

# The Council of Europe and e-voting:

## History and impact of Rec(2004)11

Robert Stein

Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior (BM.I)  
Department of Electoral Affairs  
Vienna, Austria  
[robert.stein@bmi.gv.at](mailto:robert.stein@bmi.gv.at)

Gregor Wenda

Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior (BM.I)  
Department of Electoral Affairs  
Vienna, Austria  
[gregor.wenda@bmi.gv.at](mailto:gregor.wenda@bmi.gv.at)

**Abstract**— When the Council of Europe started to deal with the subject of electronic voting in 2002, the impact of its work was not foreseeable. What followed, however, was basically a “success story”: The Recommendation on legal, operational and technical standards for e-voting (Rec(2004)11), which was adopted by the Council of Ministers on 30 September 2004, has been the most relevant international document and reference regarding e-voting for a decade. Since 2010, the role of the Council of Europe with regard to e-voting has shrunk. Nevertheless various Member States expressed the desire to further review the Recommendation in the forthcoming years. Following an informal experts’ meeting in Vienna on 19 December 2013, the Committee of Ministers was confronted with the suggestion to formally update the Recommendation in order to keep up with the latest technical, legal and political developments. The forthcoming Review Meeting on 28 October 2014 may help set the course for future e-voting activities of the Council of Europe.

**Keywords**—Council of Europe, e-voting, internet voting, Rec(2004)11, Recommendation, review meeting, update.

### I. HOW IT STARTED

Using technical devices in the vote casting process is no invention of the 21st century. It already started back in the 19th century [1] and some states (have) used voting machines for several decades.<sup>1</sup> With the rise of the World Wide Web and e-government applications in the mid-1990s, the idea of voting over the internet was born. The first binding political online election is said to have taken place in the USA in the year 2000. [2] Originally, no sharp distinction between machine voting and internet voting was drawn when employing the new term “electronic voting” or “e-voting”.<sup>2</sup> Around ten years ago, the term “i-voting” for “internet voting” came about. [3] The interest in information and communication technologies in elections coined politicians, scientists, and administrators alike. A British opinion paper outlined the motivation for e-voting activities in 2002: “Citizens rightly expect to be able to vote in a straightforward, accessible, and efficient way, being able to

have confidence in the security and integrity of the poll. (...) Governments, therefore, are being faced with requests from their citizens to introduce new technologies in the electoral processes, in particular to make available various forms of e-voting.” [4] A number of international institutions and fora could have dealt with the new phenomenon of electronic voting<sup>3</sup> but it was the Council of Europe which apparently developed the strongest interest and formed a “multidisciplinary Ad Hoc Group of Specialists on legal, operational and technical standards for e-enabled voting” within the framework of its 2002-2004 Integrated Project “Making democratic institutions work” (IP 1). The group was supported by two subgroups dealing with legal and operational aspects as well as technical aspects. [5] Some of the driving factors were the perception that citizens lost interest in politics and the drop of participation rates in elections and referenda. [6] However, Michael Remmert already noted in 2004 that “modernising how people vote will not, per se, improve democratic participation. Failure to do so, however, is likely to weaken the credibility and legitimacy of democratic institutions.” [7] The Ad Hoc Group created a set of standards on e-voting, which were eventually adopted in the form of a Recommendation by the Council of Ministers on 30 September 2004. 112 legal, operational and technical standards provided valuable guidance in the new world of electronically enabled elections and gave a better idea of principles to follow and possible risks to keep in mind. Paragraph v. of the Recommendation stipulated a first review after two years “in order to provide the Council of Europe with a basis for possible further action on e-voting”. Accordingly, the first review meeting was held in Strasbourg in November 2006. Since then, repeated two-year review periods were decided by all subsequent intergovernmental meetings.

### II. RECOMMENDATION REC(2004)11

Until today Rec(2004)11 is the only international document regulating e-voting from a legal perspective. Even though these

<sup>1</sup> In the Netherlands, all voting machines were discontinued after suspected fraud in 2007. They had been used in polling stations nationwide since 1965 (see Loeber, E-Voting in the Netherlands; from General Acceptance to General Doubt in Two Years, in Krimmer/Grimm [Eds], 3rd international Conference on Electronic Voting 2008, Proceedings [2008] 21).

<sup>2</sup> The term “e-enabled voting” also became more widely used.

