UNITED STATES
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE)
ALERT ADVISORY COMMITTEE)
MEETING)

Pages: 1 through 71

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: March 12, 2007

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005-4018
(202) 628-4888
hrc@concentric.net

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE)
ALERT ADVISORY COMMITTEE)
MEETING)

Commission Meeting Room
Federal Communications
Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Monday,
March 12, 2007

The parties met, pursuant to the notice of the Commission, at 10:07 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

MEMBERS:

FRED CAMPBELL (FCC Chairman Martin's Designee)
KENNETH MORAN (FCC Chairman Martin's Designee)
ANN ARNOLD
RALPH AUBRY
RAYMOND BAN (via Telephone)
DALE BARR
ART BOTTERELL (via Telephone)
CHERYL BLUM
MARCIA BROOKS (via Telephone)
DR. EDWARD CZARNECKI
BRIAN DALY
AMAR DEOL
ROBIN ERIKKILA
MARIA ESTEFANIA
EDDIE FRITTS
DALE GEHMAN
CHRISTOPHER GUTTMAN-MCCABE
JUDY HARKINS, Alternate
VIC JENSEN, Alternate
GARY JONES (via Telephone)
DR. ROB KUBIK
JOHN LAWSON
THOMAS LYON (via Telephone)
CHRIS MELUS, Alternate

RICHARD MIRGON
ILKKA JOHUANI NIVA
MARK PAESE
BILLY PITTS
ART PREST
PATRICK ROBERTS (via Telephone)
DAVID ROBINSON, Alternate
ANTHONY RUTKOWSKI
DOUG RUTLEDGE
EDWARD SALAS
LONNA THOMPSON, Alternate
PIERRE TRUONG, Alternate
DAVID WEBB
WILLIAM WERTZ

FCC STAFF:

LISA FOWLKES
JEFFERY GOLDTHORP

GUEST SPEAKER:

MAURICE KARL, PhD, Purple Tree Technologies

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:07 a.m.)

MR. MORAN: Thank you. Good morning. I now want to convene and call to order the second meeting of the Commercial Mobile Services Alert Advisory Committee.

And I would like to begin the meeting by introducing, to my left, Fred Campbell, Senior Legal Advisor for the Chairman and representative of the Chairman at this meeting this morning. Fred?

MR. CAMPBELL: Good morning. On behalf of the Chairman, I'd like to welcome you all to the second convening of this committee, and thank you all for taking time out of your busy schedules to be here today.

As you know, this committee brings together experts from all spheres of the wireless industry, representatives of state, local, and tribal governments, and representatives of the broadcast industry to develop a set of technical recommendations that all parties can support.

I'm particularly pleased that FEMA and NOAA are represented on this committee. I am also pleased that organizations representing the needs of people with disabilities and the elderly are participating on

this committee, as well.

Congress has tasked this advisory committee with developing recommendations for technical standards and protocols to facilitate the voluntary transmission of emergency alerts by commercial mobile service providers. We anticipate that the recommendations the committee will ultimately bring to the FCC will allow the FCC to conduct a thorough and successful rulemaking.

Because of the importance of this work, Congress requires that this committee submit a final report to the Commission no later than October 12, 2007, one year from the enactment of the WARN Act. Today's meeting is particularly important, as we will discuss the significant first steps taken by the committee's members to meet this requirement.

I am impressed by the speed and efficiency with which the committee has begun to attack these important tasks, and I want to thank the committee for the quality of its work to date. And we look forward to continuing to work with all of you on this important endeavor, and to the ultimate success of this committee.

Ken Moran is going to act as the Chairman's designee for the rest of this meeting. Thanks.

MR. MORAN: Thank you, Fred. I know Fred has some other meetings to go to, but we appreciate your comments, and let's begin.

We have a number of members who will be participating via conference call. So I think that it might be useful for all of us here at the meeting, and all of us on the conference call, to introduce ourselves so that people will know who is here, because they can't see us, and we can't necessarily see them.

So I think I'll start around the table here. We'll just introduce ourselves, and we'll go around the bridge so we'll all know who is participating.

My name is Ken Moran of the FCC.

MS. FOWLKES: Lisa Fowlkes, FCC.

MR. GOLDTHORP: Jeff Goldthorp, FCC.

MR. WERTZ: William Wertz, Michigan Association of Broadcasters.

MS. ARNOLD: Ann Arnold, Texas Association of Broadcasters.

MR. AUBRY: Ralph Aubry with Battelle.

MR. BARR: Good morning. Barr, Dale Barr, from the NCSDHS.

MS. BLUM: Cheryl Blum from the Telecommunications Industry Association.

MR. CARTER: Steve Carter, Qualcomm, Incorporated.

MR. CZANECKI: Ed Czanecki, SpectraRep.

MR. DALY: Brian Daly, Cingular Wireless/AT&T.

MR. DEOL: Amar Deol, Nortel Network.

MS. ESTEFANIA: Maria Estefania, the Alliance for Telecommunications Industries Solutions.

MR. ERKKILA: Robin Erkkila with Intrado.

MR. FRITTS: Eddie Fritts with Global Security Systems.

MR. GEHMAN: Dale Gehman, Poarch Band of Creek Indians.

MR. GUTTMAN-McCABE: Chris Guttman-McCabe with CTIA.

MS. HARKINS: Judy Harkins, representing WGBH National Center for Accessible Media. And I'm an alternate for Marcia Brooks, who is on the bridge.

MR. JENSEN: Jake Jensen, representing American Association of Paging Carriers.

MR. KUBIK: Rob Kubik, Motorola.

MR. LAWSON: John Lawson, Association of Public Television Stations.

MR. MELUS: Chris Melus, Sprint/Nextel.

MR. MIRGON: Dick Mirgon, APCO

International.

MR. NIVA: Ilkka Niva, Nokia.

MR. PAESE: Mark Paese with NOAA.

MR. PITTS: Billy Pitts with the NTI Group.

MR. PREST: Art Prest with the Rural Cellular Association.

MR. RUTKOWSKI: Tony Rutkowski with VeriSign.

MR. RUTLEDGE: Doug Rutledge, Alltel.

MR. SALAS: Ed Salas, Verizon Wireless.

MS. THOMPSON: Lonna Thompson, Association of Public Television Stations.

MR. TRUONG: Pierre Truong, Ericsson.

MR. WEBB: David Webb with FEMA.

MR. MORAN: Thank you. That's everyone at the table. We'll go around the bridge, make sure we have who I think is on the bridge right now. And I would ask the people on the bridge to mute their phones except when they're going to speak.

