

# Los Angeles County VSAP Tally 2.1 Voting System Accessibility, Usability, and Privacy Test Report for California Secretary of State

CHI-20006-AUPTR-01

<b>Vendor Name</b>	County of Los Angeles
<b>Vendor System</b>	<i>VSAP Tally 2.1</i>

Prepared by:



SLI Compliance<sup>SM</sup>  
4720 Independence St.  
Wheat Ridge, CO 80033  
303-422-1566  
[www.SLICompliance.com](http://www.SLICompliance.com)

Accredited by the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) for VSTL status.



Copyright © 2020 SLI Compliance<sup>SM</sup>, a Division of Gaming Laboratories International, LLC

## Revision History

Date	Release	Author	Revisions
8/3/2020	v1.0	M. Santos	Initial Release;

## Disclaimer

The Certification Test results reported herein must not be used by the client to claim product certification, approval, or endorsement by NVLAP, NIST, or any agency of the Federal Government. Results herein relate only to the items tested.

## Trademarks

- SLI is a registered trademark of SLI Compliance, a Division of Gaming Laboratories International, LLC.
- All other products and company names are used for identification purposes only and may be trademarks of their respective owners.

The tests referenced in this document were performed in a controlled environment using specific systems and data sets and results are related to the specific items tested. Actual results in other environments may vary.

## Opinions and Interpretations

There are no SLI opinions or interpretations included in this report.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
REFERENCES.....	4
EQUIPMENT TESTED .....	4
<b>CERTIFICATION TEST RESULTS SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
TESTING SUMMARY.....	4
<i>Volunteer One</i> .....	5
<i>Volunteer Two</i> .....	6
<i>Volunteer Three</i> .....	7
<i>Volunteer Four</i> .....	8
<i>Volunteer Five</i> .....	9
<i>Volunteer Six</i> .....	10
<i>Volunteer Seven</i> .....	11
<i>Volunteer Eight</i> .....	12
<b>FINAL CONSIDERATIONS</b> .....	<b>13</b>



## Introduction

---

SLI Compliance is submitting this test report as a summary of the certification testing efforts for the County of Los Angeles' Voting Solutions for All People Tally 2.1 (**VSAP Tally 2.1**) voting system. The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the certification testing and the findings of the testing effort for the **VSAP Tally 2.1** voting system.

This effort included accessibility, usability, and privacy testing of the **VSAP Tally 2.1** voting system's Ballot Marking Device (BMD) component.

## References

- California Voting System Standards (CVSS)

## Equipment Tested

The **VSAP Tally 2.1** voting system component involved in this test included:

- BMD firmware/hardware, polling place

The BMD is the primary touchpoint for the voter and the hub of the voting system, guiding users with screen prompts and symbols. The BMD features a touchscreen, an audio-tactile interface (controller and headphones), paper handler (scanner and printer), QR code scanner, and dual-switch input which voters use to generate, verify, and cast paper ballots. Completed ballots are transferred to the integrated ballot box, which can be detached for unloading.

## Certification Test Results Summary

---

### Testing Summary

The sessions were conducted with LA County personnel acting as poll workers and volunteers voting on the **VSAP Tally 2.1** BMDs. When the volunteers arrived, they were given a briefing on the testing and the devices. The sessions were a free form, ad hoc test where the volunteers were able to vote a ballot in any manner that they chose.

The volunteers provided feedback in real-time as they were voting, as well as completing an Accessibility Test survey for each device. Additionally, all observations were recorded as each volunteer navigated their way through the process.



## Volunteer One

Table 1 – Volunteer One Survey

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
The voting method was private.	X			
I feel I can use this system to vote independently.	X			
I am confident that my vote was recorded accurately.	X			
The voting instructions were clear and complete.	X			
The voting method was easy to use.	X			
I could read the display easily.	X			
I could understand the speech	X			
The assistive device(s) were easy to reach and use.	X			
I found the system confusing to use.	See Summary			
The timeframe it took to vote was what I expected.	X			

### Volunteer One Summary

Volunteer One was surveyed after the testing and responded that they would feel comfortable using this system.

The tester liked that the voice used in the audio was not a computerized voice.

The tester also noted that when there was more than one candidate, the instructions did not repeat when you switched between contests. For example, if they moved forward and then went back to make a change.

The tester also noted that the tactile switch seemed too sensitive and wanted to know if there was a way to adjust the sensitivity.

The tester also inquired about adjusting the speed of the audio.

No concerns were voiced over privacy issues.



## Volunteer Two

Table 2 – Volunteer Two Survey

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
The voting method was private.	X			
I feel I can use this system to vote independently.	X			
I am confident that my vote was recorded accurately.	X			
The voting instructions were clear and complete.		X		
The voting method was easy to use.	X			
I could read the display easily.	N/A			
I could understand the speech output.	See Summary			
The assistive device(s) were easy to reach and use.	X			
I found the system confusing to use.	See Summary			
The timeframe it took to vote was what I expected.	See Summary			

### Volunteer Two Summary

Volunteer Two was surveyed after the testing and responded that they would feel comfortable using this system.

The tester felt that the down arrow key on the assistive device was too sensitive. The tester felt it repeated too much.

The tester was concerned that there was no braille for the selection button.

The tester also felt that the process to complete the ballot took longer than expected.

The tester felt the latency response was annoying.

No concerns were voiced over privacy issues.



