

A Protocol for Cast-as-Intended Verifiability with a Second Device

Johannes Müller¹ and Tomasz Truderung²

¹ University of Luxembourg

² Polyas GmbH, Germany

Abstract. Numerous institutions, such as companies, universities, or non-governmental organizations, employ Internet voting for remote elections. Since the main purpose of an election is to determine the voters' will, it is fundamentally important to ensure that the final election result correctly reflects the voters' votes. To this end, modern secure Internet voting schemes aim for what is called *end-to-end verifiability*. This fundamental security property ensures that the correctness of the final result can be verified, even if some of the computers or parties involved are malfunctioning or corrupted.

A standard component in this approach is so called *cast-as-intended verifiability* which enables individual voters to verify that the ballots cast on their behalf contain their intended choices. Numerous approaches for cast-as-intended verifiability have been proposed in the literature, some of which have also been employed in real-life Internet elections. These different approaches strike a balance between practical aspects and security guarantees in different ways.

One of the well established approaches for cast-as-intended verifiability is to employ a second device which can be used by voters to audit their submitted ballots. This approach offers several advantages—including support for flexible ballot/election types and intuitive user experience—and it has been used in real-life elections, for instance in Estonia [21]. Importantly, the solutions based on this approach are typically not bound to a particular election protocol, but rather they can augment many existing and practically relevant voting protocols.

In this work, we improve the existing solutions for cast-as-intended verifiability based on the use of a second device. We propose a solution which, while preserving the advantageous practical properties sketched above, provides tighter security guarantees. Our method does not increase the risk of vote-selling when compared to the underlying voting protocol being augmented and, to achieve this, it requires only comparatively weak trust assumptions. It can be combined with various voting protocols, including commitment-based systems offering everlasting privacy.

In summary, our work presents a new option to strengthen cast-as-intended and thus end-to-end verifiability of real-world Internet elections.

1 Introduction

Internet voting has been employed by numerous institutions, such as companies, universities, or non-governmental organizations, as well as for some remote elections on the national level. The adoption of Internet voting has been driven by several practical

benefits of this form of voting, in particular enabling all voters to participate regardless of their physical location.

Internet voting comes, however, with its own challenges and risks. One of those risks lies in potential malfunctioning, which for such complex software-hardware systems cannot be easily ruled out. Such issues can be caused by design/programming mistakes, security vulnerabilities, or even by deliberate tampering with the deployed system. In any case, malfunctioning can potentially have serious practical consequences. In fact, if the final election result is accepted although it does not correspond to the votes submitted by the voters, then the actual purpose of an election is undermined.

To safeguard against such risks, modern Internet voting systems strive for so-called *end-to-end verifiability* [10]. This fundamental property requires the system to provide *evidence* that the election result accurately reflects the votes cast by eligible voters. Importantly, such evidence must be independently verifiable.

Individual verifiability is an essential part of end-to-end verifiability. This property guarantees that each individual voter is able to verify whether the vote she entered to her voting device is in fact tallied. Individual verifiability is typically achieved as follows. First, the voter verifies whether her (possibly malfunctioning) voting device cast her encrypted vote as she intended; this feature is called *cast-as-intended verifiability*. Then, the voter checks whether the ballot she cast is tallied by the authorities; this feature is called *tallied-as-recorded verifiability*. If both of these features are in place, they enable all individual voters to verify independently that exactly their secret votes are tallied.

The requirement of end-to-end verifiability in general, and individual verifiability in particular, is not only widely stipulated by the research community, but it is also becoming part of the standard legal requirements and frameworks. The relevance of verifiability is recognized, for instance, by the Council of Europe in its recommendation on standards for e-voting [26]. Importantly, the same document specifies that “individual verifiability can be implemented provided adequate safeguards exist to prevent coercion or vote-buying”. Requirements for individual verifiability are also postulated for the Swiss elections in *Federal Chancellery Ordinance on Electronic Voting*³, for the Estonian elections in *Riigikogu Election Act*⁴, and for non-political elections in Germany [6].

Numerous techniques for cast-as-intended verifiability have been proposed in the literature (see, e.g., [14,17,18,5,9,2,21,16,15,25,28]). Some of them are also employed in real elections, for example [21] in the Estonian voting system IVXV, and [2] in the Helios voting system [1]. Each of these techniques provides its own balance between security, trust assumptions, usability, and deployability.

³ “For the purpose of individual verification, voters must receive proof that the server system has registered the vote as it was entered by the voter on the user platform as being in conformity with the system.” [7]

⁴ “A voter has an opportunity to verify whether the application used for electronic voting has transferred the vote cast by the voter to the electronic voting system according to the voter’s wish.” [27]

1.1 Our contributions

We propose a method for cast-as-intended verifiability that offers a new balance between security guarantees and practical aspects; in particular, it can be used to augment many relevant Internet voting protocols. Our method does not increase the risk of vote selling, when compared to the underlying voting protocol being augmented, which is provided under comparatively weak trust assumptions.

More specifically, we optimized our cast-as-intended mechanism for the following *design goals*. The first four design goals (DG1)-(DG4) are functional and they essentially determine the election scenarios in which the cast-as-intended mechanism can be applied; in combination, the functional design goals cover a wide range of real-world elections over the Internet, which is a central requirement for our practically orientated work. The last two design goals (DG5)-(DG6) express security features that the cast-as-intended mechanism should provide.

- (DG1) *Support for flexible ballot types*. The mechanism should not be restricted to only some specific ballot types, such as simple ballots with relatively small number of candidates or simple ballot rules. On the contrary, it is desirable that complex ballots are supported, including, for instance, ballots with write-in candidates or ranked voting.
- (DG2) *Low cost*. The mechanism should not significantly increase the cost of the election, for instance by requiring dedicated secure printing/distribution facilities.
- (DG3) *No disenfranchisement of voters*. The mechanism should not make unrealistic assumptions about voters' knowledge, abilities, and what they possess. This rules out mechanisms which assume some sort of custom hardware. Also, the mechanism should be reasonably intuitive so that an average voter could understand what he/she is supposed to do and why.
- (DG4) *Modularity*. The mechanism can be used to augment a large class of Internet voting protocols, in particular protocols using different type of tallying, and protocols with everlasting privacy. The method should support modular security analysis, where the security properties of the combined scheme can be derived from the security properties of the underlying protocol (without individual verifiability) and the properties of the individual verifiability method.
- (DG5) *No facilitation of vote-selling*. The mechanism should not make vote-selling easier than in the voting scheme being augmented. To be clear: We do not aim at protecting the overall voting scheme against vote-selling, but we require that the cast-as-intended mechanism should not additionally provide voters with receipts that they can use to *trivially* prove towards a vote-buyer how they voted.
- (DG6) *Possibly minimal trust assumptions*. We prioritize solutions which require weaker or more flexible trust assumptions.