Raymond Ban, are you there?

MR. BAN: Yes. Ray Ban of the Weather Channel, present.

MR. MORAN: Thank you. Art Botterell?

MR. BOTTERELL: Yes, good morning. Art Botterell from the Office of the Sheriff of Contra

Costa County, California. Good morning.

MR. MORAN: Good morning. Marcia Brooks?

MS. BROOKS: Good morning.

MR. MORAN: Good morning.

MS. BROOKS: Marcia Brooks with the National Center for Accessible Media at WGBH.

MR. MORAN: Marian Dunn-Tudor? Marian?

(No response.)

MR. MORAN: Gary Jones?

MR. JONES: Yes. Gary Jones with T-Mobile US and Deputy Chair of the -- Group.

MR. MORAN: Pat Roberts?

MR. ROBERTS: Pat Roberts for the Florida Association of Broadcasters.

MR. MORAN: Paul Wilcock?

(No response.)

MR. MORAN: Kelly Williams?

(No response.)

MR. MORAN: No. T. J. Lyon?

MR. LYON: Good morning. T. J. Lyon, International Association of Fire Chiefs.

MR. MORAN: Okay, thank you. So I think we know who is here before us.

Now, I believe that before each of you at the table we have a package of papers here which show

the agenda. I believe the first one is the agenda. And then we have a presentation that we're going to have here shortly from Purple Tree, and then we have the presentations for each of the working groups. So I hope you have a full complement of that. And if not, let me know.

I believe we've also e-mailed all this information on Friday, so the people on the conference call ought to be able to see that information, also.

So before we begin our working group update reports, Dr. Maurice Karl is here with us this morning, and he will make a presentation regarding Purple Tree's alerting technologies.

Dr. Karl?

MR. KARL: Thank you. Good morning. I appreciate this opportunity to talk to this group, and to explain the technology we've been working on for several years right now with Purple Tree Technologies.

We're a small company out of Missouri, and we have started this company a number of years ago. We're actually assembling various groups, larger corporations, to help us out in this process.

We will start, basically go through the slides. The first part, we're going to explain how we approach the problem. We looked at this problem a

number of years ago and started doing some research, the same kind of research you guys are doing today. We've kind of gone through that. We continued to learn this whole process, and how to make things work in the right manner.

We'll talk a little bit about the architecture of how we're approaching this problem, and the basic structure of our system. We'll also talk about our solutions and some of our partnerships.

The vast majority of EAS messages that go out today are national weather related. Everybody knows that. Seventy to 80 percent depend on which papers you look at will clearly demonstrate the National Weather Service by far hands out, most of the alerts out there. And with the all-hazard alerts now being included, that number I would expect would increase.

Some of the codes that are available today, this is a handful of them. There's over 200 of them, I believe. You have a tornado warning. You have a child abduction emergency, Amber alerts. Hazard material warnings: a train tips over, releases a toxic waste of some kind.

You have flash flooding. Of course, that's in low-lying areas. We live over by the Missouri

River, so that's a really big area, but not that, you know, we've learned how to handle that. And the nuclear power plant warnings.

Tornadoes, I just want to go through tornadoes, because I live in Tornado Alley. I don't know how many people here live in Tornado Alley, but I've experienced two of them in my life and had to repair the barn twice. So we're keenly aware of how vital it is to gain the information in a timely manner.

Actually, a neat story is back when I was a child, my father was an electrical engineer; worked in the Navy, telecommunications. And he had this idea that if you turned the TV dark -- this was when we only had three stations in the area -- turned it dark on channel 2 and wait until it brightens up, you hit the deck. Well, we did that, and sure enough, the barn was gone. But we found it in the next field, and rebuilt it.

Tornadoes, 88 percent of all tornados are considered weak. They cause five percent of the deaths, and are on the ground for less than 10 minutes, sustain winds of 110 miles an hour.

Strong tornados, 11 percent of the time. And of course, as it increases in strength, the

occurrence decreases. But they cause 25 percent of the deaths, and they could be on the ground for 20 minutes. Winds up to 205 miles an hour.

The violent tornados, the really big ones, occur less than one percent of the time, but they cause the majority of the deaths, and can be on the ground as long as an hour, okay. And I think this is important for you to understand, that we live with this every day in the Midwest: Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Indiana, Illinois. We understand it.

The tornadoes on average travel 30 miles an hour. The speed can vary, can become stagnant, stay at zero, or it can go as high as 70 miles an hour, but for a short duration.

Tornadoes, typically if you look at the affected area, they're traveling 30 miles an hour, they're on the ground for less than 10 minutes; 88 percent of the times they're going to travel less than five miles. So it's a very localized kind of alert system.

Now, most of the alerts that you find on the TV, they see a hook in the radar, and that's when they set off the alarms. We're used to that. In fact, thank you for the National Weather Service doing that.

Where I live is in Boone County. It's in the middle of the city, or in the middle of Columbia, Missouri, in the middle of Boone. We have the National Weather Service, on average the towers transmit 40 miles. That's 5,000 square miles that are being alerted for a relatively small area of a tornado.

And if you were to, if we were able to activate one tower or a few towers, we could go down to 75 square miles, because this is a line-of-sight communication system. We want to create a geo-specific alert.

And one of the reasons I'm bringing up how most alerts are local in nature is that I honestly believe that you have to create the ability to handle the local alerts and have the ability to go national, as opposed to creating a national alert and going local. That's because 45,000 times a year, the National Weather Service gives severe thunderstorm warnings. What a way to practice your system, over and over and over again.

The President of the United States has never activated the system. So why wouldn't you exercise our local bases and have the ability to expand? Okay, let's see.

Line-of-sight communication. If you're within the sight of that tower, you can activate it. Most cell towers are three to seven miles. Now they're putting them in subway stations. Of course, in the city it's a different story. Wireless providers around here understand all that.

Reduce the area to about 75 miles, assuming it was a five-mile-radius transmission. Reduce the complacency. A lot of people in the Midwest, they understand tornadoes, they see them coming, but they still become complacent because it hasn't hit their barn yet. So by reducing the actual area that's notified, you reduce complacency, because if the people see the alert going off, they will react.

One time I was traveling through Iowa and there was a tornado warning. And I didn't know what county I was in, so I just kept driving. This system will allow you to know that you're at least within five miles or seven miles of a tornado.

And then of course we want to minimize the number of alerts going off on a cell tower, because we don't want to overload the system. And we're working on some issues there to address those.