<sup>3</sup> The European Union never set sustainable steps in the area of e-voting. One of the few international events was an „eDemocracy Seminar“ organized by the European Commission, which took place in Brussels on 12 February 2004 and provided an overview of European e-voting activities (including the non-EU country Switzerland) at that time. The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) appointed an expert for the observation of New Voting Technologies for the first time in 2010 and developed a “Handbook for the Observation of New Voting Technologies” in 2013.

“minimal standards” are merely voluntary and thus non-binding, the member states of the Council of Europe declared their general support and commitment with the adoption by the Committee of Ministers in 2004. The Recommendation states that “e-voting shall respect all the principles of democratic elections and referendums” and “shall be as reliable and secure as democratic elections and referendums which do not involve the use of electronic means.” [8] Member States were asked to “consider reviewing their relevant domestic legislation in the light of this Recommendation” [9] though a wide margin of individuality was respected since individual member states were not required “to change their own domestic voting procedures which may exist at the time of the adoption of this Recommendation, and which can be maintained by those member states when e-voting is used, as long as these domestic voting procedures comply with all the principles of democratic elections and referendums”. [10] Since its adoption in 2004, Rec(2004)11 has become a unique reference for matters of e-enabled voting. [11] It has been drawn upon by various countries, scientific institutions, and even courts when evaluating plans or the actual use of electronic voting. Norway is said to be the only state that incorporated most of the Recommendation’s standards into the regulatory framework for the 2011 and 2013 internet voting trials. [12] A 2007 study on e-voting in Belgium, initiated by Belgian Federal and Regional administrations, took reference of Rec(2004)11 and used it as a benchmark in its evaluation. [13] The Estonian Supreme Court considered the Recommendation when deciding about the constitutionality of e-voting. [14] The 2008 pilot in Finland, where some municipalities used voting machines in polling stations, was monitored by civil society and the Council of Europe while taking Rec(2004)11 into account. [15] Switzerland had the Recommendation, as well as other practical experiences since 2004, “on the radar” when passing recent legislative changes concerning their “vote électronique”. [16] In Austria, standards of Rec(2004)11 were drawn upon for the evaluation and certification of the e-voting system used in the 2009 Federation of Students’ elections. OSCE/ODIHR monitored the use of “New Voting Technologies (NVT)” in a number of states in light of the Recommendation and gave respective reference in its reports. The OSCE Handbook on the “Observation of New Voting Technologies”, which was published in late 2013, calls Rec(2004)11 “the only specialized international legal document in this regard” and mentions it under “Good Practice Documents” on e-voting. [17] The publication “Introducing Electronic Voting – Essential Considerations” by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) listed Rec(2004)11 among the essential international documents. [18] Even in several overseas countries such as Canada [19] or the United States, [20] elements of the Recommendation were included in different studies and reports.

Despite its worldwide recognition, the Recommendation has become a bit long in the tooth. Ten years after its adoption, numerous technical developments and new social approaches have changed the “e-world”. Consequently, voices in favour of a formal update have gained strength. Ongoing innovations and technological changes were already in the states’ minds when a first review after two years was demanded. The e-voting group

suggested to the Committee of Ministers to “recommend to member states to keep their own position on e-voting under review and report back to the Council of Europe the results of any review that they have conducted” as “e-voting is a new and rapidly developing area of policy and technology” and “standards and requirements need to keep abreast of, and where possible, anticipate new developments.” [21] In 2004, the Council of Europe established a new project, “Good governance in the information society”, which would last until 2010 and continued the discussions on e-voting. It also followed new challenges posed by the broader scope of “electronic democracy” (e-democracy)<sup>4</sup>. The overall project aimed at providing “governments and other stakeholders with new instruments and practical tools in this field and to promote the application of existing instruments and of good and innovative policy practice”. [22]

The first review meeting in Strasbourg on 23 and 24 November 2006 concluded that the Recommendation had become accepted by member states “as a valid and currently the only internationally agreed benchmark by which to assess and evaluate e-voting systems.” [23] The second review meeting was organized on the occasion of the Forum for the Future of Democracy dedicated to “e-democracy” in Madrid. It took place on 16 October 2008 and summarized the latest developments and new questions concerning e-voting. In this regard, the Recommendation was still considered useful but some aspects, particularly concerning certification and observation, were identified as topics not sufficiently covered. Hence, the Council of Europe organized a Workshop on the “Observation of e-enabled elections” in Oslo on 18 and 19 March 2010 and subsequently had experts reconvene in Strasbourg in order to work on two follow-up documents complementing Rec(2004)11 – the “Guidelines on certification of e-voting systems” and the “Guidelines on transparency of e-enabled elections”. [24] Both guidelines, along with an “E-voting handbook” about the “key steps in the implementation of e-enabled elections”, were presented during the third review meeting in Strasbourg on 16 and 17 November 2010. This also constituted the end of the Council of Europe’s activities during the project “Good governance in the information society”.

