

- c compose new post
- j next post/next comment
- k previous post/previous comment
- r reply
- e edit
- o show/hide comments
- t go to top
- esc cancel



[An unconference about improving citizen-driven democracy](#)

- [Search for:](#)

## • [Pages](#)

- [Directions](#)
- [Schedule](#)
  - [10:30 – 11:30](#)
  - [11:45 – 12:45](#)
  - [12:45 – 1:45 \(Lunch\)](#)
  - [1:45 – 2:45](#)
  - [3:00 – 4:00](#)
- [Sponsors](#)
- [About](#)

## • [Tag Cloud](#)

[apps for democracy](#) [#demoapps](#) [citizens](#) [civicid](#) [decisions](#) [eDemCamp](#) [edempublic](#) [edemcamp](#) [flickr](#) [gov2.0](#) [healthcare](#)  
[incomesecurity](#) [incomesecurity edemcamp](#) [legislative](#) [lightning](#) [rounds](#) [nextsteps](#) [opencongress](#) [open data](#) [OpenGov](#) [collaboration](#) [network](#)  
[Open Government](#) [pardemsol](#) [platform](#) [policy change](#) [schedule eDemCamp](#) [session notes](#) [social](#) [technology](#) [tools](#) [voting](#) [Washington DC](#)  
[Welcome](#) [wifi](#)

## • [Meta](#)

- [Log in](#)
- [Entries RSS](#)
- [Comments RSS](#)
- [WordPress.org](#)

## Recent Updates Page 2 [RSS](#) [Hide threads](#) | [Keyboard Shortcuts](#)



**[djames](#)** 2:10 pm on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)  
 Tags: [lightning rounds \(2\)](#)

I am updating the list of lightning round talks as they go: <http://edemocracycamp.org/schedule/145-245/lightning-rounds/>



**[Wayne](#)** 2:07 pm on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)  
 Tags: [eDemCamp \(22\)](#), [lightning rounds \(2\)](#)

Here is the order of presentations:

- David Stern of [MixedInk](#)
- Ed Pastore of [MetaGovernment](#)
- ? of [FoodAndWaterWatch](#)
- Kathy McShea of [Emerald Strategies](#) : [How to Review Your Team's Performance](#)
- [Silona Bonewald](#) of [Citability.org](#) demoed [Citability.org: Using advanced permalinks to make government information more accessible, reliable, and transparent](#)
- [Kai Degner](#), [Mayor of Harrisonburg, VA](#) invited the group to give feedback about how he can use blogging
- Elena Panfilova from Transparency International – Russia demoed [AskJournal](#)
- [Nick Troiano](#) of the [Pike County Youth Coalition](#) demoed [School Board 2.0](#) (They won [an award based on their participation at the Constitutional Convention 2.0](#), congratulations!)
- [Dazza Greenwood](#) of [The Open Dialogue Coalition](#) demoed a few things. For example: [Simile Widgets](#). He also talked about how [Recovery.gov's Timeline is not very well populated](#).

Thanks to Lucas for keeping the time! (Each participant has 5 minutes to present.)



**[djames](#)** 2:05 pm on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)  
 Tags: [voting \(2\)](#)

I just published my notes from the “electronic voting systems” panel here: <http://edemocracycamp.org/schedule/1145-1245/electronic-voting-systems/>



• [dJames](#) 2:04 pm on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)  
Tags: [eDemCamp \(22\)](#), [voting \(2\)](#)

Here are my notes from the “Electronic Voting Systems and Citizen Involvement” panel that happened from 11:45 – 12:45 pm at eDemocracyCamp 2009.

Big questions about electronic voting

- \* record of your vote
- \* central authority
- \* checks and balances
- \* corruption
- \* accessibility (digital divide)
- \* electronic even feasible?
- \* usability of the system

Federal Election Commission

- \* how many investigators?

Help America Vote Act

ways of authenticating:

- \* something you know
- \* something you have
- \* something physical about you

authentication of identity

- \* fingerprints
- \* one-off usernames for elections

post-mortem validation

anonymous voting, value of the secret ballot

UN overseeing international elections

proposal: all countries should have election oversight

Open Source Voting Technology

The government pays for open source development.

To secure the code, the hardware, the system. Businesses are driven by money. There needs to be a good incentive to hack the system.

Examples

- \* <http://www.openvotingconsortium.org/>
- \* <http://www.electionreformproject.org/>

Should government pay for an open source voting project?

Should government build an open source voting project? How much should they do?

What is the role of the open source community?

What is the process by which the federal government goes out to find voting technology?

- \* straight to Diebold?
- \* how do they define requirements?
- \* do they even know what is possible?

Sounds like a good opportunity for business

- \* sell / give away / open source hardware
- \* open source software?

“Brave New Ballot”

Aviel Rubin

University of Maryland

<http://www.bravenewballot.org/>

Spain Example:

1 election -> paper ballots

Another election -> electronic systems

US is behind other countries for e-voting

Examples that the voting project might tie into:

- \* <http://elgg.com/>

Organic decision-making

- \* beyond voting
- \* towards increased involvement
- \* more engagement

Organizational Development

- \* what do people want?
- \* how can you use technology to increase participation of people in decision-making
- \* how to gather feedback
- \* how to use feedback for public decision
- \* political area
- \* all aspects, including community
- \* integrate new technology to provide useful information for people making decisions
- \* how can we engage people?

