June 20, 2023 GA SOS Brad Raffensperger

Rating	"Setting The Election Record Straight"	ACTUAL VOTERGA FACTS
"Georgi	a's election system is secure"	Ha! Numerous experts have provided court testimony and letters to government officials confirming it is not secure
FALSE "it has	s been subject to repeated audits"	The voting system had only one audit every 2 years by law
" and	[the system has] come through with flying colors"	The voting system <u>declared wrong winners</u> for DeKalb District 2 Commission which was the only 2022 primary race that was fully audited
"The 'cr	itics of Georgia's election security' are	Critics include cybersecurity experts and science professors
M. M. M. M. M. C.	ne of only two groups: election-denying acy theorists or litigants"	throughout the country. The demeaning terms used by the author are intentionally designed to deceive the reader
ONTS CIVER	e two groups make ever-shifting but always s assertions that Georgia's election system is "	Assertions were confirmed by <u>Senate Judiciary</u> and House Government Affairs Committees, county election boards and <u>Governor Kemp's 36-point study</u> for the State Election Board
recount	conducted a risk-limiting audit and a full hand of every ballot in Georgia to prove that our results ccurate"	VoterGA determined the Fulton Co. full hand recount had a 60% batch error rate, falsified tally sheets, 300+ duplicate scanned ballots and 4,000+ duplicate reported ballots
Now the state of t	22 elections saw virtually zero complaints about cess -or the results"	In 2022, a candidate was <u>found to have gotten no votes</u> in the precinct where she and her husband lived and voted
10. A.	ystem, proven and tested, is the system we have e today for Georgia elections."	The system has been tested but has not been proven to always count accurately
	ave layers of security protocols and procedures to ally protect ballots, the system, the software, and sults."	Security protocols and procedures do not include ballot inspections and are inadequate to protect voters against counterfeit ballots and incorrect results
"We have	ve tests and audits to verify results."	Tests cannot verify results because they are run before the results are produced
"It ident	tified risks that are theoretical and imaginary."	The <u>Halderman Security Analysis</u> identified risks that are real, not imaginary
	ITRE report points out that the vulnerabilities ed by Halderman as operationally infeasible."	The MITRE report was funded by Dominion, produced without access to a voting system and assumes perfect procedural defenses, called "ridiculous" by 29 experts
	tack was technically scalable but alsoinfeasible access controls in place"	Counties have no access controls to detect malware attacks when received in election definition files as the <u>Halderman Security Analysis</u> points out
Georgia malwar	ssible for a team of bad actors to break into n's 2700 voting precincts, install reIt's more likely that I could win the lottery t buying a ticket."	Halderman explains no break in is needed when the state system can currently distribute election definition malware to all counties. That malware can then spread to each scanner and touchscreen without detection
penaltie	ve that legislative consideration for increasing the es would demonstrate to the people of Georgia take their elections seriously."	Making ballots public record to detect counterfeits and verify election results would tell the people of Georgia that they take elections seriously