February 28, 2019

Attendees:
John Wack
John Dziurlaj
Katy Owens Hubler
Ericka Haas
John McCarthy
Ray Lutz

Status Updates:

• Where we are with CDF work
  o Interoperability work is kind of winding down, or rather entering a new phase.

• VVSG Term Glossary living version located at [https://github.com/HiltonRoscoe/GlossaryMD/blob/master/vvsg_living_glossary.md](https://github.com/HiltonRoscoe/GlossaryMD/blob/master/vvsg_living_glossary.md)
  ▪ Eventually we’ll build a NIST Special Publication on this and may end up in a NIST repository, but currently hosted by John Dziurlaj
  ▪ NIST Special Publication will probably not be published until requirements are done so that we can make sure all terms that are in the VVSG are in there. Another few months.

• Election Results Reporting 2.0 [https://github.com/usnistgov/ElectionResultsReporting](https://github.com/usnistgov/ElectionResultsReporting)
  o Complete, in a polished document, waiting to be official approved.
  o There will still probably be later revisions and another opportunity make comments.
  o Look at them like a first draft — once there is some usage of it changes can be made and subsequent versions created if necessary.
  o More comments on VVSG requirements, less so on the CDFs themselves.
  o If we hadn’t had the furlough it probably would’ve been out six weeks ago, as it is it’s still in the approval process.
  o Now identical to what Google and others will be using with VIP 5.2

• Election Event Logging [https://github.com/usnistgov/ElectionEventLogging](https://github.com/usnistgov/ElectionEventLogging)
  o Was complete in 2017 but has been languishing. Put it through the internal review process again.
  o When it was first written it described only XML schema. Since then we’ve focused on also describing the UML model. So there were some changes made in the UML model (not big). Classes, use cases still the same. Minor differences from original in some of the attributes.
  o Desire is that a device would be able to export a log in this format.

• Voter Records Interchange [https://github.com/usnistgov/VoterRecordsInterchange](https://github.com/usnistgov/VoterRecordsInterchange)
  o What has changed?
    ▪ John Dziurlaj: Now has comprehensive support for absentee ballot requests. It can handle FPCA requests. It can also now support entire process of online voter registration. Added a transaction scenario where you can look up a voter and get their voter record back. It’s a lot more versatile than originally envisioned.
    ▪ It supports a lot of transactions around the voter registration system.
  o John McCarthy question: to what extent is this congruent with the format ERIC uses?
- Ericka: it’s been a while since I did a comparison but it has all the same elements. We have a simplified XML; there are elements that we use that aren’t in here, but it’s not “crazy different.” ERIC defines the format that the states use.
  - Paul Stenbjorn created has additional use cases available here: https://github.com/pstenbjorn/VRIUsecases
- Cast Vote Records https://github.com/usnistgov/CastVoteRecords
  - Intent is that devices that produce cast vote records be able to export in this format.
  - John D added that this is a key element for jurisdictions looking to implement risk-limiting audits.
- What’s the plan after this for these formats?
  - Will be working on this in the next few months.
  - Idea is to provide assistance and guidance for states that want to use them.
  - Maybe a year or two down the road new versions may need to come out.

**The Next VVSG:**
- Status
  - With new Commissioners in place, this is moving again.
  - There will likely be a TGDC Meeting within the next couple of months. A lot of the meeting will likely be focused on Next VVSG Requirements, and some of the ones that are controversial. More of those are in the security arena – bar codes, wireless, indirect associations between CVR and paper ballot, etc.
  - The CDFs probably won’t be features prominently.
- How did NIST build requirements?
  - We had an effort in 2007 to do an update – the EAC didn’t implement it. That version was based on the previous 1992 and 2002 VVS standards and VVSG 1.0. A number of the 2007 requirements did end up in VVSG 1.1, but others aren’t. In coming up with new requirements, we took 1.1 and the gaps between 1.1 and the 2007 document.
  - There were public reviews of the 2007 document and a number of requirements were updated as a result, and then put out a 2012 version. We’ve been using that as a baseline.
    - A lot of the these requirements related to security, human factors, etc. have been discussed and refined.
    - There are others that are a little more mundane and haven’t had many eyes on them – have fallen to John Wack. On a big push to get through those.
  - There’s not clarity on whether the higher-level Principles and Guidelines or the Requirements themselves will be the official “VVSG.” It could be the requirements are part of the VVSG or not.
  - There will be a set of requirements from NIST to the TGDC and there will be plenty of opportunities for public comment. This is the baseline but there will be time for comments and analysis.
- Plan for the next month or so
  - The 2007 requirements, updated in 2012, had three “volumes.”
• May have gotten too descriptive in some cases. It may be better to point to other existing standards rather than having them within the VVSG.
• Would like to go through these in mind and see what is really necessary.
• COTS is being used a lot more, so does it make sense to have requirements in here that is in excess of COTS equipment?
• Would be good to have a conversation about what’s necessary, what isn’t, and where can we point elsewhere? Hope is to streamline the VVSG.
  o Plan to hold meetings in March to go through these requirements as much as possible.
  • A simpler VVSG and keeping number of requirements as low as we can, while still pointing to other standards and requirements, will make the program easier to maintain and more flexible. Especially with security requirements. The standards should be living rather than static.

Next Steps:
• John will send out some initial thoughts and guidance for what needs to be reviewed.
• It would be helpful to have good attendance in the upcoming meetings.