

## EM-TC REVIEW OF PROPOSED REVISION TO CAP-AU PROFILE

Background: At the June 18, 2013 EM-TC meeting, various Members agreed to participate in a review of changes proposed in a redlined CAP-AU Profile document posted on Kavi on June 11, 2013, and provide feedback to Greg Trott prior to the July 16 EM-TC call.

Feedback was received from three EM-TC members. Comment bubbles contain observations or proposed actions from Greg Trott (CAP-AU Custodian):

### 1) Darrell O'Donnell

I have gone through the most recent document. The work done to date is quite thorough so I don't have a ton of substantive input. I'll add some ideas and opinion though.

#### Document Version Number

On the question of versioning I think that it is really up to you. Give that I'm not seeing a ton of technically substantive change, I would lean towards a 1.1 as opposed to a v2.0. I'm not really sure that the <valueName> items need to be revised.

**Comment [t1]:** Agreed. V1.1 is to be proposed

#### valueName Changes

If your lists haven't changed then I am of the opinion that you don't really need to version them. I'll note that some people differ and like to move all the versions in lockstep. I just find that in the long-term that just adds pain. The one that is most likely to diverge soonest (my best guess) is your AUeventList. So your <eventCode> value of "urn:oasis:names:tc:emergency:cap:1.2:profile:CAP-AU:1.0:AUeventLIST:1.0" will likely become a 1.1 or even a 2.0 if your community revises it. There is a problem in that the [EDXL-CAP-AU] profile may not "know" about these subsequent versions but your community should.

**Comment [t2]:** Yes, the Australian community has agreed to revise the AUeventLIST to v2.0

With your Event List and other lookups moving on their own you're going to end up with different version numbers for different lists over time. So I suggest leaving most of the <valueName> items as they are. This will mean less change for your community and when you do add new items (or radically change one) it will be more clear to them what things mean (i.e. what is really new - and thus needs to be changed in their code). Your community will need to be educated. I'd suggest looking to CAPAN and the work that Doug Allport has done with CAP-CP on how to share the information on the lists with your community.

**Comment [t3]:** I feel we already have this issue covered by <eventCode> Note 4 on page 20 where we stipulate that "Code lists not defined by this Profile or not recognised by a receiver SHALL be passed through by CAP-AU Profile-compliant devices"

#### Version Numbers - General

To use the Canadian example, the CAP-CP Event/Location References have been running in approximate lockstep but they have already had some deviation (e.g. currently the CAP-CP Location Reference is at beta 0.4 while the CAP-CP Event Reference is at beta 0.5). These will be harmonized at CAP-CP v1.0 (both set to v1.0) but they will most likely diverge again quickly - as they should. We tend to have update cycles on the two that are disjoint and tying them together makes things tough.

So, it really comes down to whether you want to reset things all to a new version number (I don't see the need in any of your <parameter> style items. The <code> value will certainly need to change.

**Comment [t4]:** Agreed. <code> will change but we expect to be revising all documents at different frequencies

The remaining changes reflect subtle (yet very important - I know what these committees/groups are like) changes and I can't really comment on their impact though I'm sure you've got a good handle on them.

**Comment [t5]:** The remaining changes have been evaluated and approved by a group of interested CAP stakeholders we call the CHANGE ADVISORY BOARD (CAB). The CAB's role is to evaluate the changes requested by anyone, and to authorise and prioritise what changes will flow into a revised document. We have been fortunate enough this year to attract interest from the organisations (government and private industry) who are most vocal about CAP use in Australia.

As to your direct questions on 19JUN2013:

- normative references - if AU isn't using EDXL-DE then I suggest avoiding mention of it at all. We have avoided it in Canada quite religiously as EDXL-DE goes kind of counter to the Canadian approach to sharing information. On the MASAS front (I am the Chief Technology Officer of that initiative) we avoid EDXL-DE and only see it in use by US organizations and even that is casual use or very, very domain specific. That being said, If you're using something directly then a normative reference would be best.
- RIM SC Extensions - there has been a lot of churn in this area. I chair the HAVE 2.0 Sub-Committee and edit the schema - on that front we're taking one of the minor ideas (the formal extension) but that doesn't (and can't) apply to CAP 1.2. This is early days on the extension concept. My advice is to take the <parameter> nameValue/Value concept as it stands and as you have applied and run with it. The extension concept won't really apply until CAP v.next (1.3? 2.0?) which will be some time in coming.
- Canadian lessons - we haven't learned much new. We're pretty happy with the approach that has been taken to date. We're moving to the CAP-CP v1.0 formalization using an ISO approved approach as you may know. After that happens and we make revisions we will mostly have some lessons to share.

**Comment [t6]:** Agreed

**Comment [t7]:** Agreed

**Comment [t8]:** I would like to review any lessons learned that Canada can share in the future

## 2) Gary Ham

Three comments,

1. The practice of referencing every previous message is the opposite of the U.S. IPAWS take, where an update is a total replacement for the referenced message, so multiple references are not encouraged. Updates where the previously referenced message is not found updates are treated as new messages. This was required by our FCC for the cell carriers under CMAS/WEA.