An example of such a trust assumption is reliance on some trapdoor values generated by a trusted entity, where for the integrity of the individual verifiability method, we need to assume that this party is honest (not corrupted) and that the trapdoor value does not leak.

As we discuss in detail in Sec. 2, no existing method for cast-as-intended verifiability in the literature achieves all of our design goals simultaneously in a satisfactory

degree. We note, however, that, while our solution is optimized for our particular design goals, other methods may be better suited for different election settings which require different resolution of the security/usability/deployability trade-offs.

Let us now explain on a high level how and why our cast-as-intended mechanism achieves all of our design goals satisfactorily:

- We follow the approach that employs a second device, called *audit device*, which voters can use to verify that the ballot submitted on their behalf contains their intended choice. This approach is established and it has already been used in real-life elections, for example in Estonia [21]. More precisely, in our method the voter can use a general-purpose device, such as a mobile phone or tablet, as the audit device. This audit device needs to be able to scan QR-codes and it also has to connect with the Internet in order to communicate with the election system. In this way, we avoid a costly additional infrastructure (DG2), and we do not need to make unrealistic assumptions about what voters possess (DG3).
- The audit procedure is straightforward from a voter’s point of view, as explained next. Once the encrypted ballot has been sent to the election system, a QR-code is displayed by the voting application. The voter uses the audit device to scan this QR-code. The audit device then prompts the voter to authenticate against the election system and, if this authentication is successful, it shows the voter’s choice in plaintext, in the same form as the ballot was displayed in the primary (voting) device. We note that, nowadays, most voters are used to such or similar checks, for example in the context of secure online banking. Furthermore, the audit step is optional and thus not required to cast a ballot successfully. In summary, we make reasonable assumptions about the voters’ knowledge and abilities (DG2).
- On a technical note, our method works well with all possible ballot types, even very complex ones, satisfying (DG1). Moreover, our modular method can be used to augment a large class of relevant Internet voting protocols (DG4), and the computational cost of the ballot audit computations is very reasonable (DG2).
- Unlike all previous cast-as-intended mechanisms that employ a second device [21,16], our method simultaneously satisfies (DG5) and (DG6). We achieve this by providing *cryptographic denialability*, without introducing additional trust assumptions. To this end, we employ *interactive zero-knowledge proofs* where any party, by definition, can easily simulate the protocol transcript without the knowledge of the plaintext or the encryption coin. We use well-understood and relatively simple cryptography: our method, in its essence, relies on the interactive zero-knowledge proof of correct re-encryption. This results in simpler security proofs, which is an additional important factor in building trust.

Technically, the main challenge that we needed to resolve was induced by the general limitations of QR-codes. As described above, the QR-codes in our method are used as the only communication channel between the voting application and the audit device. However, QR-codes provide only very restricted communication capacity since they are one-way and of very limited bandwidth. Now, in order to implement an *interactive zero-knowledge proof* in this restricted setting, we split the role of the prover between the voting application and the election system in such a way that the election system

does not learn anything during this process, while doing most of the ‘heavy-lifting’. The role of the verifier, as usual for such schemes, is played by the audit device.

We note that, since the audit device displays the voter’s choice, it needs to be trusted for ballot privacy. This is also the case for all other techniques that employ a second device [21,16]. In general, cast-as-intended methods based on return or voting codes do not have this disadvantage; however, they fall short on other design goals (see Sec. 2 for more details).

1.2 Structure of the paper

In the next section, we provide more details on the existing approaches for cast-as-intended verifiability. We describe our cast-as-intended mechanism in Sec. 3 and we analyze its security in Sec. 4. In Sec. 5, we embed our cast-as-intended protocol in an example protocol which provides full individual verifiability and state higher-level security properties of this protocol. Finally, in Sec. 6, we discuss some practical cryptographic instantiations of our approach.

For completeness, we recall the relevant definitions of the zero-knowledge proofs in Appendix A and provide a concrete instantiation of an interactive zero-knowledge proof for equality of discrete logarithms in Appendix B.

2 Related Work

Various mechanisms for individual (cast-as-intended) verifiability have been proposed in the literature, striking different balances between security, usability, and several other practical aspects of the ballot casting process. In this section, we provide a brief overview of such mechanisms and explain why none of them offers our desired security features (DG5)-(DG6) in those real-world elections that we are interested in, as determined by (DG1)-(DG4). In particular, we focus here only on methods used for *Internet e-voting* (as opposed to on-site voting).

Return Codes. In the return-codes-based approach (see, e.g., [14,17,18,5]), before the voting phase starts, each voter receives a *code sheet* (e.g. via postal mail) listing all the possible voting choices together with corresponding *verification codes*. These codes are unique for each voter and should be kept secret. During the voting phase, the voter, after having cast her ballot, receives (via the voting application or another dedicated channel) the return code corresponding to the selected choice. The voter compares this code to the one listed on the code sheet next to the intended choice.

While this approach may work well and seems intuitive from the voter’s point of view, it has several drawbacks. It does not scale well to complex ballots ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG1), such as ballots with many candidates or when voters have the option to select multiple choices, because the code sheets become very big and the user experience quickly degrades (see, e.g., [24]). Another disadvantage is the cost incurred by (secure) printing and delivery of code sheets ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG2). Finally, the printing and delivery facilities must be trusted in this approach: if the verification codes leak to the adversary, the integrity of the process completely breaks (a dishonest voting client can cast a modified choice and return the

code corresponding to the voter's intended choices). This trust assumption is rather strong ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG6).

Voting Codes. In this approach, the voter, as above, obtains a voting sheet with voting codes. The difference is that the codes are not used to check the ballot after it has been cast, but instead to prepare/encode the ballot in the first place: in order to vote, the voter enters the code (or scans a QR-code) corresponding to their choice. By construction, the voting client is then only able to prepare a valid ballot for the selected choice and no other ones. This approach is used, for example, in [9], where the voting codes are used not only to provide individual verifiability, but also to protect ballot privacy against dishonest voting client.

This approach, similarly to the return codes, works only for simple ballots ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG1); arguably, the usability issues are even bigger than for return codes, as the voter needs to type appropriated codes or scan appropriate QR-codes in order to correctly cast a ballot, not just compare the returned code with the expected one. As before, it incurs additional costs ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG2) and requires one to trust the printing/delivery facilities ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG6).

