

## Approved Meeting Notes from the EMA-TC Teleconference

Date: July 09, 2010  
12:00-13:00 EDT

Next Meeting: July 23, 2010

### 1. Attendance

Agha Ahmed (AA)	Aviv Siegel (AS)	Bill Tabor (BT)	Buddy Ackerman (BA)
<b>Camille Osterloh*</b> (CO)	Claire Carpenter (CC)	Daniel Ryan (DR)	Dara Ung (DaU)
David Box (DB)	Dee Schur (DS)	Denis Gusty (DG)	Don Beattie (DoB)
Don Uyl (DoU)	<b>Donald McGarry*</b> (DMG)	Doug Allport* (DA)	Elysa Jones* (EJ)
<b>Gary Timm*</b> (GT)	Gavin Treadgold (GTr)	<b>Hans Jespersen</b> (HJ)	Herbert White (HW)
Jacob Westfall (JWe)	Jane Harnad (JH)	Jeff Waters (JWa)	Mark Titus (MT)
Mary McRae (MMR)	Norm Paulsen (NP)	Patrick Gannon* (PG)	Paul Denning (PD)
<b>Rex Brooks*</b> (RB)	Rob Torchon* (RT)	Robin Cover (RC)	Shayne Barr (SB)
Sukumar Dwarkanath (SD)	<b>Thomas Ferrentino*</b> (TF)	Thomas Merkle (TM)	Tim Grapes (TG)
<b>Werner Joerg*</b> (WJ)	William Cox (WCx)	William Flannigan Jr. (WF)	William Kalin (WK)

\* indicates voting member

**Guest:** Tim Gilmore

**Quorum** – achieved

2. **Review of Agenda:** GT notices missprint in date of meeting notes - no request for change.

3. **Review of meeting notes:**

- June 11, 2010 Draft Minutes – RB moves, GT seconds motion to approve. Approved.
- June 25, 2010 Draft Minutes – GT moves, WJ seconds motion to approve. Approved.

4. **New Business:**

- Validating EDXL implementations – WJ: a request for test messages for a new RM implementation and our inability to find satisfactory answers brought one aspect of a bigger problem forward. Our goal is to a) frame the broader problem of validating EDXL implementations, b) take stock of what capabilities already exist or are under development (e.g. CO's work at NIMS STEP, DMG's work on EDXLSharp<sup>1</sup>, and RB, JW and HJ in CA), c) determine where the discipline ought to be and how to get there, and d) what role EMA-TC should play.

A fairly unstructured but educational discussion followed, yielding numerous suggestions that will need to be sorted out and built upon through the upcoming session(s).

DMG: lack of support for implementing standards can hurt adoption. In order to increase adoption we need to educate people about how to effectively implement and test standards.

WJ and DMG agree that it is necessary to separate testing during development and

---

1 EDXLSharp: an Open Source set of libraries for implementing EDXL

formal conformance testing. We need to fill the gap between Standard documents and NIMS STEP by establishing some intermediary steps and providing guidance on how to get from one to the next. CO confirms that there are a lot of vendors who would like to get started and are looking for support in terms of structuring the development and testing it. Others have started and done their internal testing that they have not been able to exchange with multiple vendors, due to limited awareness of other work – e.g. Tim Gilmore observes that many of these vendors do not know about DMIS and the DM framework. This is an issue of educating newcomers with a very basic level of knowledge about EM data interoperability; they need to be taught about terminology, how to get engaged and where to go with questions; where to find more mature products. They need to be taught also about the importance of standards, their existence and on-going work.

RB: we need to make sure that we do not exclude anyone and cover the entire range, beyond DMIS and commonly known organizations.

GT: all this is material for an EDXL-102, covering all the buzzwords, COGs, block diagrams of how systems work, ...

DMG: or rather have EDXL-102 cover the EDXL-101 topics in more depth, such as EDXL-102 on CAP, EDXL-102 on DE, ... and dedicate an entire session to a more in depth technical guide on how to implement, and more resources and how to use them.

GT suggests putting in place mentors, e.g. on the OASIS site, for taking questions and answering them directly or redirecting them as needed. DMG restates that idea as, say a CAP Help setup within OASIS that sends questions to a set of volunteers, rather than the entire TC, who then coordinate their answers.

Tim Gilmore: this starts to look more like a forum setup. RB notes that it might be possible to setup forums for public access within the OASIS site, but the main concern is the lack of resources for managing and moderating it.

