

## OASIS Election and Voter Services Technical Committee: Meeting 2004-02-19

**London:**

John Borrás (JB) (Chairman) UK e-Envoy, Farah Ahmed (FA) (Secretary) UK e-Envoy, John Ross (JR) UK e-Envoy, Paul Spencer (PS) UK e-Envoy, Roy Hill (RH) Opt2Vote, Bruce Elton (BE) Oracle.

**Washington:**

Hans Van Spakovsky (HS) US Justice Dept.

**Phone:**

Paul Brown (PB) Scytl, Craig Burton (CB) Everyone Counts, Alan Goldfine (AG) NIST.

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND ACTIONS ARISING FROM JULY MEETING

ACTION	OWNER	RESULT
TC members to review version 4.0a (available on the TC members' site) and send comments/suggestions by 28 <sup>th</sup> February.	<b>ALL</b>	<b>Carry forward:</b> All TC members to send comments/suggestions by 28 <sup>th</sup> February.
Members of TC were asked to identify examples of this element being used in practice before 2004-02-28. (ElectionRuleId)	<b>ALL</b>	To be discussed under Item 2.
FA to post a message on this (Message Flow) as part of the review process to initiate discussion as to how to take this forward.	<b>FA</b>	No comments received to date.
To discuss multiple addresses further at next meeting scheduled in February. TC members to put forward suggestions to the TC.	<b>ALL</b>	To be discussed under Item 2.
JB to provide the TC with the draft documents from the Council of Europe.	<b>JB</b>	<b>Carry forward:</b> Draft yet to be finalised.
JB knows of two organisations involved in (Accreditation Programmes) this and will contact them to investigate their views.	<b>JB</b>	<b>Carry forward</b>
CB will investigate (Accreditation Programmes) this area in Australia.	<b>CB</b>	CB has provided information.
HVS to find contact details of suppliers involved (in Michigan elections).	<b>HVS</b>	JB has made contact with supplier and now awaiting response.

2. REVIEW OF DRAFT VERSION 4.0A

UPDATE

HVS updated the TC on the latest on the status of e-voting in the US. The entire SERVE project has been cancelled in light of a critical report by four computer scientist academics.

BACKGROUND TO CHANGES

JB explained the significant changes derived from lessons learned in the 2003 UK pilots and also from the requirements and input from colleagues in the Council of Europe (CoE). These two avenues have produced a numbers of changes in EML, and have made the specification more robust and proven.

MAIN CHANGES:

More voting types such as referendums, voting for parties (rather than just individuals), voting for named individuals within a party, and preferential voting have been included in

version 4.0a.

HVS asked whether EML can restrict the ballot (e.g. registering as a democrat in the Primaries and then given a voting card with only the democratic nominations displayed). PS said there were two ways of dealing with this, a) decide on the ballot before the EML stages, or b) enter voter information (affiliation) in the EML for the ballot.

**Action:** PS to investigate and accommodate.

JB continued describing the requirements put forward by the CoE that meant significant additions in EML, such as the ability to cross check databases for candidates.

PS described the concept of Additional Member System. This is where the result of one election is required to count another election. This is commonly used for European Union elections. CB added that this system was also used in Australia.

**Action:** CB to send documentation to TC to explain the Australian methods of voting.

In referring to chapter 5.4 (splitting of messages), it was explained that its incorporation into version 4.0a had been based on experience in UK pilots. Similarly with traditional voting methods, the largest proportion of votes is cast in the last few hours of polling, and this was mirrored in the pilots. PS explained that splitting the messages as described in this section was largely to aid the transportation of files from one system to another (such as to printers) and through firewalls.

Message 330 had been changed so it has the ability to display 'add', 'modify' or 'delete' so that the entire list would not always have to be sent to another system at the close of play.

**Action:** TC to submit any further data types that are not currently listed in this draft by the 28<sup>th</sup> February deadline.

The removal of ElectionRuleId was discussed. No calls for its inclusion have been put forward, and the meeting attendees were therefore inclined to remove it.

**Action:** Members of TC were asked to identify examples of this element being used in practice before 2004-02-28.

The error codes in section 6.2.6 derived from requests during the UK pilots.

**Action:** TC members to suggest further codes before 2004-02-28.

Section 6.2.13 (voting channel types) was discussed by the TC

**Action:** TC members to suggest other channel types before 2004-02-28.

PS described the revising of the complex data types described in section 6.3. The changes highlighted the experience from the UK pilots of handling logos for candidates and parties. It was decided to leave the choice as optional, as the use depends on local or national business rules.