This is kind of what we're looking at doing. We have two devices. One is just a normal cell

phone. We believe that the alert should come off and be simple and to the point. We want to be able to display a radio station. We talked to some emergency management representatives, and they said they really want to be able to get people to turn on their TVs and radios and take a look at what's actually happening. So we want to tell the people in that local area what radio station they might want to turn to, and what television station they might want to turn to.

On 9/11, 78 percent of the people turned on their televisions for further information. I was actually working in a manufacturing facility at the time, and they basically shut down production because everyone wanted to turn on and watch the TV, okay? That's how important that event was to everybody in this room.

The radio stations, we believe that if you're in a car you need to have that information, as well.

Let me go back one if I can here. It's not coming up, the graphics aren't coming up. But we actually have in the process of developing and working right now a key-size remote system that will be able to be affordable to everybody. If you create a large enough volume, everyone here knows that the cost of

manufacturing goes down, and you can sell at a lower price.

We believe that there's, what, 28 million people in this country who do not have cell phones, or cannot afford them. So we wanted to create a system that was affordable to everyone.

This device will also have sound capability, and it will vibrate, depending on the level of alert. We came up with a red-light configuration because we wanted to make sure it was international. Because if everywhere you look, if it's red you stop, you listen. You go through the process of trying to find out what's going on to protect yourself.

If it's yellow, it's a child being kidnapped. And there's 200 alerts, I believe, a year, over 200 alerts a year where a child is being kidnapped by a stranger, an Amber alert. And that's a very serious situation, especially for that child.

And if we can get seven out of 10 people in this country, when a child is being kidnapped, looking at their cell phones or turning on their radios and TVs, I would hope that would diminish the number of children being kidnapped. I have twin daughters who are 20, and thank God they are healthy and happy; at least they tell me they are.

While we want to make this inexpensive device, we believe that we can manufacture this at a high enough volume we can drive the price down between $10 and $15 a unit, I believe. I look over there to my marketing person to see if I said the right thing.

The overall system is simple in nature, but complex to actually implement. And we're working on those issues. We take the EAS system, and we format it for going through the cell system, and we go through geo-specific targeting of what towers you would actually activate. And then of course we send it out to the various wireless providers. We must have the wireless providers involved. Wireless providers need to be able to trust the people actually implementing this system. Okay.

This is just another way of representing the same technology. We're feeding systems in from WEN and from the EAS, and we're targeting what towers need to be actually targeted. And then we hook right up to the wireless providers. Our goal with our company is to be able to give them that feed without any work on their part, or at least minimize the work on their part. And then we send it to the towers, activating cell phones and E-FOBs.

Purple Tree's solution is to alert only the

affected area. If you go too large, you run a risk of people overloading the system. We are actually working on a methodology for throttling the number of towers being activated. You want to do that based on threat level and geographic area, relationship to.

We want to avoid complacency. Again, we want to address the concerns of overloading, because the very people that send it out are the people we need to protect.

Use existing technology. We're not trying to recreate the wheel, we're just trying to figure out how to put it on a different wagon. And that's been the philosophy from day one.

We want to use the EAS system. It's a system that exists today, and that will exist in the future. You need to be able to get both CDMA and geo-specific technology on board. Half the people have GSM, the other half CDMA.

You want to create a win-win situation. This technology, being an engineer, is about making things happen. And so I realized early in this process that you have to make it a win situation for everyone involved: federal, state, and local.

And revenue sharing. I was told not to bring it up, but I'm going to bring it up anyway. I

believe a no-cost system may or may not sustain itself over a long period of time. I think you need to look at some kind of funding that's always in place, that allows people to sustain this system, and allow it to continue from not just next year, but the year after, the year after.

We want to make sure it's at reach to the economically challenged. Just because you're a mother of three doesn't mean you don't have a right to protect your children and your life, and that's why we want to be able to create this E-FOB at a low enough cost that with any hope we can just give it to the people that can't afford it, or the government can buy it and then hand them out, just like you do gun locks at a gun show.

We want to make sure that we meet the requirements of the disabled. The E-FOB is specifically designed for vibration and lights. The level of alert will indicate that for your disabilities that if you can't see the light, at least you would know from the sound and the vibration that that's an issue.

We also want to make sure in order to implement this process, because each wireless provider has their own IP that they want to protect, each one

has a slightly different system, and all that needs to be addressed. So you need to create a partnership with the bandwidth to handle it, the band width meaning capability.

You need a deployment infrastructure company that can step in and help with the networking. And you can probably take a guess who that might be, but I'm not going to mention names here.

You need a handheld device manufacturer, someone who is actually designing and developing the E-FOB. The beauty behind the E-FOB also is that it's something that you can deploy immediately, it's something that can be tested over time. And if wireless manufacturer, device manufacturers of cell phones decide to implement it, we'll have the data to prove that the system works. So it minimizes any risks associated with Motorola or Nokia, or any of these other people trying to integrate this into their system.

Now, what's important is a lot of self-owneds today have the capability to receive broadcasts. Some may not; I'm not here to testify whether they are all capable or not. What I'm saying is that there are some that already exist. There's no reason why this can't be rolled out over time.

We have geographic mapping capability. You need a company that can come in and make sure that the mapping is done properly, and to a level that can actually satisfy the needs of this system.

You need a telecommunication infrastructure technology company, a company that understands the switches and the base stations and the other technology required to pull this off. And then of course you need cell providers.

We're fortunate, just last week we found out we have several providers that are signing on board that have both CDMA and GSM capability, and they welcomed the opportunity to work with us. And we welcome that opportunity as well. And we will have some testing capability in the middle of May, right? Yes. We're actually planning on the final testing in June. So if you guys would like to discuss those exercises or see it actually occur, we can do that.

I believe that is it. Any questions? No questions? I can't believe I did that well.

MR. PITTS: Thank you for your presentation. There is a competitor, I think, privately held in Houston called Cellcast. And they allegedly can do wave files as well with this. Can you do wave files? And what's the limit to the number of characters that

you'd be sending?

MR. KARL: Well, I know about the competitor. They're actually a British-based company, if you actually do the research. And their system actually relies on using the internet, which I specifically avoided that, because I feel it's a very fragile system. Actually, a guy from the university, Penn State University, Patrick Daniels did some research on SMS, terrorism attacks. And he specifically stated anything on the internet is considered compromised.

About what we're capable of doing, I hesitate to say anything because of confidential agreements we have right now with other companies. We're working on it. We'll be able to roll it out completely in May.

MR. PITTS: Can you give us a range in the number of word characters for printed text?