Brasil / Brazil

- \* a big discussion in Brazil
- \* 15 years of electronic voting
- \* Brazilians can vote from home. Is this safe?
- \* Avoiding fraud
- \* Book about electronic voting – explained how to use the machines efficiently
- \* Electoral justice doesn't teach people to use the electronic voting systems well
- \* The Supreme Court -> Court of Electoral Systems
- \* In Brazil, voting is compulsory
- \* If you don't vote, you pay a fine
- \* So people vote, arguably, for the wrong reasons (in some cases) “people vote with the hand, not the head”
- \*

“The Dance” – purpose: to make you feel that you participated:

- \* get a ballot
- \* walk over to the station
- \* vote in a booth
- \* drop the ballot off

## MicroJustice

\* validate that people have correct documents

One Laptop Per Child



**[dwitzel](#) 12:48 pm on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)**  
**Tags: decisions, [eDemCamp \(22\)](#), gov2.0, session notes**

Lead by Laura MacCleery, Chris Wolz, Michael Lennon.

The “agency” as the unit of action. Constraints aren’t necessarily lack of willingness, but lack of access to “constituents,” the voice of the people. Technology as an enabler.

“Drinking from a firehose” is especially a problem during times of crisis.

3 interesting questions – is it possible to do large-scale collaboration? what are reasonable demands for collaboration? how do agencies switch from a broadcast to a collaboration paradigm?

Distinction between “making decisions” vs. giving input on decisions.

Need for a trusted entity to frame the discussion. “Trust” as a keep concept.

Need containers for interaction that include culture.

NCDD has streams: 1) discuss, explore an issue, 2) conflict resolutionn, 3) decision-making, 4) collaborative action – need many actors to respond to an issue (e.g., race relations). Don’t confuse collaboration with decision-making.

How to cope with digital divide? Not just talk to the people in the room.

Government language is not user-friendly. Federal Register is “clear as mud.” How to provide context.

Existing gov’t comment rules designed in the 70’s by corporate stakeholders.

Military Blogger Roundtables (phone calls) facilitated, kicked-off by DoD and DHS. Coordinated by the agency. Any blogger covering military issues can participate if they sign-up. Working on how to monitor cross-feed with mainstream media. E.g., we know a phrase in the MSM came from the Roundtable discussion, but hard to track. Phone or face-to-face. Have to make it clear to Sr. Mgt that it isn’t about the number of people in the session or hits on the website. It is the conversation.

Hard to facilitate conversions at the micro-level. Agency reps have to ‘stay in their lane’.

We’re in a process of learning about agency management of social media that mirrors learning about how to manage email (e.g., only the World Bank president can send email).

There’s tension between the legal issues related to free/open info of gov’t deliberations and wanting to be free/open.

Federal regulatory process is very complicated and hard to get into and favors the professionally

engaged folks who know what they are watching for in the Federal Register.

“Meaningful input” is not as clear as “cheeseburger” and we’d still disagree about what makes a good burger. Credibility may or may not be an objective of participation.

No training, experience, reward for public engagement. Need to let go of the assumption that “there are people waiting to hear from us.”

At EPA took 12 years to get rid of an award so they could give another reward for collaborative excellence. Managers who don’t read their own websites.

Everyone has to post one final, interesting thought using #edemcamp and #decisions hashtag.

How do we frame discourse so it will be widely accepted as “legitimate”? one person-one vote?



•

[barryeverett](#) 11:32 am on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Hmm, does twitter volume increase or decrease during breaks....???? 11:30 -11:45



•

[svelmurugan](#) 11:27 am on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)  
Tags: [civicid \(2\)](#), [eDemCamp \(22\)](#), [pardemsol \(9\)](#)

civic id can help tie down users to constituencies providing better substantiation for comments. on the other hand, there are certain cases where location does not matter.



•

[barryeverett](#) 11:22 am on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)  
Tags: [OpenGov collaboration network](#)

For all those in the room, and in the ether: There is no easy button. All this takes people and technology and hard work 24/7...



•

[svelmurugan](#) 11:21 am on April 19, 2009 | [0 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

**Tags:** [eDemCamp \(22\)](#), [opencongress](#), [pardemsol \(9\)](#)

already tools available to comment on legislation on opencongress.org; why not open it up for states to use ? how to maintain privacy ?



**[svelmurugan](#) 11:16 am on April 19, 2009 | [1 Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)**  
**Tags:** [civicid \(2\)](#), [eDemCamp \(22\)](#), [pardemsol \(9\)](#)

how to aggregate data that users are creating on different sites ? using open id or civic id ?



**Lou 2:14 pm on April 19, 2009 [Permalink](#)**

CivicID.org runs on top of OpenID, Information Cards and will support any/all other open authentication standards that emerge — enabling the various innovators creating eDemocracy apps have a non-profit, non-commercial system which they can rely on for individual constituent verification. Geographic relevancy is half the equation, the other half is verifying that individual user accounts are indeed unique individuals – not a single person creating multiple accounts.

[← Newer Posts](#) | [Older Posts →](#)

**eDemocracyCamp** is proudly powered by [WordPress](#). P2 theme by [Automattic](#).