### III. TOWARDS AN UPDATE?

A fourth review meeting took place in Lochau near Bregenz<sup>5</sup>, Austria, on 11 July 2012. During this meeting, several state representatives said that Rec(2004)11 was still precious but that in light of recent practical experiences, and despite the additional guidelines of 2010, a number of issues were not dealt with any more. As a consequence, the representatives of the Member States “agreed to recommend that the 2004 Committee of Ministers’ Recommendation (...) should be formally updated.” [25] They further stated “that the biennial review meetings were highly useful and should be continued (...)”. [26] The Republic of Austria, one of the countries actively involved in the creation of the

<sup>4</sup> The Council of Europe’s Ad Hoc Committee on e-democracy (CAHDE) prepared a Recommendation on e-democracy (Rec(2009)1), which was adopted by the Committee of Ministers in February 2009.

<sup>5</sup> The precise location was Castle Hofen in Lochau near Bregenz but all international documents bear the more widely known city name of Bregenz.

Recommendation from the start, used the opportunity during the Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers<sup>6</sup> to invite e-voting experts to Vienna in order to follow up and discuss the future of Rec(2004)11 within the framework of an informal workshop. Austria had already suggested such a get-together during the 2012 review meeting. [27] Since 2010, e-voting matters have not been under the umbrella of a Council of Europe project. They are now handled by the “Directorate of Democratic Governance“ belonging to the “Directorate General of Democracy“. The “Division of Electoral Assistance and Census“ was in charge of preparing the workshop in Vienna, which was held in co-operation with the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior, being Austria’s primary electoral management body, on 19 December 2013 in Vienna.<sup>7</sup> In preparation of this meeting, the Council of Europe commissioned a report “on the possible update of the Council of Europe Recommendation Rec(2004)11 on legal, operational and technical standards for e-voting“. The author was Ardita Driza Maurer, an independent lawyer/consultant and former member of the e-voting team at the Swiss Federal Chancellery. [28] Based on the findings of Ardita Driza Maurer, reasons for updating the Recommendation were debated. [29] New technological developments and concepts such as in the context of the verifiability of votes, and conclusions from studies and reports, for instance regarding certification, called for addenda or adaptations (for further details on a possible future recommendation update see the article of Ardita Driza Maurer).

More than a decade ago, developing the 112 legal, operational, and technical standards was a “rather theoretically driven exercise“. [30] There is no doubt that this facilitated the intergovernmental work as not too many existing systems were influenced by the then new set of rules. However, the work on the two guidelines in 2010 already showed that this situation had changed in just a few years: Since some countries meanwhile had e-voting in use or were in the process of implementing specific solutions, discussions over specific models and paragraphs became more detailed and heated than originally expected. In the end, the guidelines remained more general in their wording than intended in the beginning. The participation of civil society and other non-governmental stakeholders was also of a different quality in the early 2000s than today’s era of public participation and open government would permit. Hence, the experts’ workshop in Vienna concluded that “it must be ensured that the necessary legal and technical expertise is available during the drafting process and that it must be open, with detailed mechanisms to be determined, to the full range of stakeholders, e.g. civil society actors, e-voting systems providers and possibly non-member states.“ [31] Another difference to the drafting work of 2002 to 2004 is the monetary perspective: While the Ad Hoc Group of 2002-2004 had sufficient resources to cover travel expenses and the input of experts within the framework of Project “IP 1“, no such budget is currently available at the Council of

Europe. It goes without saying that proper updates could only be realized if future budgets would allow work on Rec(2004)11.

