Consideration through the TC for EML

General from Paul Spencer:

1. Get rid of the ElectionRuleId. We have discussed this. It was put in by Charbel because EML could not describe all the rules they used to link voters to ballots. We can now express more complex rules directly in EML. We can also reference external documents in a more generic and less obtrusive way.

2. The three 350x schemas are a bit repetitive and still don't allow for communications with a candidate. I think we could make do with a single, more generic, schema. I suspect nobody is currently using these.

3. The message numbering has got a bit strange as we have altered the uses of some schemas. One or two might benefit from changing (e.g. changing 350 to 140, 480 to 150).

4. It could be worth looking more carefully at whether the new 130 (response) message could be used as a basis for other response messages.

5. I would like to look more at message flows and define them in the process document.

Comments from XPress Software

1. The <MailingAddress> for the Elector can be different for different contests, as an Elector (if they really want) can request a Postal Vote for Parliamentary Elections and not Local Elections (or vice-versa).

2. This is probably something for discussion at the next meeting, but couldn't there be a field against the Elector that indicates that they have a Postal Vote. This would mean that only the original 330 file and any updates would need to be sent, as the Postal and Proxy votes would automatically be identified.

3. Again, probably something for the next meeting. I would have thought that only the <PollingStation> Id would be required to tie up to the Elector to the correct <PollingPlace> and <ElectronicLocation> from the 110. This would also greatly reduce the size of the 330.

4. This is in addition to some comments Mark made about the mapping (or lack of) between BS7666 and mailing addresses that I don't think should result in changes.