MR. KARL: Oh, if you'd look at -- I'll tell you what. Text messaging and GSM right now has the ability to do I think 15 pages of text. That's actually out on some websites that I found about a year ago.

So I mean, it's out there. You can do a lot of texts. You can do up to several pages. But my

question is why would you want to do that. You would want to make sure you minimize the amount of messaging going across. You want to turn people to the information they're used to obtaining.

I mean, I wish I could give you more information. Troy, we really can't talk about that right now.

MR. MORAN: Okay. Thanks, Dr. Karl. If you have further questions, you could perhaps see Dr. Karl after the meeting.

Let's go to the presentations of the Advisory Committee informal working groups. We'll begin with David Webb from FEMA, who will have a report on the Alerting Interface Working Group. David?

And as we have questions for David and others, please introduce yourselves before you speak so the people on the conference bridge will know who you are, and also the people who are doing the recording for us.

David?

MR. WEBB: Good morning. Thank you for allowing me to present the outcome so far that the Alert Interface group has worked up.

The AIG has been meeting regularly, and we

are pleased to report a few findings that we have come up with. Just to refresh everyone's memory, the primary mission of the AIG is to recommend specific public alert and warning systems for inclusion into the commercial mobile services' alerting capability that the carriers can voluntarily elect to carry. We were given several specific things to look at, and we've started down that process.

The participants in the group: Myself as the group leader, Art Botterell is the Deputy Group leader, and then we have the rest of the -- I don't believe we've left anyone out of the membership.

Our first task was to define the requirements of what we thought we needed to proceed with, and how we needed to proceed, and what we wanted to come up with. We defined 16 requirements, and we reported those to the Project Management Group. Fifteen of those were accepted, and they were incorporated into the PMG requirements document.

The primary recommendation of the group early on was that we should use OASIS CAP, the common alerting protocol format. That seems to be the most useful and ubiquitous method of transmitting alerts at this time.

The next steps, we want to consider which

fields are most applicable to the commercial mobile services industry. We know we can't put everything on the page. Which fields do we extract to make the message most useful? How can we prioritize those messages, and then how can we put forth a trust model that the carriers will accept, that they know that the authorization of the message is there, it's authentic, it hasn't been tampered with? It is a valid alert.

So our working assumption is that we will proceed with CAP, and we will develop our standards around the common learning protocol.

In the next few months we're going to work on prioritization. We will comment on the scope and the definition of wireless alerts. One of our requirements was to give a refined list of a sample of systems that are available today that can produce alerts, and then the trust model.

Later on this summer we're going to look at geo-targeting, what the specifics are, how wide of an area, do we take a whole county, is it by state, is it by subcounty? How geo-specific do we want to get?

CAP message limits. We've been working with the Communications Technology Group to define what they can accept. And this mostly comes from a system limit and from handsets, so we've got some user needs

group coordination going on there, also.

And then we will present in August our final recommendations to the PMG.

MR. MORAN: Thank you, David. Does anyone have any questions for David on his report? Okay, no questions. I appreciate it, David.

Next we have Edward Salas from Verizon Wireless to report on the Alerting Gateway Working Group.

MR. SALAS: Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to come and provide status on the AGG.

We'll jump into the mission statement again, as a refresher. We're charged with drafting requirements for interface into the alerting systems, as recommended by the AIG. We're to recommend methods by which alerts received from the target systems are processed, and these alerts will depend on many attributes, things like user-specific data, where the users opt in, opt out.

We certainly want to meet all statutory requirements. Geo-targeting methods will be accommodated. We'll work procedures required for maintenance of the data that we're processing. And the handling of alert priorities, as well.

We're to draft recommendations to address

possible unique interfaces associated with unique CMS implementations of technology, and then generally make any other recommendations that emerge as important with regard to transactions between the CMS entities and the alerting originators.

AGG participation. Verizon Wireless, CTIA, ATIS, Cingular, DHS, Intrado, Motorola, Sprint/NexTel, Syniverse, TIA, and VeriSign. We've had active participation by all members, and I want to thank all the participants for a lot of work and time commitment.

AGG status. To date we have held two formal meetings in Washington, D.C., in January as well as February. We've adopted working procedures for the informal working group, again leveraging the good work of Brian Daly and the CTG. We've developed schedules for monthly face-to-face sessions. We've defined a project plan. And the current status is we're on schedule.

We have formed a technical subgroup for in-depth and specific dialogue with regard to the charges that we have. This group has scheduled biweekly sessions, so they're very busy. We've discussed system requirements and defined an outline, and we've assigned working items not only to the team members,

but other subject matter experts.

We've discussed the network architecture, and determined that a single alerting aggregator to distribute alerts to the carriers' networks is required. We're in the process of analyzing CAP parameters to be mapped into the alert service profile that has been defined by the CTG.

We've defined some working group working assumptions in support of multiple protocols: protocol mapping, as well as an evolution of protocols. We've identified and listed key deliverables, gateway system requirements, interfaces to the alerting authorities, interfaces to the carriers' networks. We've addressed system reliability and redundancy requirements, as well as security requirements.

Working assumptions. And again, I want to preface the working assumptions and have the group understand that these are working assumptions intended for use of the working group itself, and really don't rise to the level of the PMG working assumptions, which will be outlined I think in a subsequent report. So this is a set of assumptions that allow us to function internally.

First, to deal with inputs to the gateway,

outputs from the gateway. We're basically asserting that we want to support multiple media profiles: text, audio, video, and multimedia.

We want to support in the gateway protocol mapping from the input to the output protocols. The gateways need to format messages properly so the carriers should not be required to modify or edit the alert message content. We want carriers to do what they do best, which is to address distribution of messages, as opposed to the treatment of the content of those messages.

The gateway will support geo-targeting requirements, and we will have an architecture that will support redundancy and reliability. We list a number of points. Bottom line, we do not want to have a single point of failure within the architecture of the system.

All gateways will use the same format and same message identifier when sending the same message to carriers' networks.

Here we have a project timeline. This is very high level. This identifies key milestones that we will need to achieve in order to meet the larger committee objectives from a timeline standpoint.

This chart doesn't reflect all of the

interdependent activity that goes on between and among all of the various working groups, so there's a whole other level of specificity that kind of underpins this.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I'm done.

MR. MORAN: Thank you. I appreciate it. Any questions for Mr. Salas? Okay, great. Thank you.

Next we're going to have a report from Brian Daly on the Communications Technology Working Group. Mr. Daly, of course, is from Cingular.

Jeff, I guess they're holding all their questions for you at the end.