## Volunteer Three

*Table 3 – Volunteer Three Survey*

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
The voting method was private.	X			
I feel I can use this system to vote independently.	X			
I am confident that my vote was recorded accurately.	X			
The voting instructions were clear and complete.	X			
The voting method was easy to use.	X			
I could read the display easily.	X			
I could understand the speech output.	N/A			
The assistive device(s) were easy to reach and use.	N/A			
I found the system confusing to use.	X			
The timeframe it took to vote was what I expected.	X			

### Volunteer Three Summary

Volunteer Three was surveyed after the testing and responded that they would feel comfortable using this system.

The tester liked the accessibility of BMD.

The tester thought it was a good accessibility height and felt it was very easy to maneuver around.

No concerns were voiced over privacy issues.



## Volunteer Four

*Table 4 – Volunteer Four Survey*

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
The voting method was private.	X			
I feel I can use this system to vote independently.	X			
I am confident that my vote was recorded accurately.	X			
The voting instructions were clear and complete.	X			
The voting method was easy to	X			
I could read the display easily.	X			
I could understand the speech	X			
The assistive device(s) were easy to reach and use.	X			
I found the system confusing to use.	See Summary			
The timeframe it took to vote was what I expected.	X			

### Volunteer Four Summary

Volunteer Four was surveyed after the testing and responded that they would feel comfortable using this system.

The tester pointed out that the candidate names were not re-read (audio) when changing back and forth between contests.

The tester felt that the different voices used in the audio could be confusing.

The tester also pointed out that the text of the contest (Yes/No) had to be touched on the screen for the audio to start.

Tester felt that the text of the proposition should be read first and then the contest options (Yes/No) after.

No concerns were voiced over privacy issues.





## Volunteer Five

*Table 5 – Volunteer Five Survey*

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
The voting method was private.		X*		
I feel I can use this system to vote independently.	X			
I am confident that my vote was recorded accurately.	X			
The voting instructions were clear and complete.	X			
The voting method was easy to use.	X			
I could read the display easily.	X			
I could understand the speech output.	N/A			
The assistive device(s) were easy to reach and use.	N/A			
I found the system confusing to use.	X			
The timeframe it took to vote was what I expected.	X			

### Volunteer Five Summary

Volunteer Five was surveyed after the testing and responded that they would feel comfortable using this system.

The tester liked the accessibility of the device.

The tester felt the “More” button on the screen should be brighter.

\*The voter expressed concerns about privacy, because of the number of observers during the testing process. An explanation was provided to the voter, that the testing observers are not a part of the normal voting process, and the voter will have complete privacy while in a polling place.



## Volunteer Six

*Table 6 – Volunteer Six Survey*

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
The voting method was private.	X			
I feel I can use this system to vote independently.	X			
I am confident that my vote was recorded accurately.	X			
The voting instructions were clear and complete.	See Summary			
The voting method was easy to use.	X			
I could read the display easily.	X			
I could understand the speech output.	X – See Summary			
The assistive device(s) were easy to reach and use.	X			
I found the system confusing to use.	See Summary			
The timeframe it took to vote was what I expected.	See Summary			

### Volunteer Six Summary

Volunteer Six was surveyed after the testing and responded that they would feel comfortable using this system.

The tester felt the voting contest options were clear, but the System Help instructions were not. Once the tester knew how to adjust the rate settings, the tester thought it was easier to understand.

The tester felt the process took a little longer than expected.

The tester felt the system was confusing because the tester had to select each contest option to have it read to them.

The tester also pointed out that the select button on the keypad could not be used to exit out of the “More” button screen overlay.

No concerns were voiced over privacy issues.



## Volunteer Seven

Table 7 – Volunteer Seven Survey

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
The voting method was private.	X			
I feel I can use this system to vote independently.	X			
I am confident that my vote was recorded accurately.	X			
The voting instructions were clear and complete.	X			
The voting method was easy to use.	X			
I could read the display easily.	x			
I could understand the speech output.	N/A			
The assistive device(s) were easy to reach and use.	N/A			
I found the system confusing to use.	See Summary			
The timeframe it took to vote was what I expected.	See Summary			

### Volunteer Seven Summary

Volunteer Seven was surveyed after the testing and responded that they would feel comfortable using this system.

The tester found the system very easy to use and thought the process was faster than expected.

No concerns were voiced over privacy issues.



## Volunteer Eight

*Table 8 – Volunteer Eight Survey*

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
The voting method was private.	X			
I feel I can use this system to vote independently.	X			
I am confident that my vote was recorded accurately.	X			
The voting instructions were clear and complete.	X			
The voting method was easy to use.	X			
I could read the display easily.	X			
I could understand the speech output.	N/A			
The assistive device(s) were easy to reach and use.	N/A			
I found the system confusing to use.	See Summary			
The timeframe it took to vote was what I expected.	X			

### Volunteer Eight Summary

Volunteer Eight was surveyed after the testing and responded that they would feel comfortable using this system.

The tester found the system very easy to use but did note that the tester assists the tester’s elderly parents with voting and that they may find the “More” button confusing.

No concerns were voiced over privacy issues.



## **Final Considerations**

---

The general consensus of the volunteers was that they felt the technologies implemented for accessibility and usability improved the experience for voters that are most in need of them.

No concerns were voiced over privacy issues

As directed by the California Secretary of State, this accessibility, usability, and privacy testing report does not include any recommendation as to whether or not the system should be approved.

---

End of AUP Test Report

---