

## **Risk Limiting Audit vs. Post-election Audit**

**Changing the verbiage *Risk Limiting Audit (RLA)* to *Post-election Audit* is an optic ploy recently implemented by our Indiana state legislature.** Indiana voters do not appreciate the simple change in language regarding audits without an true overhaul of the auditing process. **We expect a clear definition around what the audit consists of, how it is done and who it is conducted by, preferably by a third party** as we have a vote of **no confidence in the lack of transparency.** **As per standard auditing guideline, who runs the election shouldn't be the ones to audit the elections.**

Hoosiers don't want Risk-Limiting Audits (RLAs) here in the State. Hoosiers want to be ground-breaking. Why the quick rename? **Because RLAs are a con....that's why we are sharing it with the state.** In fact, **RLAs count random ballots and compare them to the voting system tally.** That's it! **Think of counterfeit money.** You run it through a counter...NO PROBLEM. Numbers matchy-match. **You only find the problems when you are handling the money, putting it under UV light, looking at currency grade printing, then AH HA! Found it. Same principle.**

### **RLAs will not find:**

- \***PHANTOM** voters
- \*Voters who have **MOVED OUT OF STATE** but cast vote in Indiana
- \*Voters who **VOTE BY MAIL AND IN PERSON**
- \*Voters who are **DEAD**
- \*Voters who are **NOT CITIZENS**
- \*Voters who **VOTE IN TWO STATES**
- \***VOTERS WHO VOTED** but the State does not have record of their vote
- \***CITIZENS WHO DIDN'T VOTE** but the State has record of having voted
- \*Voters who are **INELIGIBLE TO VOTE.**

**In RLAs, they don't check the validity of the ballots or look if the signatures match on absentee ballots. RLA's are not looking for duplicate scanned ballots or malicious software, internet connections or any issues found on the electronic voting machines. RLAs don't look for any state, federal, or constitutional violations or any advanced statistical analysis suggesting fraud.**

Risk Limiting Audits (RLA) are not thorough audits, so we don't want them. We don't want **UNSPECIFIED** Post-election Audits either. We only want **FULL FORENSIC AUDITS** because **they are thorough.**

**An RLA is problematic because in many cases like Indiana, clerks decided not to print the ballots on paper.** In many states the paper ballots were not stored securely, which is a requirement that many states have already ignored. Secondly, in an RLA, a committee manually examines a statistical **sample** of paper ballots. Because the system itself is flawed, and there is already suspicion, it's like a Magician showing you where to look. **A "sample" that already has a known outcome can be selected to show the public that it was cast and counted correctly while the real fraud, fake ballots, or illegally cast ballots are existing outside the chosen "sample" OR the "other ballots" that would reflect the truth have already been destroyed.** In a situation of an RLA, it's like the Wizard of Oz. **The truth is behind the curtain, and we want to look!**