Cast-or-Audit. The cast-or-audit approach, used for instance in Helios [1], utilizes the so-called Benaloh Challenge [2] method. In this approach, the voter, after her choice has been encrypted by the voting client, has two options: she can *either* choose to (1) cast this encrypted ballot *or* (2) challenge (i.e., audit) the ballot. If the latter option is chosen, the voting client enables the audit by revealing the randomness used to encrypt the ballot, so that the voter (typically using some additional device or application) can check that it contains the intended choice. The voter then starts the ballot cast process over again, possibly selecting a different choice.

The security of this approach relies on the assumption that the client application (the adversary) does not know beforehand, whether the encrypted vote will be audited or cast. Therefore, if the adversary tries to manipulate the ballot, it risks that this will be detected. Note, however, that the ballot which is actually cast is not the one which is audited. This, unlike most of the other approaches, provides the voter with some (probabilistic) assurance, but not with fully effective guarantees.

This method has the advantage that it does not produce a receipt (the voter can choose different candidates for the audited ballots) and that the audit device does need to have Internet access for verification (unlike cast-and-audit methods like ours), but it has several usability issues. The studies on usability of this scheme [29,22] conclude that voters tend to not verify their votes and have serious problems with understanding the idea of this type of ballot audit, which make this approach score low on (DG3). The above issues render the cast-or-audit approach ineffective in practice.

Cast-and-Audit. The solution presented in this paper belongs to this category. In this approach, the voter audits, typically using a second device, the cast ballot (before or after it is cast).

This approach is used by the system deployed for the Estonian elections [21]. In this case, the voters can use a mobile application to scan a QR-code displayed by the voting client application. This QR-code includes the random encryption coin used to encrypt the voter's choice. The audit device fetches the voter's ballot from the ballot box and

uses the provided randomness to extract the voter's choice which is then displayed for the voter to inspect.

This method is flexible as it works well also for complex ballot types (DG1) (the audit device conveniently displays the vote in the same way the ballot appeared in the main voting device). The user experience, for this method, is relatively simple (DG3). The method does not incur extra cost (DG2).

The main disadvantage of this method in general is that the additional (audit) device must be trusted for ballot privacy, as it "sees" the voter choice in clear. Also, the fact that the voters need to have an additional device (such as a mobile phone), which is able to scan QR-codes and which has Internet access, can be seen as a disadvantage. However, with the high availability of such devices, this does not seem to be a significant issue in practice. The correctness of the ballot audit process relies on the assumption that one of the devices the voter uses (either the main voting device or the audit device) is not corrupted. In practice, it is therefore desirable that the software programs (apps) run on these two devices were developed and installed independently, ideally by different vendors or trusted third parties (e.g., pro-democratic organizations).

The main idea of the cast-as-intended mechanism proposed in [21] is that the QR-code includes the encryption random coins. Such a coin constitutes a trivial and direct evidence for the plaintext content of the encrypted ballot. As such, the simple cast-as-intended mechanism of [21] does not provide cryptographic *deniability* and may potentially facilitate vote buying/coercion ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG4). Whether this potential for vote buying/coercion becomes an actual threat depends on the overall voting protocol; for instance, the Estonian system allows for vote updating as a measure to mitigate the threat of coercion. The lack of cryptographic deniability remains nevertheless a serious drawback of this method and significantly limits its applicability.

The issue of selling cast-as-intended data as trivial receipts in Internet elections is addressed in [16], where cryptographic deniability is provided using non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs with trapdoors. This solution to the receipt problem has, however, its own issues: the trapdoor (for each voter) is generated by a registrar who therefore needs to be trusted for integrity of this method. This is arguably a strong trust assumption ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG6).

As already mentioned in the introduction, the solution presented in this paper, while also providing cryptographic deniability, does not require such an additional trust assumption (DG6). It also avoids the relatively complex cryptographic machinery of [16], which often is the source of serious programming flaws (see, e.g., [19]).

Custom hardware tokens. Some other solutions, such as [15], rely on using dedicated hardware tokens during the cast process. Relying on custom hardware makes these solutions expensive and difficult to deploy in real, big scale elections ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG2), ($\frac{1}{2}$ DG3). Furthermore, [23] demonstrated that [15] suffers from several security issues and concluded that [15] was not yet ready to be deployed.

Tracking codes. The sElect system [25] achieves cast-as-intended in a simple way: voters are given random tracking numbers as they cast their ballots. After the tally, voters can check that their tracking numbers appear next to their respective votes.

This method is simple and intuitive for the voters, but has the following drawbacks. End-to-end verifiability relies on the voters to perform the checks because there is no universal verifiability process that complements the individual verifiability made by the voters. Also, in [25], the tracking codes were “generated” and entered by the voters. This is somehow problematic both from the usability point of view and because of the poor quality of “random” numbers made up by voters (see, e.g., [3]). Altogether, this method seems to take somehow unrealistic assumptions about the voters: that the voters carry out the process often enough for achieving the desired security level and that they are able to generate decent randomness ($\not\leq$ DG3). Furthermore, the tracking codes, as used in [25], may allow for simple vote buying ($\not\leq$ DG5).

The construction presented in Selene [28] also builds upon the idea of tracking codes, but further guarantees receipt-freeness, and thus impedes vote buying, due to a complex cryptographic machinery. The cast-as-intended mechanism is here, however, tightly bound to the e-voting protocol and thus not modular ($\not\leq$ DG4). In particular, unlike for the method proposed in this paper, it is not immediately obvious how to improve Selene towards everlasting privacy or how to instantiate Selene with practical post-quantum primitives.

3 Cast-As-Intended Verifiability: Generic Protocol

In this section, we present our protocol for cast-as-intended verifiability. We take a modular approach: in Section 3.1, we start off describing a generic basic ballot submission process *without* cast-as-intended, and then, in Section 3.2, we build upon this basic process and extend it with cast-as-intended verifiability.

In Sec. 5, we will explain how to (easily) extend our cast-as-intended protocol so that full individual verifiability is achieved.

3.1 Basic ballot submission

We describe now how the basic ballot submission (sub-)protocol of an e-voting protocol without cast-as-intended verifiability works which establishes the starting point for our mechanism, introduced in the next subsection. Doing this, we abstract from some aspects (such as authentication) which are irrelevant for our cast-as-intended protocol.

We provide this explicitly defined basic protocol in order to be able to compare the knowledge the voting server gathers during this process with the knowledge it gathers during the process extended with the cast-as-intended mechanism.

Participants. The basic submission protocol is run among the following participants: the voter V , the voting device VD , and the voting server VS . In what follows, we implicitly assume that the channel from V (via the voting devices) to the voting server VS is authenticated without taking any assumption about how authentication is carried out.⁵

⁵ Since the exact method of authentication is not relevant for the purposes of our cast-as-intended protocol, we abstract away from authentication in our presentation. In practice, the voter can use for example a password to log in to VS .