**Action:** TC to review the alterations in this section and comment before 2004-02-28.

The issue of agents was discussed in depth by the meeting attendees.

RH noted that the term agent is a statutory function within an election, and that this agent employs sub-agents. This area of using agents and other agents requires clarification. CB and HVS commented that the running of the candidate during an election is undertaken by the candidate in the States and Australia. The TC decided to leave the use of agent as optional.

PS described the use of affiliation. At the moment EML provides voter identification at this level, but the TC should consider adding voting information. This is similar to the basis of the creation of ElectionRuleId. The TC agreed to accept the changes taken in this section.

JB explained the issue surrounding multiple addresses, specially relating to postal votes (where a voter has a different address for different elections).

HVS commented that in the USA the voter would give a postal address as well as

their residential address (the address that entitles them to vote), and also a third address. JB noted that EML provides the optional feature of adding a mailing address that links to the election taking place. This address can be changed up to a certain point in time.

**Action:** PS to investigate further.

PS reported that a supplier experienced difficulty when using British Standard schema with a certain Java parser. PS has posted a message to the TC as to how to resolve this by using EML's own schema, thus enabling the parser to work. Due to the changes the schemas will be re-issued.

JB summarised the way forward. Following the 28 Feb deadline for comments, once the issues noted above and any further comments have been addressed he would post a revised draft of version 4 for formal approval by TC members.

**Action:** JB to post a revised draft of version 4 for TC approval.

### 3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

#### EML FUTURE

JB explained that this version takes EML to a very comprehensive level of meeting requirements. What is now needed is evidence of its use in the real world.

RH noted that the development of EML is needed for the use in the UK CORE project. Opt2Vote have been using EML to transfer data to printers for example.

HVS explained that the current climate for e-voting in the USA was poor, certainly for the use in public political elections. HVS reported that a project to design a state-wide computerised voter registration database is underway throughout all States.

**Action:** JB to contact NASS.

CB reported that his organisation had been running a number of elections for the USA's democratic primaries this year in the Asia-Pacific Rim, as well as a number of private elections.

JB mentioned that there have been recent discussions in the news of enabling e-voting for company shareholder elections.

**Action:** JB to report back on progress in this area.

CB reported that the compliance of EML within his organisation is based on version 2.0.

**Action:** CB to feedback to TC on experience gathered.

PB reported that his organisation is working on the Nuechatel e-voting pilot, encrypting EML for another organisation. This EML is based on version 3.0.

JB concluded by suggesting that the TC be suspended for six months, giving time for EML usage to increase and develop. In the meantime JB noted that the use of EML should be pushed in areas of voter registration and within shareholder voting scenarios.

PS called for a list of EML compliant systems.

**Action:** FA to investigate how to provide an area for suppliers to express how they used EML, when and where.

#### ACCREDITATION

JB reported that the CoE will be publishing a report soon, and will likely to be positive for use of accreditation systems.

### 4. DATES AND LOCATIONS OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Meeting arrangements for late summer/early autumn will be provided nearer the time.

### 5. ACTIONS FROM MEETING:

<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>
<b>Carried Forward:</b> TC members to review version 4.0a (available on the TC members' site) and send comments/suggestions by 2004-02-28.	<b>ALL</b>
<b>Carried Forward:</b> JB to provide the TC with the draft documents from the Council of Europe.	<b>JB</b>
<b>Carried Forward:</b> JB knows of two organisations involved in (Accreditation Programmes) this and will contact them to investigate their views.	<b>JB</b>
Investigate and accommodate restricting the ballot.	<b>PS</b>
Send documentation to TC to explain the Australian methods of voting.	<b>CB</b>
Submit any further data types that are not currently listed in this draft by the 2004-02-28 deadline.	<b>ALL</b>
Identify examples of ElectionRuleID being used in practice before 2004-02-28.	<b>ALL</b>
Suggest further error codes before 2004-02-28.	<b>ALL</b>
Suggest other channel types before 2004-02-28.	<b>ALL</b>
Review the alterations in this section (6.3) and comment before 2004-02-28	<b>ALL</b>
Investigate further the use of multiple addresses	<b>PS</b>
Post a revised draft of version 4 for TC approval after the 2004-02-28 deadline.	<b>JB</b>
Contact NASS.	<b>JB</b>
Report back on progress in this shareholder voting area.	<b>JB</b>
Feedback to TC on experience gathered using EML.	<b>CB</b>
Investigate how to provide an area for suppliers to express how they used EML, when and where.	<b>FA</b>