Attendees:
Bernie Hirsch
Jessica Bowers
Jim Halter
John Dziurlaj
John Wack
Katy Owens Hubler
Keith Ingram
Kim Brace
Lauren Lochridge
Paul Hain
Ryan Macias
Sam Dana
Sarah Whitt

Status Updates

- Getting VVSG requirements in better shape
    - Would like to walk through what's currently in the document to facilitate future discussion.
    - John feels that these requirements are there for election officials – what they want equipment to do. So very important that election officials weigh in. Are they adequate? Need to be updated? Missing things?
    - Will send out email soon to hopefully get more election officials involved – more eyes on, more input would result in a better set of realistic requirements.
    - Feels that some of the current language was too terse – tried to clean up some of it.
- Election Definition
    - A lot of these are pretty straightforward.
    - Not totally up to speed on what new, modern EMS systems today do but anticipate that they meet most/all of these requirements already.
    - Ryan: we are talking of an EMS as an election definition device as we know it today. Could define what election definitions means – doesn't have to mean setting up an EMS. NIST broke up EMS into election definition and tabulation, i.e., that part of an EMS dealing with tabulation of votes.
    - Have a requirement that OD-IDS must be supported.
    - Question on whether several requirements are necessary – seems like everything these days handles 1-of-M, primaries, yes/no questions, etc.? Don't systems already deal with this?
        - Ryan: cross-party endorsement and primaries are not all handled in every system. Some only do open or closed primaries but not necessarily both.
        - Jessica: cross-party endorsement doesn't mean the same thing to everybody.
        - Added something on referenda that has multiple choice options (not sure yes/no). Wisconsin does this.

- ▪ Ryan: there are jurisdictions that don't do yes/no. It may be "affirm" – different terminology.
  - o How to deal with different voting variations?
    - ▪ Lauren: they do have comprehensive survey and research on local rules for different voting methods. Might be able to contribute things like how common different variations are.
    - ▪ Bernie Hirsch: do you have a voting variation for "secondary vote limit?" Our EMS allows you to group together and vote for that group. You can set a vote limit across more than one office, i.e., 5 people max to elect across 3 n of m contests. Lauren: don't think we've looked at that, but there's an attorney who is part of the group doing that research.
- Support L&A testing
  - o Should probably be security group that deals with this, but usability aspects need to be looked at by election officials.
  - o Not sure about using COTS scanners. Sarah: good point – how do we handle that? Make sure we're not writing requirements in such a way that you couldn't possibly use COTS. John: yes, also consideration of how to test COTS.
  - o Ryan: there's only one vendor that *doesn't* use COTS scanners (at least for central count).
  - o Jessica (Dominion): they use COTS scanners for central scan – it's the software that analyzes and interprets the vote that's produce by the scanner. It's not the scanner itself that's performing the validation.
- Recording votes
  - o Added some things that were implied by some of the CDF work. Not sure whether these are the right requirements or not – please review.
  - o There were only very high-level requirements for cast vote record specifications in previous version of VVSG. Put some of that in. Are these requirements necessary? Are they the right requirements?
  - o How to require scanners add information into cast vote record as to any selections that were overridden by election rules.
    - ▪ In CVR CDF you do need to do this.
- Definition of casting of a ballot?
  - o No, John/Katy will propose a definition.
- 5.7 Procedures assumed for correct system functioning: from the previous VVSG – it would probably be best to base this in the Election Modeling work going forward.
- Point of call is to present these points – just wants to let you know they're there. Don't have time to discuss everything now but will at a later date.
- 7.5 Accuracy – in last VVSG referred back to voting system accuracy. John: out of my technical league to deal with these requirements, but they will need to be dealt with.
- Consider renaming optical scanner with "optical scanning system" – combination of software and hardware. John: in the 2007 VVSG there were requirements for optical scanners that applied to central count and precinct count. Not sure if that's the way to do it going forward.
- Best way to deal with review of the VVSG2 Draft Requirements?

- o Have a telecon dedicated to requirements but would like to have email back and forths ahead of that.

Next Steps:
- Please review the draft VVSG requirements located here: http://collaborate.nist.gov/voting/bin/view/Voting/Interoperability#Next_VVSG_Requirements_Developme
- Encourage email discussions about various sections before the next call.
- Subsequent telecons will take deeper dives into specific requirements. John will put together a roadmap of telecons to outline what we'll tackle when.