Attendees:
David Cary
Jim Halter
Sam Dana
John Dziurlaj
John McCarthy
Katy Owens Hubler
Lauren Massa-Lochridge
Tammy Patrick
Lynn Garland
Ericka Haas
John Wack

Status Updates:

- Changes to election night reporting CDF:
    - This was finalized in early 2016. Used by OH, Google, North Carolina, LA county. Synchronized with latest version of VIP. More states started to use it through Google's efforts – also internationally.
    - Google initiated version 2 process due to some things it would be nice to have – associating information with elements that weren't associated before. It would be a benefit to interoperability to make one, clear way to do it. There were a number of inconsistencies in implementation with the first version that were cleaned up. Also able to produce the JSON schema.
    - Sam Dana went over changes (see attached doc on changes).
    - Would be helpful to get more information on how to incorporate RCV. Several on the list said they would contribute.
    - Did most of these changes apart from the working group, but ought to have a period of time where the group looks at changes and provide feedback. Try to finalize soon, so that we have an established second version. Review it within the next two weeks.
- Goal of interoperability group: look at requirements that have been developed so far on interoperability and do necessary updates, but also stay true to principals and guidelines that were voted on by the VVSG.
    - Have been primarily looking at the 2007 TGDC Recommendations. Written by NIST in conjunction with TDGC members. The EAC subsequently did not adopt them, but the next VVSG might end up looking a lot like the 2007 document. Will be a requirement for a paper audit trail.
    - Some of the requirements have been updated as recently as 2012 via a public comment process.
    - Today want to go over updates to the general requirements. Received very few comments on the document.
    - Requirement B5 specification of manufacturer native formats has sparked debate.

B.5 Public specification of manufacturer native formats

Where a NIST SP 1500 CDF Specification or other interoperable interchange specification does not exist for a particular area of data interchange, the voting device manufacturer SHALL provide a specification for its native format, describing how the manufacturer has implemented the native format with respect to the manufacturer's specific voting devices and data, including such items as descriptions of elements, attributes, constraints, extensions, syntax and semantics of the format, and definitions for data fields and schemas.

Changed from:

The voting device manufacturer SHALL provide a specification for each of its native formats describing how the manufacturer has implemented the native format with respect to the manufacturer's specific voting devices and data, including such items as descriptions of elements, attributes, constraints, extensions, syntax and semantics of the format, and definitions for data fields and schemas.

- o David Cary: Does language distinguish between CDF that exists vs one that is being used? Add a statement about goal of documentation, i.e. "sufficient to allow a third party to read and interpret the data in the interface"
- o Agreement from others to have something in the documentation that outlines this more explicitly.
- Discussion of next point, B.6.
  - o Concern that CDFs may be too limiting of innovation, i.e. if a CDF doesn't support the particular way that a vendor wants a system to operate.
  - o There's a difference between system interoperability vs. data interoperability. (Herb)
  - o David summarizing: Herb is looking for required us of CDF only in an interface/data exchange from voting system to something outside of a voting system, whereas in the current requirement in B.6 – using CDFs to exchange data between devices. Those are two different things. Fundamental issue that needs to be worked out. Two issues: are the CDFs operationally complete? And are they operationally sufficient? Feels that CDFs still have a ways to go. May be premature to be asking for this in this iteration.
  - o John Wack: agree that it is too much to ask of the CDFs that they are efficient as they are written today. The other 50% of this effort is a standards maintenance program to work with states and jurisdictions to change things as needed. There are bound to be issued that need to be dealt with down the line.

Next Steps:

- Please submit any changes or suggestions in writing.