Cryptographic primitives. In the basic ballot submission protocol, an IND-CPA-secure public-key encryption scheme $\mathcal{E} = (\text{KeyGen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ is employed.

Ballot submission (basic). We assume that $(pk, sk) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}$ was generated correctly in the setup phase of the voting protocol and that each party knows pk .⁶ The program of the basic submission protocol works in the standard way:

1. Voter V enters plaintext vote v to her voting device VD .
2. Voting device VD chooses randomness $r \xleftarrow{\$} R$, computes ciphertext $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(pk, v; r)$, and sends c to voting server VS .

We note that the basic protocol may include signing the ballot with voter's private key if a public-key infrastructure (PKI) among the voters is established.⁷

3.2 Cast-as-intended verifiable ballot submission

We now describe how to extend the basic ballot submission protocol described above for cast-as-intended verifiability.

Participants. In addition to the three participants of the basic ballot submission phase (voter V , voting device VD , voting server VS), the extended protocol also includes an audit device AD .

Cryptographic primitives. The extended submission protocol employs the following cryptographic primitives:

1. An IND-CPA-secure public-key encryption scheme $\mathcal{E} = (\text{KeyGen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ that allows for re-randomization and special decryption:
 - *Re-randomization* guarantees the existence of a *probabilistic polynomial-time (ppt)* algorithm ReRand which takes as input a public key pk together with a ciphertext $c = \text{Enc}(pk, m; r)$ and returns a ciphertext c^* such that $c^* = \text{Enc}(pk, m; r^*)$ for some (fresh) randomness r^* . We assume that ReRand is *homomorphic* w.r.t. randomness: $\text{Enc}(pk, m; x + r) = \text{ReRand}(pk, \text{Enc}(pk, m; r); x)$.
 - *Special decryption* guarantees the existence of a *polynomial-time (pt)* algorithm Dec' which takes as input a public key pk , a ciphertext c , and a randomness r , and returns the plaintext m , if $c = \text{Enc}(pk, m; r)$, or fails otherwise.⁸

⁶ The secret key sk is known only to the talliers of the election who use (their shares of) sk to decrypt the ballots in the tallying phase. The exact method used to verifiably tally the ballots (via, e.g., homomorphic aggregation, or verifiable shuffling) is orthogonal to the cast-as-intended method proposed in this paper.

⁷ Since this aspect is independent of our cast-as-intended protocol, we do not assume that voters sign their ballots in our presentation. We note that our protocol also works with ballots signed by voters.

⁸ Special decryption is given for free if the message space is polynomially bounded: one can simply brute-force all the potential plaintext messages and encrypt each with the given randomness until this produces c .

Note that neither ReRand nor Dec' require knowledge of the secret key sk associated to pk .

2. A proof of correct re-encryption, i.e., an interactive zero-knowledge proof (ZKP) π_{ReRand} for the following relation: $(pk, c, c^*, x) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{ReRand}} \Leftrightarrow c^* = \text{ReRand}(pk, c; x)$. The joint input of the prover and the verifier is statement (pk, c, c^*) and the secret input of the prover is witness x , i.e., the randomness used to re-randomize ciphertext c into c^* .

Ballot submission (extended). The program of the extended ballot submission works as follows (note that the first two steps are the ones of the basic ballot submission protocol):

- (BS1) Voter V enters plaintext vote v to voting device VD .
- (BS2) Voting device VD chooses randomness $r \xleftarrow{\$} R$, computes ciphertext $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(pk, v; r)$, and sends c to voting server VS .
- (BS3) Voting server VS chooses a blinding factor $x \xleftarrow{\$} R$ and sends x to VD .
- (BS4) Voting device VD computes blinded randomness $r^* \leftarrow x + r$ and returns r^* to voter V (in the practical implementations, r^* can be displayed as a QR-code).

From the voter's perspective, the outcome of the submission protocol consists of the blinded randomness r^* , which is used for individual verification purposes, as described next.

Cast-as-intended verification. The program of the voter's individual cast-as-intended verification works as follows. It is executed, if the voter chooses to audit his/her ballot. As for the ballot submission, in what follows, we implicitly assume that the channel from V (via the audit devices) to the voting server VS is authenticated.

- (BA1) Voter V enters r^* to the audit device AD (in practical implementations this is done by scanning a QR code produced by VD), which contacts voting server VS .
- (BA2) Voting server VS computes ciphertext $c^* \leftarrow \text{ReRand}(pk, c; x)$ (i.e., original ciphertext c re-randomized with the blinding factor x) and sends the original ciphertext c along with c^* to the audit device AD .
- (BA3) Voting server VS and audit device AD run interactive zero-knowledge proof π_{ReRand} , where VS is the prover and AD the verifier, with joint input (pk, c, c^*) and voting server's secret input x in order to prove/verify that c^* is a re-randomization of c .
- (BA4) If the verification algorithm in the step above returned 1, then AD decrypts the re-randomized ciphertext c^* using blinded randomness r^* to obtain $v^* \leftarrow \text{Dec}'(pk, c^*, r^*)$ and returns v^* to voter V . Otherwise, AD returns 0 (indicating failure) to V .
- (BA5) Voter V returns 1 (accepts) if AD returned v^* such that $v = v^*$ (where v is the voter's intended choice). Otherwise, V returns 0 (reject).

4 Security

Our cryptographic security analysis of the cast-as-intended protocol (as introduced in Sec. 3.2) consists of two parts. In the first part, we prove that this protocol is an interactive zero-knowledge proof (ZKP) protocol, run between voter V and audit device AD , jointly playing the role of the verifier on the one side, and the voting device VD and voting server VS jointly playing the role of the prover on the other side. This fact establishes the *cryptographic deniability* of our cast-as-intended method: the protocol transcript (the data gathered by the audit device) is useless as a receipt, because an indistinguishable transcript can be generated by any party, using the simulator algorithm (for an arbitrary election choice, independently of the actual voter’s choice).

In the second part, we prove that the voting server VS does not learn more information about the voter’s secret choice than what VS already learns in the basic ballot submission protocol. Note that this statement is not directly covered by the zero-knowledge (simulation) property of the protocol, because VS is part of the prover.

In Sec. 5, we will explain how to extend the cast-as-intended protocol analyzed in this section so that it provides full individual verifiability.