#### IV. PRACTICAL USE OF E-VOTING IN EUROPE

In contrast to 2004, a number of countries have meanwhile gained experience in the e-voting field. Some of them even provide binding, e-enabled voting channels today. Other states, however, stopped using any kind of technology in the voting process. The following overview is not meant to be exhaustive but supposed to give a better feeling of some of the recent, more note-worthy activities in the field. [32]

*Albania* worked on two pilot projects – one regarding the introduction of electronic voter identification means in polling station (by using the national identification card), the other concerning optical scanners in two regional counting centers during the elections in June 2013. Both pilots eventually failed. In *Armenia*, the Central Election Commission came up with a (rather simple) system allowing Armenians working at diplomatic missions abroad and Armenian professionals working for Armenian companies abroad to vote online. The legal basis was passed before the 2012 parliamentary elections but the participation rate was small. In *Austria*, only remote voting over the internet has been seriously discussed. The Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior conducted an intergovernmental feasibility study presented in late 2004. [33] In order to implement internet voting, an amendment to the federal constitution (two-third majority in parliament) would be required. Some non-binding academic trials [34] in 2003, 2004<sup>8</sup> and 2006 and a legally binding use during the 2009 elections of the Austrian Federation of Students [35] were the only notable experiences. In 2011 the Austrian Constitutional Court suspended some provisions in the regulation for the 2009 students’ elections. At the same time, the Constitutional Court emphasized that in all future deployments of e-voting the legal basis had to be clearly determined in order to allow transparency both for election commissions and individual voters. [36] *Azerbaijan* ran some non-binding pilots of internet voting (“shadow elections”) in the past but no further steps towards e-voting have materialized. *Belgium* did away with voting machines in the wake of the discussions in the Netherlands but has lately looked into a new and improved paper-based machine voting system which was piloted in the regional elections in October 2012 and showed the need for various modifications. The improved system is supposed to be used in half of the country during the 2014 elections. Internet voting may only be considered for Belgian voters abroad. *Bulgaria* started discussing e-voting solutions in both polling stations and over the internet in 2004. A draft law allowed for internet voting pilots. In 2009, a test was run in nine electoral precincts. A legal amendment on the permission of e-voting was passed in 2012 but subsequently overturned by the Constitutional Court. The current election code stipulates the introduction of machine voting in 2015. *Estonia* was the first

<sup>6</sup> Austria assumed the chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 14 November 2013. The formal end was the annual meeting of the Committee of Ministers on 6 May 2014.

<sup>7</sup> Approximately 50 persons from about a dozen countries participated, among them almost all states actively involved in e-voting (among them being Belgium, Estonia, Norway, Russia, and Switzerland).

<sup>8</sup> The 2004 trial was organized along the lines of the Austrian presidential elections. For further details see Alexander Prosser, Robert Kofler, Robert Krimmer, Martin Karl Unger, E-Voting Election Test to the Austrian Federal Presidency Election 2004, Working Papers on Information Processing and Information Management 02/2004 (<http://epub.wu.ac.at/194/1/document.pdf>).

country to introduce internet voting as a legally binding channel during the 2005 municipal elections and the 2007 parliamentary elections. [37] Online votes have to be cast in advance of the election day. [38] During the 2013 municipal elections, 24.3% of the votes came over the internet. The i-voting system and procedure are constantly improved, for instance by installing an Electronic Voting Committee composed of IT professionals responsible for conducting the i-vote process. More transparency will be ensured by introducing a new verification system, which was tested in 2013 and will become an integral part of the law in 2015. **Finland** piloted voting machines based in polling stations and connected to the internet in three municipalities in 2008. Following some flaws and court decisions, the project was discontinued. A working group looked into the possibilities of internet voting and presented an internal report in June 2014. Further research on the use of the internet for participative instruments was suggested. **France** has been using electronic voting machines in certain municipalities though the number will not be increased after the discussions in the Netherlands and Germany. Since the early 2000s, online voting for French citizens abroad had been debated and some pilots were carried out. In 2012, select representatives for the French living abroad were elected via internet for the first time. **Germany** used to have voting machines in certain constituencies (for all kinds of elections) since the 1960s. Due to complaints regarding the 2005 parliamentary elections, the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany held on 3 March 2009 that the use of machines undermined the principle of publicity. [39] While electronic voting machines with a paper audit trail should suffice the requirements of the decision, Germany stopped using all kinds of machines. Internet voting is exercised on a very small scale in an academic and semi-private environment but not in any political elections. **Ireland** introduced electronic voting machines in 2004 but never used them due to public concerns about their reliability. The machines were stored for years and finally demolished in 2012. **Latvia** currently focuses on the use of ITC in scanning and counting ballots. Aside from optical scanners, ideas about internet voting are debating with the neighbouring country Estonia in mind. **Liechtenstein** has the legal basis for e-voting in municipal elections and, influenced by developments in Switzerland, has followed e-voting discussions for a number of years – so far, however, without any further steps. **Lithuania** has repeatedly tried to follow the Estonian example but proposals of the Central Election Commission to introduce e-voting have not earned sufficient support in parliament yet. The Netherlands had mechanical and electronic voting machines dating back to the 1960s and also used internet voting for certain bodies. After doubts about the security of voting machines were publicly expressed by an NGO, both voting machines and internet voting were stopped in 2008 by a ministerial decree. In late 2013, a Study Commission recommended introducing electronic voting and counting “in order to make the voting and counting process more accessible and faster”. Ballot stations should use new machines with ballot printers. A nation-wide roll-out could take place after a piloting phase around 2018 or 2019. **Norway** conducted a feasibility study on internet voting in 2006 and carried out a first pilot on the local level (10 municipalities and 4.5 % of population) in 2011. Lessons learned from other e-

