

**Los Angeles County
Voting Solutions for All People (VSAP) 4.0
Voting System Accessibility, Usability,
and Privacy Test Report
for
California Secretary of State**

CAF-25010-AUPTR-01

Vendor Name	<i>Los Angeles County</i>
Vendor System	<i>VSAP 4.0</i>

Prepared by:



SLI ComplianceSM
4720 Independence St.
Wheat Ridge, CO 80033
303-422-1566
www.SLICompliance.com



Revision History

Date	Release	Author	Revisions
January 15th, 2026	v1.0	J. Kirby	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.

Copyright © 2026 SLI ComplianceSM, a Division of Gaming Laboratories International, LLC.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
REFERENCES.....	4
EQUIPMENT TESTED	4
<i>Ballot Marking Device</i>	4
CERTIFICATION TEST RESULTS SUMMARY.....	4
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
FINAL CONSIDERATIONS	11



INTRODUCTION

SLI Compliance is submitting this test report as a summary of the certification testing efforts for the **Los Angeles County's Voting Solutions for All People 4.0 (VSAP 4.0)** 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 4.0** voting system.

This effort included accessibility, usability, and privacy testing of the **VSAP 4.0** voting system's Ballot Marking Device (BMD) component.

References

California Voting System Standards (CVSS)

Equipment Tested

The **VSAP 4.0** voting system component involved in this test was the BMD.

Ballot Marking Device

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 California Secretary of State (CASOS) personnel acting as election workers and with volunteers from the disability community voting on the **VSAP 4.0** BMDs. When the volunteers arrived, they were given a briefing on the testing and the devices. The sessions were free form, ad hoc testing where the volunteers were able to vote 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*
Audio-only voter

Question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
If used, was the display clear and readable?			X	
If used, was the headset audio clear and easy to understand?	X			
If used, were the assistive devices easy to reach and use?	X			
Do you feel the voting method was private?	X			
Do you feel this accessible voting device allows you to vote independently?	X			
Do you feel confident that your vote was recorded accurately?	X			
Were the voting instructions clear?	X			
Would you be satisfied using this system to vote in an election?	X			

Volunteer One Summary

Voter One had difficulties using the first machine assigned, finding that the lack of instructions made it difficult to use the device. The voter was confused, voicing concerns that it was difficult to use the nav pad without full instructions.

After moving machines, full initial instructions were delivered correctly, and the voter found the BMD easy to use, at one point stating, “It works good.” Voter voiced some concerns over the rate of speech, at times finding it to be jerky, or clunky. Voter also expressed concerns that the maximum volume was not loud enough (note that at maximum volume, audio was discernable from the adjacent voting station).



Volunteer Two

Table 2 – Volunteer Two Survey
Audio-only voter

Question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
If used, was the display clear and readable?			X	
If used, was the headset audio clear and easy to understand?	X			
If used, were the assistive devices easy to reach and use?	X			
Do you feel the voting method was private?	X			
Do you feel this accessible voting device allows you to vote independently?	X			
Do you feel confident that your vote was recorded accurately?	X			
Were the voting instructions clear?	X			
Would you be satisfied using this system to vote in an election?	X			

Volunteer Two Summary

Voter Two voiced some early issues with navigating using the NavPad. At times they felt they would become “stuck” while navigating the settings, having some difficulty returning to the contests.

After the initial difficulty, the voter was able to vote successfully without intervention by a poll worker. They expressed that more familiarity with the NavPad would have been helpful before sitting down to vote with it. Voter voiced that overall, they liked the system.



Volunteer Three

Table 3 – *Volunteer Three Survey*
Audio-only voter

Question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
If used, was the display clear and readable?			X	
If used, was the headset audio clear and easy to understand?	X			
If used, were the assistive devices easy to reach and use?	X			
Do you feel the voting method was private?	X			
Do you feel this accessible voting device allows you to vote independently?	X			
Do you feel confident that your vote was recorded accurately?	X			
Were the voting instructions clear?	X			
Would you be satisfied using this system to vote in an election?	X			

Volunteer Three Summary

Voter Three had very few difficulties navigating the system. They expressed concern over the volume level, but after adjusting, found it to be adequate. The voter also appreciated that the screen could be turned off for added privacy during voting with audio-only.



Volunteer Four

Table 4 – *Volunteer Four Survey*
Touchscreen only, no audio

Question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
If used, was the display clear and readable?	X			
If used, was the headset audio clear and easy to understand?			X	
If used, were the assistive devices easy to reach and use?			X	
Do you feel the voting method was private?	X			
Do you feel this accessible voting device allows you to vote independently?	X			
Do you feel confident that your vote was recorded accurately?	X			
Were the voting instructions clear?	X			
Would you be satisfied using this system to vote in an election?	X			

Volunteer Four Summary

Voter Four used the touchscreen exclusively with no audio output from the system. They found the BMD easy to use and did not experience any complications while voting.



Volunteer Five

Table 5 – *Volunteer Five Survey*
Limited-mobility voter

Question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
If used, was the display clear and readable?	X			
If used, was the headset audio clear and easy to understand?	X			
If used, were the assistive devices easy to reach and use?	X			
Do you feel the voting method was private?	X			
Do you feel this accessible voting device allows you to vote independently?	X			
Do you feel confident that your vote was recorded accurately?	X			
Were the voting instructions clear?	X			
Would you be satisfied using this system to vote in an election?	X			

Volunteer Five Summary

Voter Five found the system easy to use, utilizing both the touchscreen and audio to complete the voting session. The voter noted that there were some delays in audio after adjusting the rate of speech but that it did not interfere with their ability to complete the voting session.



Volunteer Six

Table 6 – *Volunteer Six Survey*
Touchscreen only, no audio

Question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
If used, was the display clear and readable?	X			
If used, was the headset audio clear and easy to understand?			X	
If used, were the assistive devices easy to reach and use?			X	
Do you feel the voting method was private?	X			
Do you feel this accessible voting device allows you to vote independently?	X			
Do you feel confident that your vote was recorded accurately?	X			
Were the voting instructions clear?	X			
Would you be satisfied using this system to vote in an election?	X			

Volunteer Six Summary

Voter Six was able to successfully complete the ballot without outside help or intervention. They expressed confidence in the system as it was presented.



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 while voting during an election.

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 Accessibility, Usability and Privacy Test Report