MR. DALY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Advisory Committee. It is my pleasure to be here this morning to give an update on the status of the Communication Technology group.

Again, my name is Brian Daly of Cingular Wireless, now part of the new AT&T. I am the leader of the CTG. My deputy leader is Jay Pabley of Sprint/NexTel.

Today I would like to present an update of the CTG activity since the formation of the working group at the December 12 Advisory Committee meeting.

This slide was presented at the December 12 meeting, and highlights the mission of this

Communication Technology Group. Our primary mission is to develop and submit recommendations for the relevant technical standards for devices and equipment, and technologies used by electing commercial mobile service providers to transmit wireless alerts to subscribers.

Since the technology's availability will vary as operators' business need meets subscriber expectation, the WARN Act also defines the need to define recommendations when not all of the devices or equipment used by such providers are capable of receiving alerts, or the provider cannot offer alerts throughout the entirety of the service area.

Technologies, devices, and equipment are not widely deployed today. That will support wireless alerts. Therefore, the deployment of those technologies will be dependent upon a wireless operator's commercial business deployments, and will vary greatly. So there are a number of scenarios where devices will only be in portions of the network or portions of the devices.

Furthermore, the CTG will look at technologies for the priority transmission of alerts by the electing providers, as well as the development of recommendations to transmit emergency alerts in

languages in addition to English to the extent practical and feasible.

Some of the issues we've been given to address are listed on this slide, which again was presented at the December 12 meeting. We are to come up with recommendations for the technologies and methods permitting the efficient transmission of messages to potentially an entire subscriber base of operators.

We also need to associate appropriate priorities on those alert messages, and target the alert messages to specific geographic regions or locales, enabling the use of the important emergency service by other alerting authorities, including state and local governments.

We need to come up with recommendations on handset and device technologies, which are appropriate for alerting services; take into account the needs of non-English subscribers, as well as people with special needs, including people with disabilities and the elderly; and also to ensure the critical emergency services continues to evolve with technology supporting it. What's available and deployable in the near term may be different from the longer-term technologies that will be available.

And then finally, we want to make sure we align the technologies with the relevant standards organizations that are focusing on the evolution of the various technologies.

I am fortunate to have a very capable, dedicated team in the CTG. The representatives from companies listed on this slide have provided significant expertise on the technologies. I am confident that this team will be successful in developing recommendations that the industry will embrace. And those companies are Cingular, Spring/NexTel, Alltel, the American Association of Paging Carriers, the Rural Cellular Association, T-Mobile, Verizon Wireless, Ericsson, Motorola, Nokia, NorTel, Qualcomm, and the Telecommunications Industry Association.

I should also point out we do have representatives of the FCC on the CTG that are also very active contributing members to the process.

As far as the status summary, the CTG has developed a set of working procedures and assumptions for the informal working group. These working procedures help us guide the work efficiently and fairly to maximize the successful completion of our mission.

We've been holding monthly face-to-face meetings with interim conference calls, and as of February 15 we have held three face-to-face meetings and two conference calls. The face-to-face meetings have been here in Washington, D.C.

We formed a number of ad hoc groups to specifically investigate specific issues that have come up. Battery life, security, and devices are just three of the issues that we've formed ad hoc groups on.

We are coordinating with the other informal working groups, with liaisons being sent over as necessary in order to get information shared between each of the working groups.

And then finally, we are on track for making recommendations to the Project Management Group per the project schedule and assignment of responsibilities.

The CTG has also come up with a number of working assumptions -- and again, these are the informal working group assumptions -- some of which have been submitted to the Project Management Group, which we'll hear about a little bit later.

The first is, we're in the process of defining what we're calling service profiles. Service

profile defines the underlying delivery attributes, such as text, audio, video, and multimedia. The goal is to define service profiles, and not specific delivery technologies. The reason for that is multiple technologies are available for each service profile, and the operator will have options to use any available technology that supports a given profile if they do elect to transmit alerts. And what technology and operator picks will be based on operator business needs and technology availability.

Text is viewed as the universal service profile. That is, it's the minimum capability that must be supported by an operator that elects to transmit alerts. Text is available across delivery technologies, and also across different mobile devices.

We have to take into account various classes of mobile devices, from the low-end all the way up to the high-end devices. And with that, there are economic factors that come into play, as well. We can't rely on a technology that will require a subscriber to buy a high-end device, a very expensive device. We have to take into account the low-end devices for those that can't afford those high-end devices or premium service plans.

Additional profiles can be supported as technology advances and operators commercially deploy those technologies. But again, defining generic service profiles will take into account some of the evolving technologies of the future.

I recall in the CTG mission statement we were asked to develop recommendations for electing operators that may transmit in whole or in part. With that we have come up with a number of deployment scenarios to define what whole or part is. A whole or part is not a simple yes-or-no answer, because technology availability and operators' commercial rollouts are going to be very dependent upon the operators' business plans.

The technology scenarios, deployment scenarios will be based on multiple technologies, the mobile device capabilities, product availability, implementation phases, as well as wireless operator elections that support wireless alerts. These scenarios will be used to develop the process under which the providers can elect to transmit alerts for each scenario.

If an operator transmits an alert to a wireless device, one of the concerns we have is they are going to have that mobile device in their hand

when they receive that alert. Immediately we're concerned that they are going to turn around to use that device to either call family or friends, or try to get some more information about the alert in one manner or another.

During emergencies, we believe the need for support of national security emergency personnel and 911 calls is important. Therefore, we are looking for ways to minimize the potential for wireless alerts resulting in severe network congestion that will inhibit critical communications. And again, having that device in hand will encourage subscribers to use that device when they receive the alert in order to make a phone call.

Even more disruptive is if they make that phone call to 911 services just for general information instead of emergency calls, or even to a wireless operator's customer care, where we may not even have the information on what the problem is to give them.

So the CTG is working on the assumption that any point-to-point or unicast delivery technology, such as SMS point to point or MMS, are not feasible or practical for the support of wireless alerts, especially when you look on a nationwide, or even a

large-city or even a smaller-city scale.

Point-to-point technologies will quickly congest the network, resulting in message delays, messages not delivered, as well as the potential for denying voice service capabilities for those critical calls that need to get through.

We are also assuming that the distribution of the alerts from the wireless subscribers will be uni-directional. That is, there will be no acknowledgement coming back from the device or from the subscribers that the message was received. Having a confirmation message again would put added traffic on the network, which will again congest the network and prevent calls that may be essential.