4.1 Zero-knowledge proof

We show that our cast-as-intended protocol is a ZKP to prove that a given ballot contains a vote for a particular candidate. From the soundness of this ZKP, it follows that even if the voter’s voting device VD and the voting server VS collude, then they are not able to convince the voter V (who uses an honest audit device AD) that her submitted ballot contains a vote for her favorite choice v when it actually contains a different choice. Moreover, due to the zero-knowledge property, VD and VS prove that the submitted ballot contains a vote for the voter’s favorite choice without revealing any information beyond this statement; in particular, the protocol does not leave any information which could undesirably serve as a receipt that could be used for vote buying.

Let Verify be the composition of the programs run by voter V and her audit device AD after the basic ballot submission protocol is completed, i.e., steps (BS3)–(BS4) in the extended ballot submission protocol followed by the cast-as-intended protocol; in short: $\text{Verify} = (V\|AD)$. Analogously, let Prove be the unification of the programs run by the voting device VD and the voting server VS after the basic ballot submission protocol is completed; in short $\text{Prove} = (VD\|VS)$.

Observe that the resulting interactive protocol with joint input (pk, v, c) and prover’s secret input r can be re-written as the following protocol:

1. Prove chooses $x \xleftarrow{\$} R$, computes $r^* \leftarrow x + r$ and $c^* \leftarrow \text{ReRand}(pk, c; x)$, and returns (r^*, c^*) .
2. Prove and Verify run the interactive ZKP π_{ReRand} with joint input (pk, c, c^*) and prover’s secret input x .
3. Verify returns 1 if and only if the execution of π_{ReRand} returned 1 and $v = \text{Dec}'(pk, c^*, r^*)$ holds true.

We now state that this protocol is an interactive ZKP for proving that ciphertext c encrypts vote v (see Appendix A, where we recall the definition of zero-knowledge proofs).

Theorem 1. *The interactive protocol $\pi_{\text{Enc}} = (\text{Verify}, \text{Prove})$ is a zero-knowledge proof for relation $(pk, v, c; r) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Enc}} \Leftrightarrow c = \text{Enc}(pk, v; r)$.*

In order to prove this theorem, we need to show that π_{Enc} satisfies correctness (i.e., if Verify and Prove are executed correctly for a true statement, then Verify returns 1), soundness (i.e., if Verify returns 1, then the statement is correct), and zero-knowledge (i.e., the verifier's view can be simulated without knowledge of the witness), each with at least overwhelming probability.

Proof. Correctness: Let x, x^*, c^* be defined as in Prove. Because $(pk, c^*, c; x) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{ReRand}}$, the verifier returns 1 in an execution of π_{ReRand} with probability p_c , where p_c is the correctness level of π_{ReRand} . Furthermore, the verifier's second check is also positive because

$$c^* = \text{ReRand}(pk, \text{Enc}(pk, v; r), x) = \text{Enc}(pk, v; x+r) = \text{Enc}(pk, v; r^*).$$

Hence, Verify returns 1 in π_{Enc} with probability p_c if both Verify and Prove are executed correctly; in short: $\Pr[\langle \text{Verify}, \text{Prove}(r) \rangle(pk, v, c) = 1] = p_c$.

Soundness: Assume that Verify returns 1. Then, due to the soundness of π_{ReRand} , there exists with probability p_s a unique plaintext v^* such that we have $c^* \in \text{Enc}(pk, v^*)$ and $c \in \text{Enc}(pk, v^*)$, where p_s is the soundness level of π_{ReRand} . Furthermore, since Verify returns 1, by the property of special decryption Dec' , we have $c^* \in \text{Enc}(pk, v)$ and hence $v = v^*$. This means that $c \in \text{Enc}(pk, v)$ with probability p_s .

Zero-knowledge: We can construct a simulator Sim, which does not have access to the witness r and which replaces Prove in the re-written protocol, as follows:

1. Sim chooses $r^* \xleftarrow{\$} R$, computes $c^* \leftarrow \text{Enc}(pk, v; r^*)$, and returns (r^*, c^*) .
2. Sim simulates the interactive ZKP π_{ReRand} without knowledge of x .

Due to the ZK property of π_{ReRand} , the verifier is not able to distinguish a real execution and a simulated one with probability p_z , where p_z is the ZK level of π_{ReRand} .

4.2 Simulatability towards voting server

Recall that in the basic ballot submission protocol, the only data that VS obtains from the voter is the voter's encrypted choice $c = \text{Enc}(pk, v; r)$. Due to the semantic security of the public-key encryption scheme \mathcal{E} , the probability that VS can derive any information about the voter's vote v is negligible (if VS is computationally bounded).

Now, in what follows, we show that the voting server VS does not learn more information about the voter's vote in the cast-as-intended protocol than what VS learns in the basic ballot submission protocol. To this end, we compare the voting server's view in both protocols and show that all additional interaction between those participants that know/learn the voter's vote (i.e., voter V herself, her voting device VD , and her audit

device AD) on the one side and the voting server VS on the other side can be perfectly simulated without any knowledge of the voter's vote v .

From the voting server's perspective, the basic ballot submission protocol can be re-written as follows, where \hat{V} is the unification of the programs of V and VD :

1. \hat{V} chooses randomness $r \xleftarrow{\$} R$, computes ciphertext $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(pk, v; r)$, and sends c to voting server VS .

From the voting server's perspective, the cast-as-intended protocol (i.e., verifiable ballot submission followed by cast-as-intended verification) can be re-written as follows, where \hat{V}_{ext} is the unification of the programs of V , VD , and AD :

1. \hat{V}_{ext} chooses randomness $r \xleftarrow{\$} R$, computes ciphertext $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(pk, v; r)$, and sends c to voting server VS .
2. Voting server VS chooses blinding factor $x \xleftarrow{\$} R$, computes ciphertext $c^* \leftarrow \text{ReRand}(pk, c; x)$, and sends (c^*, x) to voting device \hat{V}_{ext} .
3. VS and \hat{V}_{ext} run interactive ZKP π_{ReRand} with joint input (pk, c, c^*) and voting server's secret input x in order to prove/verify that c^* is a re-randomization of c .

Due to the re-written presentations of the two protocols, it is easy to see that from the voting server's perspective, the only task carried out by \hat{V} in the cast-as-intended protocol in addition to \hat{V}_{ext} 's tasks in the ballot submission protocol is executing the verification program of the interactive proof π_{ReRand} . Observe that the verification program of π_{ReRand} can be executed by *any* party which knows (pk, c, c^*) ; in particular no knowledge about the voter's vote v or randomization elements r, r^* is required. We can therefore perfectly simulate \hat{V}_{ext} 's additional program in the cast-as-intended protocol. Using the standard (simulation) argument that the voting server VS could run the simulation algorithm (in our case: the verification program of π_{ReRand}) itself, we conclude that the voting server VS does not learn more information about the voter's vote in the cast-as-intended protocol than what VS learns in the basic ballot submission protocol.

