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Status Updates:

• VVVSG Requirements Development
  o Working with Center for Civic Design to go through draft requirements and rewrite in plain language, more understandable.
  o They have a higher-level view of all requirements, which has been helpful. There is a working draft of requirements available on the Twiki.

• VRI CDF – John Dziurlaj
  o Group mapped a path forward for VRI work – use cases for lookup transactions and absentee ballot requests.
  o Changes to model are complete – new JSON and XML schema available.

• Ballot Definition – John Dziurlaj
  o The differences from ENR spec are very small, have decided to add them to the new version of ENR specification and discontinue ballot definition as a separate model/schema.

• Election Modeling – John Dziurlaj
  o Helping with the more difficult terms/definitions in the glossary that need a rigorous once-over to build good, concrete, unambiguous definitions.
  o Going to a third-party graphic design studio to build visualizations to bring the work to life. Hope to have something to share in the next month.

• Voting Methods Group – Lauren Lochridge
  o There is a roadmap available in the Twiki and GitHub.
  o Set of 19 tabulation process flows – diagrams and descriptions of steps.
  o Group was focused mainly on RCV for some time, focus now is on other voting methods.

• Cast Vote Record specification – John Wack
  o Is complete and ready for internal NIST review prior to publication.
  o Is available on GitHub, could use help/feedback on CVR examples in the specification.
• Cast vote records and supporting audits – Lynn Garland
  o Audits of statewide races require the ability to collect and exchange data, so interoperability is key.
  o Where to put information on ambiguous marks, etc. and also information that happens after the audit, like how something was adjudicated.
  o Neal: things that could be split out:
    ▪ A CVR might be the record of how the vote was cast in the original system, or it might be the record of how the audit board interpreted a piece of paper. We should be flexible in how to represent that – either by human auditors or a system.
  o Worthwhile to discuss further – John Wack will schedule a telecon to discuss this.
• Glossary – Katy Owens Hubler
  o The latest version of the glossary is available on the Twiki (in a Word document). Please review and send comments to John Wack or Katy Owens Hubler.

Discussion:
• Barcodes and applicability to common data format. Would it be helpful to have CDF for this?
  o Clarify what the data elements are - candidate selections on a ballot? Yes.
  o What is driving the common data format for this?
  o VVSG requirements 1-A.2 requires data encodings such as bar and QR codes standards, publicly-available and document protocols for exchanging or encoding data. Some feeling that this isn’t enough.
  o In order to have transparency of how votes are counted, needs to have transparency in what the code is used for. Privacy and transparency issues.
  o Is there a worry that CDF would stifle future innovations? Worry that it would be somewhat limiting.
  o Would requiring a vendor to produce an export of the codebook enough? Test labs would need to know this.
  o We’re trying to move to evidence-based elections so it needs to provide transparency to voters to do that interpretation. It would need to be shared in a way that the public can understand – what the information printed on the ballot that they’re supposed to be verifying is actually saying?
  o There would need to be a standardization of how codebook information would be available.

Next Steps:
• John Wack will have conversation with Lynn Garland about what is needed for CVR applicability to audits.
• Continue conversation on barcodes via email.
• Examine VSAP’s use of barcodes.