voting examples, for instance the need of universal verifiability, were taken into consideration. Another use of internet voting took place during the 2013 parliamentary elections (12 municipalities and 7% of population). In June 2014 the government announced to discontinue the use of e-voting trials. [40] In **Russia**, the Central Election Commission introduced electronic voting machines with a paper audit trail in 2005. In February 2013, the constitutional committee proposed to look into internet voting as well. In Slovenia, electronic voting machines have been used in polling stations in order to assist handicapped voters though no further expansion seems to be considered. In **Spain**, pilots regarding electronic voting machines have been carried out since 1995. In addition, some internet voting tests were carried out on the regional (2003, Catalonia) and national level (2005). The basis for internet voting was laid down in the Basque Country electoral code in 1998. Lately, no further serious discussions have materialized. **Switzerland** had its first debates on internet voting in 1998 and started a pilot project on e-voting (“vote électronique”) in three cantons in 2002. In the beginning, it was only used in local elections and referenda. In 2011, the first nation-wide use (for national parliamentary elections) took place. The government is still in the process of gradually expanding the use of e-voting. New legal backbones for the federal level were adopted in December 2013. In order to further extend internet voting, a new model of verifiability and new auditing routines will be required. Until the end of 2013, 12 cantons used e-voting in one way or the other. The **United Kingdom** was very active in testing all kinds of electronic voting methods in the early 2000s. Trials in several constituencies between 2002 and 2007 involved ballot booth voting, kiosk voting, and internet voting. After negative experiences in other countries and critical voices from the UK Electoral Commission, [41] the government has not looked into e-voting opportunities any further. In March 2014 the chair of the UK Electoral Commission called for a modernization of elections and a move to online voting. [42]

Interesting enough, the implementation of the European Citizens’ Initiative<sup>9</sup> in all EU Member States on 1 April 2012 recently stirred up discussions about new forms of e-participation in several member states since it is possible to sign a statement of support online. [43] The future will show whether this new instrument of direct democracy in the EU really has an impact on e-voting discussions around Europe.

## V. OUTLOOK

The future of e-voting certainly looked brighter when Rec(2004) 11 was adopted ten years ago. While e-enabled elections were still in their infancy, some kind of “e-voting hype” seemed to go around, which led to legal amendments or the first pilots in a number of countries. [44] In the meantime, some kind of stagnation has emerged [45] though current international examples show that electronic voting is possible – not only in a supervised environment but also with online solutions. [46] The reasons for a decline of the e-voting euphoria are multifaceted. The economic and financial crisis of

<sup>9</sup> Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 of the European Parliament and the Council of 16 February 2011 on the citizens’ initiative.