Remark 1. In the individually verifiable ballot submission protocol described above, the voting server VS does not learn whether the voter accepted or rejected a protocol run, i.e., whether \hat{V}_{ext} returned 0 or 1. Depending on the overall voting protocol specification, VS may however learn the final output of \hat{V}_{ext} , for example, when the voting protocol requires that each voter submits a *confirmation code* to the voting server after she completed her cast-as-intended verification successfully in order to publicly confirm that V accepts the submitted ballot (see, e.g., [14]).

We note that even if VS learns the output of \hat{V}_{ext} , ballot privacy towards a possibly corrupted VS is still guaranteed in our cast-as-intended protocol. In order to prove this claim, we show that the probability of the event that the execution of π_{ReRand} returned 1 but $v \neq \text{Dec}(pk, c^*, r + \tilde{x})$ holds true, where (c^*, \tilde{x}) is the output of VS , is negligible. Let us consider the set of runs in which this event holds true. Due to the soundness of π_{ReRand} , there exists $x \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $c^* = \text{ReRand}(pk, c; x) = \text{Enc}(pk, v; r + x)$. Now, if $v \neq \text{Dec}'(pk, c^*, r + \tilde{x})$, then there exists $\tilde{v} \neq v$ such that $c^* = \text{Enc}(pk, \tilde{v}; r + \tilde{x})$ holds true. Due to the correctness of the PKE scheme \mathcal{E} , it follows that $v = \text{Dec}(sk, c^*) = \tilde{v}$, which is a contradiction to $v \neq \tilde{v}$.

We can therefore conclude that the slightly extended cast-as-intended protocol can be simulated (with overwhelming probability) exactly as in the case above where VS does not learn the output of \hat{V}_{ext} when we additionally specify that the simulator returns 1 to VS if and only if π_{ReRand} returns 1. Note that the simulator does not need to check whether $v = \text{Dec}(pk, c^*, r^*)$ and hence does not need to know v .

5 Full Individual Verifiability

In the previous two sections, we presented the method for cast-as-intended verifiability and analyzed the security properties of this method. Cast-as-intended, which enables the voter to audit his/her ballot and check that it contains the intended choice, does not, however, fully cover the notion of individual verifiability. What is missing is the guarantee that the audited ballot takes part in the tally (sometimes called *tallied-as-recorded*).

In this section, we add the standard mechanism to achieve tallied-as-recorded verifiability: a public bulletin board and signed receipts. We also state the higher level security properties such a final system provides.

The content of this section can be seen as an example for how our cast-as-intended mechanism can be embedded in a more complete protocol to provide full individual verifiability.

As noted, we introduce an additional participant: the public bulletin board. It is used to collect all the cast ballots, where ballots are published together with unique voter identifiers. We assume that the voters (or auditors) have access to this public bulletin board (during and/or after the ballot cast process) and can check that a given ballot is included there.

We also assume that the voting server has a (private) signing key and that the corresponding (public) verification key is publicly known.

The modifications to the protocol presented in Section 3 are straightforward. The changes in the ballot submission protocol are as follows.

- The encrypted ballot c submitted in Step (BS2) is published by the voting server on the public bulletin board together with a unique voter’s identifier.
- In step (BS3), the voting server VS additionally sends to the voting device VD a *signed ballot cast confirmation* s , that is a signature on the cast ballot c . The signature s is then checked by the voting device VD and s is given to the voter in Step (BS4).

We also consider the following changes in the ballot audit process:

- The voting server VS , in Step (BA2), sends additionally to the audit device AD the ballot cast confirmation s , as in the step above. The audit device checks that s contains a valid signature of the voting server on c .
- In the final step of the ballot audit process, the voter is given the signed ballot cast confirmation.

Note that the ballot cast confirmation is provided to the voter twice: once by the voting device and then by the audit device. It is expected that these confirmations are exactly the same (which is the case when both devices are honest).

With such receipt, the voter, having executed the ballot audit process, has the following guarantees which directly follow from the results of Section 4.

Theorem 2 (informal). *Assume that at least one of the voter devices (the voting device or the audit device) is honest. If the voter successfully carried out the ballot cast process and the ballot audit process, then the voter is in the possession of ballot confirmation which (1) is correctly signed by the voting server, and (2) refers to an encrypted ballot containing the voter’s intended choice (as shown to the voter and confirmed in the ballot audit process).*

At the same time, the second device (even if it behaves dishonestly) is not able to produce a convincing evidence for a third party about the voter’s choice.

With this result, given that one of the devices is honest, the voter can check that their ballot, containing their intended choice, is included in the public bulletin board (and if not, given the valid signature, the voter can demonstrate that the voting server misbehaved) and by this also included in the final tally (where the correctness of the tallying process is given due to the universal verifiability).

Note that to strengthen this result, the voter can even carry out the ballot audit process using more than one device. With this, even if only one of these devices was honest, it would be enough to guarantee cast-as-intended.

6 Instantiations

We demonstrate that our cast-as-intended protocol can be instantiated with common cryptographic primitives. Our protocol can therefore be used to extend important e-voting protocols for cast-as-intended verification.

6.1 ElGamal-based e-voting schemes

A natural instantiation of our method is the one based on the standard ElGamal group of order q with a generator g . In this setting, the public key is of the form $h = g^{sk}$, where $sk \in \mathbb{Z}_q = \{0, \dots, q-1\}$. Given a plaintext message $m \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, the encryption of m with randomness r is $c = (g^r, m \cdot h^r)$.

Special decryption: For a ciphertext of the form $c = (u, w)$ encrypted using randomness r (which means that $u = g^r$ and $w = m \cdot h^r$), the randomness r allows one to easily extract the plaintext message by (checking that u is in fact g^r and) computing $w \cdot h^{-r}$.

Re-randomisation of a ciphertext $c = (u, w)$ is of the form $c' = (u', w')$ where $u' = u \cdot g^x$ and $w' = w \cdot h^x$. In order to prove that c' is a re-randomisation of c , one can use the well-known sigma-protocol for equality of discrete logarithms, that is the proof of knowledge of x such that $X = \frac{u'}{u} = g^x$ and $Y = \frac{w'}{w} = h^x$ [8], and transform it into an interactive zero-knowledge protocol using, for instance, the technique from [20,?]. See Appendix B, where, for the sake of completeness, a specific instantiation is provided.