CO notes that EDXLSharp does have mentoring capabilities with forum and wiki, and wonders how their effort could be leveraged. DMG: these capabilities are focused on the code, the libraries and the tools; they would not be a proper vehicle to address EDXL questions. We could apply similar ideas to EDXL mentoring, but it needs to be an OASIS sanctioned setting to which EDXLSharp and others could refer to for EDXL specific questions, and vice versa.

CO and RB raise the question whether any TC already has similar mentoring capabilities and whether OASIS can set them up e.g. through their content management (Drupal) - action item for WJ.

DMG has doubts about the effectiveness of the OASIS tools, mainly because of their unattractive visualization (e.g. Moinmoin wiki looks like a 1992 webapp) and because they are more tedious to work with than, say Wikipedia. The concept of mentoring is important and we should be careful not to sink large efforts into technologies that hamper the mission we want to accomplish.

Tim Gilmore agrees that the technology has to be simple for the user to post questions, but stresses that it is important also to have a good user base and short turn around for answers – there is some disagreement on what an acceptable turn around time would be.

Further discussion shows that a mentoring system must also be effective for the mentors: questions that are being posted should not just sit there and wait to be discovered – they should be triaged and forwarded to mentors that are most likely to have an answer.

WJ: to sum it up, we have two principal problems at hand – find appropriate tools and find the manpower to populate and operate them. But above all we need to clarify what role we want the TC to play in this. Should we involve the EM-TC in this discussion? The mission is clearly an EMA-TC mandate, but we may have to draw on EM-TC members to satisfy the manpower requirements.

DMG postulates that the manpower problem may not be that overwhelming over time if we look at it from a social networking perspective: we could be starting with an almost blank wiki and an empty FAQ; as questions get answered the wiki gets populated with short articles and the FAQ may grow; as more and more people participate we'll see “enthusiasts”(or ad hoc experts) jump in using their personal experience to answer questions without the need for intervention by TC experts. The growing FAQ on the other hand will take care of more and more frequent or beginner questions.

Q: How do we get the ball rolling (currently a search for EDXL brings forth mainly out of date material e.g. in Cover pages)? A: start cross referencing each other's relevant material (EM/EMA-TC, NIMS, EDXLSharp, ...) in all pertinent communications, and it will percolate to the top of search engines.

The discussion then moves to social networking – establishing a presence for the adoption of EM Standards, possibly via an EMA subgroup or discussion area, with the principal aim of limiting the info flow to adoption specific issues, and not confined to OASIS members. There is a consensus that the name of such an entity should include “EDXL and CAP”. TF reports that Mike Gerber had expressed interest in helping getting us out into the social networking arena.

TF makes a motion: “TF will set up a social networking group under OASIS for LinkedIn and FaceBook”. DMG seconds. The discussion clarifies that this is not a subcommittee of EMA-TC, just a subgroup “under OASIS” – approved.

At the next EMA-TC meeting, we'll need to discuss how the three EMA SCs can be included and participate in this group.

## 5. **Subgroup Reports:**

- Collateral & Documents (RB): too low attendance over the last 2 weeks for any sizeable progress. This needs to change!
- Events & Demos (TF): last call focused on advantages of social networking; no updates about IAEM available.
- Outreach and Education – chair not available to report.
  - CO: current focus is on EDXL 101, with a good rehearsal on July 8, and a public delivery on July 15, which will be recorded and archived. At this point we have 60+ registrants, and there is still more outreach under way, e.g. through EIC.
  - RB expects to pass along the final published version of the AHAW pattern from NCOIC next bweek.

## 6. **Current Business:**

- IAEM Workshop: TF learned that IAEM encouraged FEMA/IPAWS to put in for next year – there were more than 500 submissions for approx. 10 slots; no official word yet about PG's submission.
- OASIS Policies and EMA-TC mission on collision course? No further action yet.

- EDXL Product Directory:
  - CO: info about EDXLSharp has been added – first public announcement will be made during EDXL-101 webinar.
  - TF: Buffalo Computer Graphics makes all their products standards based to share data among all their communities – expect them to add their products to the directory.
  - WJ: no additional info re feedback mechanism.

Session adjourned 13:00.

Redacted and submitted by

Werner Joerg, co-Chair  
OASIS EMA-TC

100722/wbj  
Amended and approved 100723/wbj