In the handheld device technology area, the CTG has made an assumption that only alerts that are immediate, severe, or likely threat to life, health, or property will be delivered to the mobile device. We want to minimize the cry-wolf syndrome; that is, we don't want to send too many alerts to the mobile devices because people will start ignoring them, much the way they start ignoring SMSs when you're in meetings and so forth. So we want to make sure that the alerts that are sent to mobile devices are those critical alerts that we really need to get the message

through to them.

And based on that, we also have to realize that the mobile devices themselves will have limited capabilities: number of characters available on the screen. The screen size itself could be a limiting factor in many cases, as well.

So these are some of the issues that are currently being investigated and evaluated by the CTG as far as device technologies.

It's desirable to have a common experience across all carriers and technologies. An example of that would be a standardized alerting tone for the notification of an emergency alert. Having a standardized tone across carriers would be beneficial to subscribers' education so that they are aware that that tone means that an alert has been issued.

And it is also anticipated that new mobile devices are required, that will be replaced by normal subscriber device life cycles. Some devices, such as pagers, may support some of the service profiles with over-the-air programming or changes.

Devices that are in the hands of subscribers today, they don't support wireless alerts. That's because there is, at least the minimum, a need for a client to process and present the alert to the

subscriber. As we just talked about, a common alerting tone may be one of those presentation methods.

Finally, I'd like to present the CTG timelines and milestones. Over the next three months we will complete the development of service profiles, address multi-language feasibility, address geo-targeting, look more into the architecture and interfaces, and especially working very closely with the AGG, making sure that the information that is sent from the gateway to the wireless operator's network is consistent with what needs to be processed by the network. Also address special needs requirements, and continue with our ad hoc activities.

Throughout this summer we'll be drafting our recommendations, have several drafts of that. And as mentioned earlier, I believe that we are on target for the final CTG recommendations to be completed on time.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to present the CTG status. I look forward to our continued progress in line with our mission.

MR. MORAN: Thank you. Thank you, Brian.

Next we have Gary Jones from T-Mobile, on behalf of Jonathan Werbell, from the City of New York. And Jeff, I guess you're going to man the computer

there.

MR. GOLDTHORP: Yes, I am. Gary, can you hear me?

MR. JONES: Yes, I can. Thank you.

MR. GOLDTHORP: Gary is joining us from about as far away as you can get. He's in Cyprus. And if you think you had a hard time with Daylight Savings Time change this weekend, he's probably got it a little bit harder today.

Anyway, he's there. He's ready to go. I'm going to just advance the slides. Gary, if you would just cue me to go. Let me just get your slides up first, and I'll tell you when we're ready here.

MR. JONES: I apologize for not being able to be there in person, but I had a commitment I could not get out of, so I'm calling in.

MR. GOLDTHORP: Well, we're glad you could make it, and we're ready to go now. So I'm on your opening slide, your title slide. You tell me when to go.

MR. JONES: Okay, thank you. As Jeff said, I'm making the report on behalf of our Chairman, as the Deputy Chair. If you'll go to the second slide.

You see, our mission, as given to us by the FCC, is to address the needs of the commercial mobile

service. And we had some things that were particularly culled out, particularly non-English-speaking customers and customers with special needs, such as people with disabilities or the elderly.

We began to look at this. We've had several conference calls and one face-to-face meeting. And I understand that we are supposed to develop recommendations under which the electing CNS providers can offer subscribers with some disabilities, and also provide ways, capabilities for preventing subscriber devices from receiving emergency calls.

We have been working with proposals from the other informal working groups, as you'll see in just a minute. Okay, Jeff, let's go to the next slide.

This slide, our mission. One of the things we looked at early was defining emergency message formats for special-need users. What we found with some information that was contributed to us, that special-needs users really don't react any differently from emergency messages than do people without disabilities. They just have, they may have needs for special types of alerting to tell them that they have a message, but the message formats don't necessarily have to be any different.

We're also looking at making recommendations

for a common look and feel for alerts, as you heard from Brian just earlier. And it's also up to us to draft a consumer notification that will be issued by non-electing service providers -- and we hope there are not many of those -- providers that elect to partially provide this service. Okay, Jeff, let's go to the next one.

As you can see, we have a wide variety of participants, and members of the group include a variety of industries, disciplines, and of advocates. We have several folks from the broadcast industry in our group, and I think that's very useful, because they already have experience in delivering alerts to a subscriber base. And their insights have already been helpful to us.

I won't go down the list. You can just read that, the participants. And pretty much we've had good participation from most everybody, and look forward to continuing that.

All right, Jeff, let's go to the next one.

MR. GOLDTHORP: Okay.

MR. JONES: Our current status. Our group got a little bit of a late start in really getting active, but that was probably a good thing. Because we really needed to get input from some of the other

informal groups, and particularly the Communications Technology Group. We needed some baseline, if you will, for what the technologies might do, what the technology limitations might be, and that's been very helpful to us.

We have now evaluated many of the draft positions and working assumptions from the CTG. And as I say, they have been particularly helpful in guiding us and giving us a grounding point. All right, Jeff, go to the next one.

Our status. We've weighed the available research from a document that was contributed to us called "The Access to Emergency Alerts for People with Disabilities." We're also going to get some input from those folks on some potential use of the scenarios that Brian discussed, and a way of classifying emergency alerts.

We've considered and agreed to most of the CTG working assumptions. We agreed, and we looked over and agreed with the project management working assumptions. And that, as I say, has given us a very good grounding to start our work on the particular needs of the users. Now we're working to develop recommendations that will go to the PMG, and working to develop those use cases and possible alert

categories.

Our next meeting, our next face-to-face meeting will be March 21 at the FCC. And I'll stop here for any questions.

MR. MORAN: Any questions for Gary? Okay.

Next, Jeff Goldthorp of the Commission will present the Project Management Working Group report.

MR. GOLDTHORP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And let me spend a few minutes with you today and bring you up to speed on what's been happening with the Project Management Group of this committee.

When we met in December, we talked about the mission of the Project Management group as providing oversight to the various informal working groups to work issues of coordination between the informal working groups, to maintain a schedule. At that time, we presented a very sketchy schedule of milestones.

Since then we've got a much more detailed schedule that includes all of the interdependencies that we are aware of today between the different working groups. And of course, that's very important, because every time you identify a new connection between a working group, it tends to push things out in time. It never pulls things in.

So we're trying to identify as many of those

things as we can early, and the communication amongst the working groups is helping to do that. I think we've got a very sound schedule to work from now.

I can say confidently today that we are on target to meet our deliverable date in October.