We note that the *computational cost* of this method is low and the protocol can, therefore be easily handled even by low-end general purpose devices: There is essentially no extra cost on the voting device (no additional modular exponentiations). On the server (prover) side, the ballot audit process requires 6 modular exponentiations (2

for re-randomisation and 4 for the ZKP). The audit device (verifier) needs 8 modular exponentiations: 6 for the ZKP and 2 for special decryption. To put this number in a perspective, it is comparable to the cost of ballot preparation in a typical ElGamal-based voting system which, in the simplest case, requires 3 modular exponentiations. For an implementation using elliptic-curve-based ElGamal group, on an Android phone with a relatively modern CPU (Qualcomm® Snapdragon 865 CPU) the ballot audit process takes only roughly 0.08 seconds, for a simple ballot which can be encoded as one group element, and it scales linearly with ballot length.

6.2 Commitment-based e-voting schemes

E-voting protocols, in which the voters’ choices are publicly “encrypted” not as ciphertexts but as commitments, can offer several advantages. For example, [4,13] provide practical post-quantum security, and [12,11] guarantee everlasting privacy. In what follows, we will explain that our generic cast-as-intended protocol (Sec. 3.2) can easily be adapted to this family of voting protocols.

Recall that in the basic ballot submission protocol described in Sec. 3.1, each voter’s choice v is encrypted by the voting device VD as a ciphertext $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(pk, v; r)$. Now, in the basic ballot submission phase of a voting protocol where voters commit to their votes, the voting device VD “encrypts” the voter’s choice v as a commitment $c \leftarrow \text{Com}(v; r)$, where r are the random coins (as before), and sends c to the voting server VS .⁹

Analogously to our cast-as-intended verifiable protocol in Sec. 3.2, we can extend the basic ballot submission phase of commitment-based voting protocols to provide cast-as-intended verification, as described next. Regarding the cryptographic primitives, we also need to assume that the commitment scheme (just like the encryption scheme in Sec. 3.2) allows for re-randomization, that we can use an interactive zero-knowledge proof for proving correct re-randomization of commitments, and that a message in a commitment can be obtained using the randomness of the commitment.

All of the commitment-based voting protocols mentioned above (i.e., [4,13,12,11]) provide the necessary cryptographic features (re-randomization of commitments, ZKP of correct re-randomization, and reconstruction of committed messages via randomness); moreover, these protocols and the primitives they employ were proven practically efficient in the respective publications. Therefore, all of the aforementioned important commitment-based protocols can easily be extended with our cast-as-intended protocol to provide individual verifiability in real-world elections.

A Zero-Knowledge Proofs

We recall the definition of interactive zero-knowledge proof (ZKP) systems. Since each interactive ZKP is an interactive proof system (PS), we define this primitive first.

⁹ In fact, the voting device also encrypts the opening values under the talliers’ public key pk and sends the resulting ciphertext to VS or privately to the talliers, respectively. Since such details are not relevant for the purposes of this paper, we will omit them in what follows.

On a high level, *completeness* of a PS ensures that, if both the prover P and the verifier V are honest, then for each true statement proven by the prover, the verifier should accept the proof (with overwhelming probability). *Soundness* of a PS guarantees that a possibly dishonest prover B is not able to convince a verifier V that a false statement was true.

In our setting, we consider languages in NP, and so the set of ‘true’ statements of a given PS is defined as the set $L_{\mathcal{R}} = \{x \mid (x, w) \in \mathcal{R} \text{ for some } w\}$, for some relation \mathcal{R} decidable in polynomial time. For $(x, w) \in \mathcal{R}$, x is called a statement and w is called a witness. By convention, we will represent such pairs using semicolons, as $(x; w)$.

Definition 1 (Interactive Proof System). *At tuple (P, V) is an interactive proof system for a relation \mathcal{R} if (P, V) is a pair of connected interactive Turing machines (ITMs), V has polynomial runtime, and the following two conditions hold true:*

- *Completeness: For all $(x; w) \in \mathcal{R}$, the probability $\Pr(P(x, w) \mid V(x) = 1)$ is overwhelming. That is, on common input x , if the honest prover gets as private input w such that $(x; w) \in \mathcal{R}$, then the honest verifier accepts with overwhelming probability.*
- *Soundness: For all $x \notin L_{\mathcal{R}}$ and all ITMs P^* connected to V , $\Pr(P^*(x) \mid V(x) = 1)$ is negligible. That is, the probability that the honest verifier V accepts a false statement, when interacting with any (dishonest) prover P^* is negligible. If we restrict P^* to be a probabilistic polynomial-time (PPT) Turing machine, then the definition yields computational soundness.*

Now, an interactive ZKP is an interactive PS in which one more property is provided: essentially, the verifier V does not learn more information about the prover’s secret from the conversation with P than the fact that the statement is true. Formally, this concept is defined via the notion of a simulator.

Definition 2 (Zero-Knowledge Proof System). *Let (P, V) be an interactive PS for \mathcal{R} . Then, P is called (computational) zero-knowledge (ZK), if for all PPT ITMs V^* connected to P , there exists an expected probabilistic polynomial-time (expected PPT) algorithm S , called a simulator, such that, for all $(x; w) \in \mathcal{R}$, the distribution of the communication transcripts of executions of $P(x, w)$ with $V^*(x)$ is (computationally) indistinguishable from the output of S on x .*

B ZKP of Equality of Discrete Logarithms

In this section, we provide a concrete instantiation of the zero-knowledge protocol for equality of discrete logarithms. As in Section 6.1, we take the standard ElGamal group of order q with a generator g .

The standard sigma protocol which proves the knowledge of such an x that $X = g^x$ and $Y = h^x$ works as follows [8]. The prover (who knows the shared discrete logarithm x) samples random $a \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ and sends $A = g^a$ and $B = h^a$ to the verifier who replies with a random challenge $e \in \mathbb{Z}_q$. The prover replies with the value $z = a + ex$ and the verifier accepts the proof if $A = \frac{g^z}{X^e}$ and $B = \frac{h^z}{Y^e}$.

As this sigma protocol is only *honest-verifier zero knowledge* and is not known to provide the zero-knowledge property in the general case, it cannot be directly used in our cast-as-intended protocol. We can, however, apply the technique from [20] to obtain an efficient interactive zero-knowledge protocol. The high-level idea is that the verifier, first, commits to the challenge e , using a perfectly hiding commitment scheme, before the original sigma protocol is carried out.

For concreteness, we instantiate this technique with the Pedersen commitments, obtaining the following protocol:

1. In the initial step, the prover samples random $\tau \in Z_q$ and sends

$$k = g^\tau$$

to the verifier (the value k will serve as the commitment key).