2008 led to budget cuts in several countries; expensive innovation programs had to be stopped. Strict court decisions concerning the use of e-enabled voting [47] as well as a growing distrust of citizens in internet solutions after data leak and hacking incidents also did their bit. Concerns about security and reliability problems inherent to online applications were already present when passing Rec(2004)11, which states “(...) that only those e-voting systems which are secure, reliable, efficient, technically robust, open to independent verification and easily accessible to voters will build the public confidence which is a pre-requisite for holding e-voting.” [48] Today it is mainly a political decision whether countries are willing to think about e-enabled voting as computers and the internet have already influenced our daily life in an unprecedented way. Permanently excluding modern technology from voting and participative instruments does not appear realistic.<sup>10</sup>

The Council of Europe continues to be the only organization in Europe to set intergovernmental standards in the field of e-voting. Accordingly, the informal experts’ meeting in Vienna in December 2013 (similar to the 2012 review meeting) came to the conclusion that, (...) “taking into account the issues listed in this report and the high probability that in the medium and long term, the number of electoral systems will comprise some electronic features, there are a number of strong and valid reasons for updating Recommendation Rec(2004)11.” The exact terms of such an update were left to the Council of Ministers, which debated the report in the Ministers’ Deputies/Rapporteur Group on Democracy (GR-DEM) on 20 May 2014 but rendered no final decision. Even the definite organization of another review meeting by the Council of Europe Secretariat in late 2014 remained uncertain at that point of time. Thus Austria, along with Belgium, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Poland and Switzerland, sponsored a “non-paper” for information “in view of the meeting of the GR-DEM on 17 June 2014” in order “to call for the 5th Review Meeting to take place in Autumn 2014”. The delegations emphasized that such a meeting could be organized “on a costs-lie-where-they-fall basis” to keep expenses “to an absolute minimum”. The non-paper also suggested that the review meeting could be held back to back with the EVOTE 2014 conference in Lochau, Austria, to take advantage of the obvious synergies.

The Council of Europe Secretariat confirmed its support of the proposal in the GR-DEM meeting on 17 June 2014 and stated that the results of such a review meeting could even feed directly into relevant discussions at the World Forum for Democracy.<sup>11</sup> Official invitations for the 5th meeting “to review developments in the field of e-voting since the adoption of Recommendation Rec(2004)11”, scheduled for 28 October in Lochau, were sent out by the Democratic Governance Directorate of the Council of Europe on 23 June 2014. The agenda contains the points “Horizon 2016: General exchange

of views on a possible update of the CM Rec(2004)11 - defining the scope of a possible update” as well as “discussion of possible first elements of the future updated Rec(2004)11 and necessary conditions for the next steps: modus operandi, terms of reference, possible timeline”. There is no denial that the Council of Europe’s expertise and reputation in electronic voting is internationally renowned. The Recommendation, its review, and the general objective of developing secure use of the internet in the field of democratic elections currently form part of the Council of Europe’s Internet Governance Strategy 2012-2015. [49] However, future activities will largely depend on the allocation of the essential budget. It will be up to the Committee of Ministers to say which role the Council of Europe wants to play in the area of e-voting in the future. In case of a “go” for a formal Recommendation update, its outstanding role in this matter would be re-iterated.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Krimmer, Overview, in Krimmer (Eds), Electronic Voting 2006, 2nd International Workshop Proceedings (2006) 9.x
- [2] Barrat i Esteve/Goldsmith/Turner, International Experience with E-Voting, Norwegian E-Vote Project, IFES Study (2012) 1.
- [3] Inter alia, Buchsbaum, Aktuelle Entwicklungen zu E-Voting in Europa, JRP 2004, 106; Grabenwarter, Briefwahl und E-Voting: Rechtsvergleichende Aspekte und europarechtliche Rahmenbedingungen, JRP 2004, 70; Stein/Wenda, E-Voting in Österreich, SIAK-Journal 3/2005, 3.
- [4] IP 1 : Exploratory Workshop on e-voting (1-2 July 2002), Proposal for a Council of Europe activity on e-voting standards - document prepared by the United Kingdom authorities ([http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/activities/ggis/E-voting/Work\\_of\\_e-voting\\_committee/03\\_Background\\_documents/98IP1\(2002\)11\\_en.asp#TopOfPage](http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/activities/ggis/E-voting/Work_of_e-voting_committee/03_Background_documents/98IP1(2002)11_en.asp#TopOfPage)).
- [5] All meeting reports are available online: [http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/activities/ggis/E-voting/Work\\_of\\_e-voting\\_committee/02\\_Agendas\\_and\\_Reports/Default\\_en.asp#TopOfPage](http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/activities/ggis/E-voting/Work_of_e-voting_committee/02_Agendas_and_Reports/Default_en.asp#TopOfPage)
- [6] See introduction on the CoE website on the E-Voting Project: <http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/activities/ggis/E-voting/>
- [7] Remmert, M. (2004), “Towards European Standards on Electronic Voting”, in Prosser, A. and Krimmer, R. (Eds.), Electronic Voting in Europe - Technology, Law, Politics and Society, P-47, Gesellschaft für Informatik, 15.
- [8] Rec(2004)11, Preamble, Paragraph i.
- [9] Rec(2004)11, Preamble, Paragraph iii.
- [10] Rec(2004)11, Preamble, Paragraph iv.
- [11] For further details see Maurer, Report on the possible update of the Council of Europe Recommendation Rec(2004)11 on legal, operational and technical standards for e-voting, 29 November 2013.
- [12] [http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KRD/Kampanjer/valgportal/Regelverk/Regulations\\_relating\\_to\\_trial\\_internet\\_voting\\_2013.pdf](http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KRD/Kampanjer/valgportal/Regelverk/Regulations_relating_to_trial_internet_voting_2013.pdf)
- [13] [http://www.ibz.rm.fgov.be/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Elections/fr/presentation/bevoting-1\\_gb.pdf](http://www.ibz.rm.fgov.be/fileadmin/user_upload/Elections/fr/presentation/bevoting-1_gb.pdf)
- [14] Madise, Ü. and Vinkel, P. (2011) “Constitutionality of Remote Internet Voting: The Estonian Perspective”, Juridica International. Iuridicum Foundation, Vol. 18, 4–16.
- [15] Whitmore K., Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (2008) Information Report on the Electronic Voting in the Finnish Municipal Elections, <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1380337&Site=Congress>
- [16] Concerning e-voting in Switzerland see: <http://www.bk.admin.ch/themen/pore/evoting/>
- [17] OSCE, Handbook for the Observation of New Voting Technologies (2013) 8.