We've also got quite a bit of work done. I'll talk later about a set of draft conclusions that the Project Management Group has come to based on recommendations from some of the different working groups. You've heard some of these things already, and the Project Management Group is functioning as a body where these things are coming together and being sort of vetted and agreed upon as a unit. And I'll talk in a moment about how we're using that to build a set of end-to-end requirements, system requirements for the architecture.

And finally, we will be assembling the final work product, but of course that work is in front of us.

Participants in the Project Management Group include all of the leaders and the deputies of the informal working groups. You've heard from a number of them already today. So those folks are all members of the Project Management Group, and they're listed here.

Our status. Like the other groups, we've had a number of meetings since December. We've had two face-to-face meetings here in D.C. The most substantive meeting was the one we just had in February, on February 15. And it was at that meeting where we talked in quite a bit of detail -- I mean, we literally spent about three hours with our sleeves rolled up -- dealing with end-to-end requirements for the architecture, dealing with architectural issues.

What we're trying to do as the Project Management Group is to define a vision of that architecture that could then be used by the working groups in their more detailed technical work. So as the working groups kind of work bottom up on technical issues, the Project Management Group is coming to conclusions top down. And we'll go through a list of draft conclusions that we've arrived at already in the next slide.

We have started that work. We have also, in addition to the draft conclusions you will hear about today, we've identified a long set of technical questions that will be passed, or have been passed, to different working groups for more detailed work.

All of the work that's being done at the Project Management Group I should say is being done

based on contributions from the working groups. So two in particular, we got detailed requirements from the Alerting Interface Group. A lot of the perhaps conclusions you'll hear in a moment were based on those recommendations. And we had a long list of questions, technical questions from the Communications Technology Group that we worked from to get those answered. And those were not just questions for the Communications Technology Group; it turns out those are questions for a number of the other groups, as well.

Now, what I'll go through now is the set of draft conclusions I mentioned before. There are 16 of them. I'm not going to go through each one of them point by point. They're all listed here, and there will be time at the end of the meeting, after we're finished here, for some discussion.

I'll also say that if anybody after this meeting has any concerns or issues, I invite you to send me e-mail by the end of the week, but please no later than Friday, and we can work to get those resolved.

But everything that you're going to see now has been discussed in detail in each working group, and at the Project Management Group. So there

shouldn't be anything here that will be a surprise to you.

And also, before I start, let me just mention there's a term that you're going to see here, an acronym, CMAS, commercial mobile alerting system. And one important point to make about that is I'm not talking about any particular part of the system; I'm not talking about the wireless distribution system, I'm not talking about the alerting origination, I'm talking about the end-to-end system. And that is the view that these conclusions take.

First of all, one of the most important early decisions or draft conclusions that the Project Management Group came to was that there is a need in the architecture for an aggregation function, for a single function in the architecture that is the recipient of alerts from various sources, whether they be local, state, federal; and to process those alerts, to prioritize those alerts, and then to present them on an integrated interface to wireless distribution systems.

It was also agreed upon that that aggregation function should be administered by a federal authority.

The second point has to do with the

definition of alert. In other words, there are lots of different views of what constitutes an alert. You can sign up for lots of different kinds of alerts today. But what we agreed to at the Project Management Group is that for the purposes of the commercial mobile alerting system -- and I'll read the language here -- "it would only be used to disseminate public alerts regarding immediate, serious, and likely threats to life, health, or property; and for updates and amendments to those alerts." So these are very serious events. We're not talking about things that happen routinely. We're trying to avoid the condition I think that was alluded to earlier, which is sort of alert -- the condition where you start to ignore alerts when you get so many of them.

The third one I'll mention on this slide is that the system, the commercial mobile alerting system, has to support a method for authentication of originators, so that carriers, wireless service providers know when they get the alert that they're getting an alert that is from an authenticated source. This is to avoid spoofing and false alerts, false alarms.

There's three other draft conclusions on this slide. I'm not going to talk about each of these

three in any detail, but they are here. And as I said, if you've got questions or comments, please either bring them up today or send me a note later.

Moving on then to this slide. We decided at the Project Management Group that the content, accuracy and completeness and so forth for content, that function would rest with the originating agency, as opposed to the distribution platform. So as it relates to content, the wireless distribution system would function sort of as a dumb pipe. And I know there's a lot of folks that probably don't want to hear about their platforms being referred to in that context maybe, except in this particular manner. So when it comes to alerts, that's how the distribution platform would be thought about.

Geo-targeting is probably one of the most difficult technical issues that's in front of us, but we agree at the Project Management Group, at least in principle, that the system needs to restrict the alert delivery to recipients located in the geographic area that is at risk. So how that's done is yet to be determined, but we have agreed that that is something that is to be done. And then there's three others here that I will not go into in as much detail.

And finally, I think David mentioned already

that the Alerting Interface Group had recommended that CAP would be the protocol used to format alerts for distribution, and that has also become now a draft conclusion of the Project Management Group. And also that the architecture must provide a level of redundancy that would avoid a single point of failure that would expose the architecture to a catastrophic outage and the inability to deliver alerts in an important time.

Then there's three other points on this slide that I won't go into in as much detail. But I think what I've tried to do with the ones that I've talked about specifically is give you a sense for the kinds of things, at this point in time, that, at the Project Management Group, we are agreeing to. This is the level of agreements that are taking place. It's high level still. We're agreeing on points in principle that are going to get drilled down on in the different working groups. But I think it's important to put this before you.

I also want to make it clear that this list is not complete. We've got 16 things on this list right now. We're going to have quite a bit more than 16 things on this list when we're done. But this is where we're starting, and we wanted to present this to

you at this meeting because it represents kind of the state of where we are.

And I think at the end of the meeting, we'll talk a little bit more about next steps. But that concludes my prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. MORAN: Thank you. Thank you, Jeff.

I have to say the work of the advisory committee and the working groups thus far has been very impressive. I think these reports show that a lot of work has been done, and all the work that's needed to get to where we need to get this report to the Commission and beyond.

We trust that all the working groups will continue their work at the pace that they're doing, if not even more. And I basically, I would have to congratulate you for all that you've done so far.

I do have a question. I would like to get a sense, if you would, Jeff mentioned his draft conclusions, and I think many of those points were mentioned in the earlier reports. Could anyone describe, how comfortable are you with these draft conclusions? Does anyone have any thoughts or comments about that? Are you pretty happy with them?

MS. ARNOLD: This is Ann Arnold, and I have

a question about one of the points that was made in the last presentation.

You said that one of the agreements' conclusions was that the alerting initiation platform aggregation function should be administered by a federal authority. But we've heard over and over again that most emergencies are local in nature.

