

Interoperability Working Group Call

September 29, 2017

Status Updates:

- Spec development is all up on GitHub repositories.
 - Link in ReadMe files to HTML version of the specification.
 - Dealing with technical issues with schema using the issues feature.
 - Good way of tracking issues.
- 4 specs in some form of development
 - Election Event Logging is in NIST internal review (waiting for some signatures)
 - Election Results Reporting – still working on some issues. Aim is to finish JSON schema and small suggestions from Google and then have some telecons to discuss changes at that point. That will be coming in early Nov.
 - Voter Records Interchange – in the process of finalizing a date with an overview meeting with voter registration vendors to go over specification and see if they note any problems – due diligence. Would like to get this out there as quickly as we can.
 - Cast Vote Records is still in limbo. It's mostly done but in need of more polished documentation and examples. There are some fairly easily addressed comments from manufacturers – none were deal breakers, all good changes. Early Nov. estimate for completion.
- John Dziurlaj update on Election Business Modeling
 - Has been working on identifying data flows between processes to aid in identifying use cases for common data formats – gap analysis, areas where reporting would be useful within the voting system.
 - Down to about 10 processes that need to be elaborated. Have done about 12 since he took over group in July, not including changes to existing process. Have modified about half of the work product all in all.
 - Working with group to make sure it's broadly applicable.
- Lauren Lochridge on Voting Methods
 - Added slide to presentation on adoption of CVR CDF – supports data interoperability and data integrity. Some of the utility: it's a digital signature signed so it satisfies that requirement. Also satisfies need to keep data provenance and chain of custody. Provides vote selection metadata. Supports requirements for use cases for data auditing, cybersecurity, etc.
 - RCV variance – will be posting to the list to ask for comments on this section.
 - Will also soon want to ask for comments on first-past-the-post and straight party.

Discussion:

- Consideration of creating a new spec for ballot tracking manifest
 - It would help to develop standards for the way that ballots are tracked when they're received, filed, etc. Not sure how that involves EMS, but it would be good to work with vendors and election officials on use cases for this.

- Right now in open source software that supports RLAs in Colorado, there's a bare minimum CSV file being used – batch 1 in box 49, batch 3 has 291 ballots in box 39, etc. With RLAs there's a need to find an individual ballot. Also helpful for reconciliation or other forms of auditing.
- What we'd like is more sophisticated than that and is important if we want to do efficient auditing for a contest that is not countywide. Hope is to take information from VRDB on what contests voters are eligible to vote in, thus what style of ballot they get, then take evidence of those that actually got the ballot, work through style information, produce a list by batch: 49 ballots in batch that were eligible to vote on a particular town, etc. to be able to do reconciliation, cross checking and chain of custody work.
- Have to take particular care to preserve ballot anonymity.
- When people talk ballot tracking they usually think through USPS, not within a local election office – need to be distinguished where we are in the election process.
- Colorado is working on creating a uniform ballot manifest throughout the step. Could provide detailed information on steps, forms, etc. to help with this process.
- Mapping CDF specifications to VVSG requirements.
 - Aim to have as few requirements as possible, but in a way that is clear. Also don't want manufacturers to have to design to a moving target.
 - 2007 VVSG Integratability and Data Export/Import – mostly general at the time. Propose to update this set.
 - Goal-oriented requirements are difficult to test, but that's the way the EAC wants to go. Keep goal-oriented requirements in VVSG or not?
 - Strict or looser coupling? Or how to couple loose CDF specs.
 - Many things within CDFs are optional because of variability within states.
 - When the actual schemas start to get used in the field, we're likely to see changes based on where the rubber meets the road. So if we start to write requirements into VVSG, are we making road block?
 - Limit to where requirements are absolutely necessary. Stick only to minimum as a requirement.
 - VVSG = general guidelines but other supplemental documentation is changeable. Could have versions and rules about who has to comply with which version.
 - Propose coming up with a new outline for requirements based on Election Business Modeling.

Next Steps:

- Continued spec development
 - Ballot definition and e-poll books – can start in Dec.
 - Ballot tracking manifest – set up a call in Jan. for those who are interested.
- Mapping CDF specifications to VVSG requirements
 - Proposed timeline:
 - End of Nov 2017: finish general interoperability requirements and determine whether CDF specs need a conformance-related section.

- Dec 2017: Develop a new outline for requirements by voting activity, with the outline based on the current breakdown of process models on the website. At same time, take existing 2007 requirements and drop them into the new outline.
- January 2018: start stepping through the 2007 requirements by voting activity and at the same time the process models developed thus far, and re-structure requirements and/or develop new requirements based on gaps we find.
- End of March, 2018: have rough draft completed.

Attendees:

- Amy Cohen
- Carl Hage
- David Cary
- David Tarrant
- Herb Deutsch
- Ian Piper
- Janet Modrow
- Jared Marcotte
- John Dziurlaj
- John McCarthy
- Judson Neer
- Katy Owens-Hubler
- Lauren Lochridge
- Neal McBurnett
- Stuart Talsma
- Tom Connolly
- Tyler Johnson