

**Industry Advisory Committee**

**Report of the IAC Task Force on Remote Voting**  
(IAC July 20, 2006 Meeting)

The IAC Task Force on Remote Voting was established at the February 22, 2006 IAC meeting. The task force is comprised of: Susan Herrenbruck (Chair), Dick Church, Mike Fischer, Kevin Kelly, Marshall Klein, Jim Messersmith, Ron Nickson, Jeff Shapiro, Ed Sutton

**The task force recommends the IAC should notify the ICC Board that the IAC does not support remote voting.**

The basis for this recommendation is noted as:

- Remote voting may encourage code jurisdictions not to send members to the hearings, resulting in lower attendance and weakening the process.
- Those present and focusing on the hearings do so without distractions. Individuals who are remote voting have other workplace distractions they may not be able to control, that may reduce the effectiveness of testimony.
- An increase in the number of voters does not necessarily improve the quality of the vote nor resulting code provisions, especially given that remote voting may actually result in lower numbers of physically attending voters due to the alternate method of participation.
- Those present and voting represent a reasonable cross section of the membership. Remote voting might result in specific interest groups focusing on specific proposals of interest as opposed to a broader voter base within each code using current procedures, and potentially weakening the process.
- No guarantee that individuals at their computers are viewing the hearings, listening to the testimony. This may have a negative impact on those in attendance. Hearing participants are present, paying attention and voting while those remote voting may not be paying attention and giving appropriate consideration to each item.
- Potential for instructed vote by eligible member's assistant/co-worker or by some other influence.
- Face-to-face attendance requires an individual who registers and obtains a correctly designated badge and then is present for the vote. The ICC staff- and other attendees present- are able to discern if there is a badge issue. Without such safeguards inherent in the process there is no guarantee that the voting delegate is the one actually casting the vote.
- Those participating at the hearings have the ability to raise a "point of order" if they have a question. The same does not hold true for remote voters. As such, remote voters may not fully understand the motion they are voting on, and will have no means by which to register their concern.
- Attendance at the hearings allows for networking and conversations between parties and results in a better understanding of the issues being debated and voted on. Remote voters will not be privy to such information. This condition will decrease the effectiveness of participation in the development process.
- Remote voting has the potential to extend the duration of the hearings due to the time lag. IAC further notes that even if this lag can be reduced or eliminated, the IAC still does not support remote voting based on the above.

The IAC further notes that they also do not support proctored sites for remote voting, for many of the same reasons noted above.