder this. I don't
8 think we are here to basically approve the operations of
9 currently available equipment. If that's all we're here
10 for, then we're wasting everybody's time. We are here
11 to set minimum requirements to established trust and
12 confidence in voting systems. If there are equipment
13 out there that may have been purchased by certain states
14 that don't meet those criteria, I don't think it is our
15 function to basically approve their operati --
16 continuing operations. I will not go any further. I
17 will just stop there and let's think about that whether
18 you agree with that statement or not and at this point,
19 I'll -- I suggest that we break for -- until 10 after 10
20 -- I mean 10 after 11. And then we can continue with
21 this discussion. Thank you.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: John, could you set up
2 (indiscernible)? Are we on page 6-21, item 6.0.2.7.2.2?
3 Is that?

4 MALE: That is correct.

5 MALE: Mr. Chairman, you challenged us to
6 think about it during the break and come back to discuss
7 it. Before John continues, I'd like to make a
8 statement, if I may.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

10 MALE: Okay.

11 In consultation with the engineers here from
12 ES&S, Sequoia Pacific, and Diebold, all three gentlemen
13 agree that number one, the goals for functionality and
14 security and reliability that we've put into this
15 standard are quite desirable. They all agree that the
16 functions that we're calling for are doable. They are
17 very concerned, though, that the functions that we're
18 calling for with the design limitations that we're
19 putting on the solutions are not doable. I think that
20 needs to be addressed very short order. I don't know if
21 it's a product that we can do as a committee.