Observation from Norm Paulsen: So this is a position of IPAWS which is different from our position in Canada (reasons for our decision see my response below prefixed with #1). Nevertheless, it is a choice of practices, you can decide yourself after weighing the arguments. It is not part of the standard which way to go and in your Profile, you can make rules like this as long as they don't violate the reference CAP standard.

**Comment [t9]:** Australian CAP stakeholders have not raised this issue yet, so they must be happy to continue our current practices

This makes it unnecessary to distinguish between minor and major updates as I saw down in your parameters section.

Observation from Norm Paulsen: Disagree, Minor update is there for another reason (see my response below prefixed with #2).

Since updates are always replacements, it is not an issue.

Observation from Norm Paulsen: Disagree about it not an issue (see my response below prefixed with #3). But again a choice of practices.

2. The practice of subordinating the geocode to the polygon or circle (using it as a backup, but still requiring at least one) violates the basic CAP standard which declares that the union of all of the geographies comprises the warning area.

Observation from Norm Paulsen: Disagree (see my response below prefixed with #4).

That said, you are doing EXACTLY what we are doing for the purposes of Cell Broadcast in the U.S. also the requirement of at least one geocode of a particular type is bot an EAS and a CMAS/WEA requirement in the U.S.

3. I have no problem at all with how you have indicated specific parameter sets as layers. There is no violation, in any way, with the original standard.

### 3) Norm Paulsen

#1: In Canada, the requirement is to <reference> all past messages that could still be valid (that have an <info> block that has not yet expired). Why? Well for several reasons...

- 1) If a message is missed in the chain of messages (on the recipient end by filtering), and if only the previous message is referenced, then the one prior to that is never actually referenced for removing on the recipient side. So we cover it by requiring at least all messages that could in theory still be valid to be referenced. This helps them out by not having recipients database messages and they can affect their operations based on the data given in the one that just came in.
- 2) If there is a delivery failure for a message and the recipient doesn't even get a chance to see an intermediate message. However, they can see that one was referenced and begin to ask and investigate.
- 3) In the case of Emergency Alerts, let's say message 1 in the chain is Severity=Severe and is considered an "Emergency Alert" message, and then message 2 comes out and says Severity=Moderate and is not considered an "Emergency Alert" message, and then message 3 comes out and it is back up to Severity=Severe and it is again considered an "Emergency Alert". In such cases, we don't know if all the recipients will get message 2 to supersede message 1. In our case, message 3 would at least end message 1 if it was still erroneously active. {NOTE: I'm still not sure how an Emergency Alert message in the U.S. is removed if the next message in the stream does not actually qualify to that Emergency level when the previous message did.}

So for these reasons it is our choice of practice that we include in our Profile documentation however at the same time it does not violate or limit CAP in any way. If our Canadian CMAS needs the same rule your FCC made down south, it can be accommodated in some Gateway.

#2: Minor Update is to inform the CAP message recipients (those that process the file and do something with it), that the CAP message is simple a follow-up to the previous message but with only a minor change. We do the minor change by informing on what the minor thing is that changed. In the case of mobile cellular, it's very likely the majority of the Minor Updates can simply be dismissed and the end client doesn't need to get a new updated message when nothing has changed from their point of view. This lets the recipient decide how they want to deal with Minor Updates. Web sites would likely use them, mobile cellular would likely not, but it is up to the people managing those channels how they want to implement a strategy. For our part, we are just giving them all the information to enable whatever strategy they choose.

#3: We see it as an issue. We also see that a single CAP message should serve all channels and not be customized at the issuer end to each channel.

#4: The AU profile only says "should", not shall. So it doesn't violate the CAP standard on the union issue. However, it could be re-worded better.

**Comment [t10]:** Feedback noted. Would appreciate any suggestions to improve the wording on <geocode> Note 1 on page 33

In Canada, we indicate that the recipient “can” use the GIS elements <polygon> and <circle> “without” having to union the geocode locations to that area, and the result can be considered accurate without creating an error. We do not state that if they do union the geocode and GIS elements together that it will be wrong. Essentially, the geocode is required for those that are not GIS savvy, and we acknowledge that for those the use geocodes the result likely will be “over-alerting” but that it will not be under-alerting. Therefore, the union of all is considered acceptable in systems because it will match to the union of all the geocodes anyway. Our GIS savvy recipients however can be far more accurate and we are giving them the ability to so without taking away the ability for the less tech savvy to play in the game.

**Comment [t11]:** In CAP-AU, we cover this by stating “whenever the consumer system has no ability to interpret the more accurate geospatial information stated in <polygon> or <circle> sub-elements”

In answer to your email questions...

1) Do you see a need to add normative references for any recently released OASIS specifications e.g CAP Feeds, EDXL 2.0 etc?

**Norm’s response: Nope**

2) Is there anything from the RIM SC Extensions work that needs to be incorporated into CAP-AU Profile document?

**Norm’s response: Not at this time**

3) Has there been any further CAP lessons learned by Canada, IPAWS or Google that should be included in the CAP-AU document?

**Norm’s response: In Canada, I would say that the use of multiple <info> blocks has been a trying experience to date however we are getting a lot more recipients used to them. This is not necessarily a Profile issue but now that our recipients are starting to get familiar with them, we can see some really good results.**

**Comment [t12]:** No-one in Australia has raised anything negative about this issue yet.