<sup>10</sup> In countries with multiple voting channels such as postal voting, the free selection of polling stations or mobile election commissions, the pressure to introduce e-voting does not seem to be as strong as in those countries where the present voting system is less flexible.

<sup>11</sup> To be held in Strasbourg on 3 to 5 November 2014 (<http://www.coe.int/de/web/world-forum-democracy>).

- [18] <http://www.idea.int/publications/introducing-electronic-voting/loader.cfm?csmodule=security/getfile&pageid=47347> (published in 2011).
- [19] Schwartz, B. and Grice, D. (2013) Establishing a legal framework for e-voting in Canada, [http://www.elections.ca/res/rec/tech/elfec/pdf/elfec\\_e.pdf](http://www.elections.ca/res/rec/tech/elfec/pdf/elfec_e.pdf)
- [20] U.S. Election Assistance Commission (2011) A survey of Internet Voting, <http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/SIV-FINAL.pdf>
- [21] Remmert, M. (2004) "Towards European Standards on Electronic Voting", in Prosser, A. and Krimmer, R. (Eds.), *Electronic Voting in Europe - Technology, Law, Politics and Society*, P-47, Gesellschaft für Informatik, 14.
- [22] CoE website: [http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/Activities/GGIS/Default\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/Activities/GGIS/Default_en.asp)
- [23] CoE website: <http://www.coe.int/t/dgap/democracy/activities/ggis/E-voting/>
- [24] Wenda, „Good Governance in the Information Society“ – Der Europarat und E-Voting, in Schweighofer/Kummer (Hrsg), *Europäische Projektkultur als Beitrag zur Rationalisierung des Rechts*, Tagungsband des 14. Internationalen Rechtsinformatik-Symposiums IRIS 2011 (2011) 293 ff.
- [25] Report Fourth Review Meeting, 4 June 2013, DGII/Inf(2013)06, 5.
- [26] Report Fourth Review Meeting, 4 June 2013, DGII/Inf(2013)06, 6.
- [27] Report of the Fourth Review Meeting of 4 June 2013, DGII/Inf(2013)06, 5 ("... it should be noted that a number of member states represented at the review meeting [including Austria, which will hold the Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers from November 2013 to May 2014] might be willing to consider making some extra-budgetary voluntary contributions to facilitate and expedite this work.")
- [28] Maurer, Report on the possible update of the Council of Europe Recommendation Rec(2004)11 on legal, operational and technical standards for e-voting, 29.11.2013.
- [29] For a summary of the whole debate see Report of 25 April 2013, DGII/Inf(2014)06, 4-6.
- [30] Report of 25 April 2013, DGII/Inf(2014)06, 4.
- [31] Report of 25 April 2013, DGII/Inf(2014)06, 5.
- [32] Sources of this summary include the relevant OSCE/ODIHR Reports, the proceedings of the EVOTE 2012 Conference near Bregenz, Austria, the Workshop Report of 25 April 2013, DGII/Inf(2014)06, 2-6, and notes of Robert Krimmer (ODIHR's expert on New Voting Technologies from 2010-2014).
- [33] [http://www.bmi.gv.at/cms/BMI\\_wahlen/wahlrecht/E\\_Voting.aspx](http://www.bmi.gv.at/cms/BMI_wahlen/wahlrecht/E_Voting.aspx)
- [34] Prosser, A., Krimmer, R., Kofler, R. *Electronic Voting in Austria. Current State of Public Elections over the Internet*, in: Kersting, Norbert, Baldersheim, Harald (eds): *Electronic voting and democracy. A comparative analysis*. New York (2004).