2. The verifier samples random $e, r \in Z_q$ and sends

$$c = g^r k^e$$

to the prover (c is a commitment to e with the randomization factor r and e is intended to be used as the challenge in Step 4).

3. The prover, as in the original sigma protocol above, samples random $a \in Z_q$ and sends

$$A = g^a \quad \text{and} \quad B = h^a.$$

4. The verifier decommits to the challenge e by sending

$$e, r$$

5. If the decommitment is not correct (that is if $c \neq g^r k^e$), the prover aborts. Otherwise, it replies with

$$z = a + ex$$

6. As above, the verifier accepts the proof if

$$A = \frac{g^z}{X^e} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \frac{h^z}{Y^e}.$$

Security. By the results of [20,?], this protocol is a zero-knowledge protocol. Because in our instantiation we use Pedersen commitments, the result (more specifically, the zero-knowledge property) holds under the assumption that the DLOG problem is hard.

Computational cost. In the above protocol, the prover needs to compute 4 modular exponentiations (if the commitment key k is reused), while the verifier computes 6 modular exponentiations (the remaining operations have a negligible effect). These numbers, especially for elliptic curve groups, yield a very efficient protocol. It means that, on one hand side, the protocol does not add much extra computational cost on the election server side (prover) and, on the other hand side, the ballot audit procedure (the verification) can be easily handled even by low-end general purpose devices (even when a ballot is too big to be encoded as one element of Z_q and, therefore, the zero-knowledge protocol needs to be executed some some number of times).

References

1. Ben Adida. Helios: Web-based Open-Audit Voting. In Paul C. van Oorschot, editor, *USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 335–348. USENIX Association, 2008.
2. Josh Benaloh. Simple verifiable elections. *EVT*, 6:5–5, 2006.
3. Joseph Bonneau. *Guessing human-chosen secrets*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, UK, 2012.
4. Xavier Boyen, Thomas Haines, and Johannes Müller. Epoque: Practical End-to-End Verifiable Post-Quantum-Secure E-Voting. In *IEEE EuroS&P 2021*, pages 272–291.
5. Achim Brelle and Tomasz Truderung. Cast-as-intended mechanism with return codes based on PETs. In *E-Vote-ID 2017*, pages 264–279. Springer, 2017.
6. BSI. Technische Richtlinie TR-03162, 2021. <https://www.bsi.bund.de/DE/Themen/Unternehmen-und-Organisationen>
7. The Swiss Federal Chancellery. Federal Chancellery Ordinance on Electronic Voting, 2013. <https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/2013/859/en>.
8. David Chaum and Torben Pryds Pedersen. Wallet databases with observers. In *Annual international cryptology conference*, pages 89–105. Springer, 1992.
9. Véronique Cortier, Alicia Filipiak, and Joseph Lallemand. BeleniosVS: Secrecy and verifiability against a corrupted voting device. In *IEEE CSF 2019*, pages 367–381.
10. Véronique Cortier, David Galindo, Ralf Küsters, Johannes Mueller, and Tomasz Truderung. Sok: Verifiability notions for e-voting protocols. In *IEEE S&P 2016*, pages 779–798.
11. Ronald Cramer, Matthew K. Franklin, Berry Schoenmakers, and Moti Yung. Multi-Authority Secret-Ballot Elections with Linear Work. In *EUROCRYPT 1996*, pages 72–83.
12. Edouard Cuvelier, Olivier Pereira, and Thomas Peters. Election Verifiability or Ballot Privacy: Do We Need to Choose? In *ESORICS 2013. Proceedings*, pages 481–498.
13. Rafaël del Pino, Vadim Lyubashevsky, Gregory Neven, and Gregor Seiler. Practical Quantum-Safe Voting from Lattices. In *ACM CCS 2017*, pages 1565–1581.
14. David Galindo, Sandra Guasch, and Jordi Puiggali. 2015 Neuchâtel’s Cast-as-Intended Verification Mechanism. In *VoteID 2015*, pages 3–18.
15. Gurchetan S Grewal, Mark D Ryan, Liqun Chen, and Michael R Clarkson. Du-vote: Remote electronic voting with untrusted computers. In *IEEE CSF 2015*, pages 155–169.
16. Sandra Guasch and Paz Morillo. How to challenge and cast your e-vote. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 130–145. Springer, 2016.
17. Rolf Haenni, Reto E. Koenig, and Eric Dubuis. Cast-as-Intended Verification in Electronic Elections Based on Oblivious Transfer. In *E-Vote-ID 2016*, pages 73–91.
18. Rolf Haenni, Reto E. Koenig, Philipp Locher, and Eric Dubuis. CHVote system specification. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2017, 2017.
19. Thomas Haines, Sarah Jamie Lewis, Olivier Pereira, and Vanessa Teague. How not to prove your election outcome. In *IEEE S&P 2020*, pages 644–660.
20. Carmit Hazay and Yehuda Lindell. Sigma protocols and efficient zero-knowledge. In *Efficient Secure Two-Party Protocols*, pages 147–175. Springer, 2010.
21. Sven Heiberg, Tarvi Martens, Priit Vinkel, and Jan Willemsen. Improving the verifiability of the Estonian Internet Voting Scheme. In *E-Vote-ID 2016*, pages 92–107.
22. Fatih Karayumak, Michaela Kauer, M Maina Olembo, Tobias Volk, and Melanie Volkamer. User study of the improved helios voting system interfaces. In *IEEE STAST 2011*, pages 37–44.
23. Steve Kremer and Peter B. Rønne. To Du or Not to Du: A Security Analysis of Du-Vote. In *IEEE EuroS&P 2016*, pages 473–486.
24. Oksana Kulyk, Melanie Volkamer, Monika Müller, and Karen Renaud. Towards Improving the Efficacy of Code-Based Verification in Internet Voting. In *FC 2020 International Workshops*, pages 291–309.

25. Ralf Küsters, Johannes Müller, Enrico Scapin, and Tomasz Truderung. sElect: A lightweight verifiable remote voting system. In *IEEE CSF 2016*, pages 341–354.
26. Council of Europe. Council of Europe adopts new Recommendation on Standards for E-Voting, 2017. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/electoral-assistance/-/council-of-europe-adopts-new-recommen>
27. Riigikogu. Riigikogu Election Act, 2002. <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/ee/Riigikogu/act/514122020002/co>
28. Peter YA Ryan, Peter B Rønne, and Vincenzo Iovino. Selene: Voting with transparent verifiability and coercion-mitigation. In *FC 2016 International Workshops*, pages 176–192.
29. J Weber and Urs Hengartner. Usability study of the open audit voting system helios. *Retrieved August*, 3:2012, 2009.