

## Approved Meeting Notes from the EMA-TC Teleconference

Date: Apr. 15, 2011  
12:00-13:00 EDT

Next Meeting: Apr. 29, 2011

### 1. Attendance

Aviv Siegel (AS)	Bryan Kaplan (BK)	Buddy Ackerman (BA)	Camille Osterloh (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)
Donald McGarry (DMG)	Doug Allport (DA)	<b>Elysa Jones*</b> (EJ)	<b>Gary Timm*</b> (GT)
Gavin Treadgold (GTr)	Hans Jespersen (HJ)	Herbert White (HW)	Jacob Westfall (JWe)
Jane Harnad (JH)	Jeff Waters (JWa)	Maria Emerson (ME)	Mark Lucero (ML)
Mark Titus (MT)	Matthias Lendholt (ML)	Norm Paulsen (NP)	Paul Denning (PD)
<b>Rex Brooks*</b> (RB)	<b>Rob Torchon</b> (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

**Quorum** – achieved

- Review of Agenda:** no changes requested.
- Review of meeting notes:** 20110401\_Draft\_EMA-TC\_Minutes: 1 miss-type corrected. GT moves to accept minutes as amended; RB seconds. Approved.

#### 4. Note(s) from the chairs:

- A time to “hunker down”? This idea emerged from an earlier conversation where it was noted that we are feeling the after effects of the recession, that companies are still cutting back and that in the process, activities such as participating in OASIS are put on a lower priority, resulting in the low attendance rates that we are witnessing currently. Adding to that is the announced demise of the OPEN Framework and the transition from OPEN 1.0 to IPAWS OPEN 2.0, which may limit our vendor's ability to participate in interop demos this year.

(a) GT asks for an explanation of what “hunkering down” means.

WJ: i) limit our production ambitions to a sharper focus on what can be accomplished with our current resources and on what might best prepare us for an expected resumption of interest; ii) limit this year's expenditures for interop demos and save for a bigger push when more participants are ready and companies realize the benefits they can get from adhering to OASIS Standards. (*This second point about carrying money over from one year to another still needs feedback from OASIS / MS St Cte.*)

(b) EJ is a little more optimistic, based on her experience from the just completed WMO CAP Implementation Workshop: CAP is being picked up and implemented world wide and there are anxious people in need for help in using the Standards, so there may be a lot of

work coming our way. With the recognition we are gaining we will be able to reach out to more members to participate and there will be more money available to fund our activities. EJ points also to the growing interest for e.g. SitRep – companies in that space are very keen to get involved. Under these circumstances it may be ok to look at a schedule that spreads the meetings out, but not anything that would change the structure of the EMA-TC.

(c) WJ reminds that the topic heading is adorned with a question mark, and that it ties in to a contrasting topic under New Business: “A wave of profiles about to hit?”. Many countries are looking to set up CAP profiles that serve their particular needs and are looking for guidance from OASIS – we must prepare ourselves for such requests. This presents an opportunity to expand our membership to a broader international community. EJ: international relevance is very important, but presents communication difficulties due to time zones, that we need to resolve. Work on topics of immediate interest such as best practices documents or particular tools e.g. ASN.1 to XML, could generate enough motivation to overcome time barriers.

(d) RB clarifies that what he meant by “hunker down” had nothing to do with meetings and everything with the conferences that we would attend. For instance the CAP Workshop was one of the worthwhile examples where we could shine, whereas events where we can't even pull together enough participation for an interop demo should be reviewed more carefully about putting up a presence. We'd rather save the money for a bigger presence at events with bigger impact potential.

(e) RT comments: i) Regarding participation in interop demos, one of the main impediments to larger participation is the fact that OASIS limits participation to members. We need to find a way to open access to demos while preserving the value of membership. ii) Regarding time zone differences for meetings with increasing international membership, a change in the method of communication may be necessary, e.g. have threaded discussions, or other social networking tools available at all time and use meetings only for resolutions and decisions. Such meetings could be less frequent or as required. Extending that thought to the first comment, we should consider running web based interop demos, e.g. through webinars; this would be much more cost effective for organizers and vendors, would allow to highlight all participating vendors, and would draw much larger (and targeted) audiences than any conference could achieve. RB agrees but points to OASIS' position in defense of membership value. RT: ... which runs counter its interests in promoting standards and attracting more active members.

(f) WJ concludes from this discussion that interop demos may not fit our mandate – may be we should encourage them, but not lead them ourselves. EJ confirms that according to OASIS' rules, “on site” interop demos are “members only”; OASIS put a lot of overhead and administrative expense in coordinating and organizing the space, and advertising. We have considered other options where vendors, members or not, participate in the demo from their own booths and OASIS operates a small booth to share info about its work products. This approach would require an exception to the interop guidelines. RT wonders if these rules apply also to online demos. EJ: online demos are subject to different rules and the Member Section (EM MS) operates public facing services. This may present a path worth exploring. WJ: at least the EM MS could promote external events geared towards OASIS based interoperability. GT raises the idea of an outside OASIS EM User Group that organizes interop demos (on-line or not): it can invite whomever it wants, to participate.