- [35] For further details, see the evaluation report: [http://www.e-voting.cc/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/05/Evaluierungsbericht\\_E-Voting\\_Hochschulereinerinnen-\\_und\\_Hochschulerschaftswahlen\\_2009.pdf](http://www.e-voting.cc/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/05/Evaluierungsbericht_E-Voting_Hochschulereinerinnen-_und_Hochschulerschaftswahlen_2009.pdf)
- [36] [http://www.vfgh.gv.at/cms/vfgh-site/attachments/7/6/7/CH0006/CMS1327398738575/e-voting\\_v85-11.pdf](http://www.vfgh.gv.at/cms/vfgh-site/attachments/7/6/7/CH0006/CMS1327398738575/e-voting_v85-11.pdf)
- [37] Trechsel, Alexander H. et al., 2007. *Internet Voting in the March 2007 Parliamentary Elections in Estonia*. Report for the Council of Europe. Strasbourg, Council of Europe (2007).
- [38] <http://www.vvk.ee/voting-methods-in-estonia/engindex/>
- [39] [http://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/entscheidungen/cs20090303\\_2\\_bvc000307.html](http://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/entscheidungen/cs20090303_2_bvc000307.html)
- [40] <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kmd/presesenter/pressemeldinger/2014/ikke-flere-forsok-med-stemmegivning-over-Internett-.html?id=764300>
- [41] [http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/electoral\\_commission\\_pdf\\_file/0015/13218/Keyfindingsandrecommendationssummarypaper\\_27191-20111\\_E\\_N\\_S\\_W\\_.pdf](http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/__data/assets/electoral_commission_pdf_file/0015/13218/Keyfindingsandrecommendationssummarypaper_27191-20111_E_N_S_W_.pdf)
- [42] <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/mar/26/uk-e-voting-elections-electoral-commission-voters>
- [43] Inter alia, Stein/Wenda, *Implementing the ECI: Challenges for the Member States*, in Prosser (Eds), *EDEM 2011, Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on E-Democracy* (2011) 45.
- [44] Inter alia, Kersting, Norbert, Baldersheim, Harald (eds): *Electronic voting and democracy. A comparative analysis*. New York: Palgrave (2004).
- [45] Inter alia, R. Michael Alvarez & Thad E. Hall, *Electronic Elections: The Perils and Promises of Digital Democracy* (2010).
- [46] See, inter alia, Barrat i Esteve/Goldsmith/Turner, *International Experience with E-Voting*, Norwegian E-Vote Project, IFES Study (2012) und den Bericht des „Fourth Review Meeting“ vom 4. Juni 2013, DGII/Inf(2013)06, 2 ff.
- [47] See especially the German Federal Constitutional Court ruling of 3 March 2009, [http://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/entscheidungen/cs20090303\\_2bvc000307.html](http://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/entscheidungen/cs20090303_2bvc000307.html) and the Austrian Constitutional Court ruling of 13 December 2011, [http://www.vfgh.gv.at/cms/vfgh-site/attachments/7/6/7/CH0006/CMS1327398738575/e-voting\\_v85-11.pdf](http://www.vfgh.gv.at/cms/vfgh-site/attachments/7/6/7/CH0006/CMS1327398738575/e-voting_v85-11.pdf)
- [48] Rec(2004)11, Preamble.
- [49] CM(2011)175 final of 15 March 2012, <http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/cooperation/economiccrime/cybercrime/Documents/Internet%20Governance%20Strategy/Internet%20Governance%20Strategy%202012%20-%202015.pdf>