(g) EJ reminds us how we got to the current structures: in the early PPW days we found that OASIS could not provide a policy arm, but could outreach to explain the need for data

standards; the EIC grew out of that, but it could not take funding for the webinars; OASIS then facilitated the Member Section, with rules of procedures that allow it to fund, promote and run webinars open to anyone interested in our standards. The EM MS therefore is the right place to suggest webinar based interop demos. WJ sees this as an opportunity for EMA-TC to adjust its focus on providing documentation and links to reliable information about implementation, testing, best practices, etc., and providing advice and support for educational and interop webinars. This should not take away from the members' incentives, whose main benefits come from participation in shaping standards in the EM-TC.

(h) TF takes away from discussions with FEMA, that they see two components to Outreach and Education: teaching stakeholders the relevance of interoperability, and detailing interoperability requirements in RFPs. This would create incentives for vendors to adopt standards and encourage them to join OASIS. EJ agrees with the need to put out more info about our standards, but doubts that bringing in more members solves our problems – what we need are active members who help develop the standards and tools, and promote adoption. “We thought that the Adoption group would be almost like a marketing arm, sort of the evangelists for the standards, and then identify how to develop tools that would better serve the users.” This does not appear to give enough incentives to many companies that use the standards, to join and actively participate. EJ and TF cite the particular example of Buffalo Computer Graphics, who adopts all EM Standards, but can not see value in joining.

(i) About incentives for membership – WJ sees two main reasons for companies to join: to be able to say that they are part of OASIS, or to have an influence on the Standards development. RB adds that we have also ongoing programs such as the Product Directory, and that there are other ways to add value, especially through social media to help develop 3<sup>rd</sup> party test harnesses and test suites, and build a community around certification. OASIS may not be able to do this on its own, but we can encourage our federal partners to put interoperability and certification requirements in their RFPs, stating that special consideration would be given to companies that can show certified interoperability using these Standards. We have to find ways to encourage 3<sup>rd</sup> parties to develop certification services, for which they may charge.

(j) About certification – WJ and RB argue over who determines what constitutes legitimate certification; WJ's position being that OASIS/EM should set up the rules that determine who can claim the right to offer certification; and RB's position being that this would be structurally very difficult to achieve and rather sees the 3<sup>rd</sup> parties make that determination, while OASIS limits itself to outreaching to such parties. EJ, reporting from past experience, e.g. with 2<sup>nd</sup> generation of IPAWS, recalls discussions with the OASIS board about different methods of validating and testing the standards. It was concluded that the NIMS work that was well under way at that time, was a good approach. OASIS is not normally in the business of endorsing or enhancing such programs, but it is never completely off the table either: had there been any specific requests for OASIS to support IPAWS or other programs, they would have been willing to consider. RB explains how some of his upcoming work with NCOIC may have to test the waters on these ideas. EJ notes that the certification issue is going to gain significance with CAP and the proliferation of profiles, and we'll need to address it with best practices and more specifically with the conformance clauses that are more explicit (“measurable”). All really exciting work for us as a committee, but how do we encourage companies to be part of that?

Discussion to be continued ...

## 5. Subgroup reports:

- Collateral & Documents - RB: we are reaching a point where we would like to discuss several topics at the TC level before we can proceed with our work on the products matrix. The topics are listed on the TC agenda under New Business, we just need to find time to get to them.
- Events & Demos:
  - Main discussion is focused on the transition from OPEN 1.0 to IPAWS OPEN 2.0. A meeting is scheduled for this topic next week (Thursday at 11:00 EDT). All vendors that have been participating in our interop demos are encouraged to join in the discussion: after June 30, in order to participate in interop demos, vendors must have implemented 2.0.
  - NIEM: The group notices that, unless other info is forthcoming, 2 out of our 6 proposals for the NIEM Training Event have been approved. That puts in doubt that the idea of an EM track has gained any traction.
  - ISCRAM: still no presenter available (EJ: Elliot Christian just informed that he could not attend).
  - CRHNet: no further action on logistics and facilities can be expected before the end of the current election cycle in Canada on May 2nd.
  - TCIP: still waiting for more details on their website.
  - IAEM: waiting for acceptance of presentation proposals; may have to be weighed against CRHNet, as both are scheduled within about 2 weeks.
  - ECBC (2<sup>nd</sup> week of June) has given ok for a poster and distribution of fliers.
- Outreach & Education
  - WJ reporting for CO: EDXL 101 webinar was held yesterday; 190 people registered and about 100 attended, which by our standards is an enormous success – thanks to Don McGarry, Camille Osterloh and Dee Schur for pulling this off!
  - EJ reporting from meeting with key individuals from ITU: nothing formal yet w.r.t. Joint CAP-ITU sessions. There is active interest in spending time to work through issues before we go to the point of public review. For instance, the ordering of elements is of keen importance to them; also building the ASN.1 first and the XML after makes sense after viewing some of the details; more about this in EJ's forthcoming CAP Workshop report. Important at this stage is to have members on both sides that can communicate. Finally: ITU-T may be interested in hosting the 2012 CAP Workshop – no further details available yet. Would be good to have 2-3 people from our side attend; we also need to generate some vendor interest.

Out of time – GT moves to adjourn, RB seconds. Session adjourned 13:01

Redacted and submitted by

Werner Joerg, co-Chair

OASIS EMA-TC

110428/wbj

Amended and approved 110429/wbj