How will a federal authority administering the delivery of these messages work to allow a state or local government to use this whole system?

MR. GOLDTHORP: The idea of the aggregation function, and it is that there would be a standard interface defined for alerts to be originated from any source, whether it be a state EOC, whether it be a county-level emergency office. So that alerts that are local in nature would simply be injected into the commercial mobile alerting system by way of the aggregation function.

So it's not a function that would make it any more difficult to provide alerts that are local in nature. It's just a function that would allow alerts to be prioritized and presented to the wireless distribution systems in a consistent way.

MR. PITTS: Does that mean that the EAS through the television system now would go through

this federal government entity, as well?

MR. GOLDTHORP: I don't have any comment about the EAS, or how --

MR. PITTS: This is only the wireless.

MR. GOLDTHORP: Right now, for the purpose of this committee, we're just talking about the wireless, or the commercial mobile alerting system.

MR. PITTS: So there could be a separate going out through the normal EAS system through television stations.

MR. GOLDTHORP: I don't have any comment on that.

MR. PITTS: How would the good work of Mr. Lawson and the public television stations fit into this federal government system, as well? I mean, they're relaying EAS? Is that what I'm understanding the law will envision?

MR. GOLDTHORP: One way that they could fit in -- I mean, you can imagine an aggregator as an aggregator of all alerts, so that alerts could originate from, either be transmitted into the aggregator. Once the alert makes it way from the source, whether it be a state, a local, whatever that source might be, there are lots of different platforms that it could be distributed on, whether that be

broadcast, whether that be wireless, whether that be internet.

And so you can imagine the aggregator as being a, almost an equalizer of sorts, something that is independent of the distribution platform, but which performs a vital function, which is to integrate the alerts and to present them to the different distribution platforms in a manner that they are most accustomed to receiving.

Or, using a standard manner, so that whatever gateway is at the front end of the different distribution systems can take that standard interface and convert it into a form that is appropriate for delivery over that distribution system. It will be one thing for broadcast; it might be something entirely different for wireless distribution.

What we're talking about here in this committee is commercial mobile delivery of alerts. And the decision that was made at least tentatively at the Project Management Group is that these alerts should be aggregated using an aggregation function in the architecture.

MR. PITTS: Right. Under the National Response Plan, though, if there's an incident declared, all telecommunications is supposed to be

managed locally. So this federal government interface is down at the local level, able to work with the local authorities.

MR. GOLDTHORP: Yes.

MR. PITTS: Thanks.

MR. BOTTERELL: Mr. Chairman?

MR. MORAN: Yes? Who is speaking?

MR. BOTTERELL: Art Botterell from California. If I may suggest another way of looking at this.

We've referred to this function as the aggregation. But in many ways its primary responsibility has to do with the authentication of the local users. So yes, the local users, as you say in the principles set forth by the PMG, will be solely responsible for content. The role of the federal system will simply be to provide a single point of contact for the cellular carriers. At least that's my understanding of the recommendation.

MR. MORAN: Okay, thank you. Chris.

MR. GUTTMAN-McCABE: The only thing I was going to say is we have a model now that's working that may help explain it. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children right now takes all the Amber Alerts from the over 100 originating Amber

agencies, and consolidates them, and then feeds them through a pipeline to the wireless carriers that are participating in the Amber Alert effort. And over 15 wireless carriers are doing that.

So the idea is that the Amber message is originated locally from one of the originating entities. It is then passed to the national center, and then two different aggregators sort of work on it so that it can be formatted correctly and then sent, via pipeline, to the wireless carriers.

It provides, as Art had said on the phone, it provides a point, a single entry point to the wireless carriers. It also provides consistency and sort of a commonality of a message. And it's working very well right now. And it happens -- and I know you asked the question -- it happens almost instantaneously. And that was the Department of Justice identified the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children as the entity that would act as the integrator. And it's a model that works, works for consumers, but also works for the carriers and is something we want to I think replicate in this space.

MS. ARNOLD: Are we looking at a number of different aggregators for different types of messages?

MR. GOLDTHORP: No, we're not looking at a

number of different aggregators for different types of messages. There will be a set of alerts that are deemed to be the ones that would be carried on the system that's being defined by this committee. And the aggregation function that we're talking about here would be the aggregation function that would apply to those alerts.

Now we're talking about logical functions of an architecture. We're not talking about hardware and software here. That time will come. And it may be that when the time comes for folks to think about how to implement this, that a logical way to implement it might be to combine it with certain other aggregation functions that are already out there for other alerts.

We are not far enough along in that process for me to even speculate about that right now. But we do believe that we're far enough along to make some sort of abstract logical decisions about what sorts of functions should exist in this architecture, without worrying yet about precisely how they should be implemented.

MR. MORAN: Mr. Rutkowski, you had a thought?

MR. RUTKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Clearly there's, I think, some interest in that

particular bullet, and further dialogue is needed.

It's not clear at the outset what it means to have a government agency administer, and that clearly, I think, needs to be fleshed out and considered.

Is this also creating a single-point failure potential itself? And the terminology being used here, alerting initiation platform and aggregation doesn't quite match I think the AGG function. It's sort of not clear how this function that's being described relates to other pieces of the architecture.

And last, but not least, for those of us who participate in NSTAC, the tensions here between this function and the NSEP functions that would exist possibly concurrent to any emergency I think need to be somehow explicitly dealt with.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORAN: Thank you. Any other thoughts, questions, on this point? Any other thoughts on the draft conclusions that Jeff presented?

Okay. I think we're moving along quickly enough that we can probably conclude this before lunch, as far as I can tell here.

I think next on the agenda is to review schedule and action items. Jeff, what do you have

there?

MR. GOLDTHORP: Okay. Let me just say that you've probably gotten the sense from all of the working group leaders that you heard today that we've got meetings scheduled. All the working groups have meetings scheduled all the way out through the end of the cycle, the end of the committee's term, which is October. And so those meetings will occur. Almost all of those meetings take place here in D.C.; they are face-to-face meetings.

And of course, there are bridges set up so folks can join by bridge. But the meetings themselves are face to face.

There are also working groups -- or not working groups, but subgroups in a number of the working groups, working on some more detailed technical issues.

So as far as next steps and action items for us, we will continue to execute against the project plan that we have. But more specifically, at the February 15 Project Management Group meeting, we did leave that meeting with a long list of technical questions that are more detailed than the kinds of things we talked about here.

I mean, a lot of the draft's conclusions

that I talked about are things that leave you with the question, it's more the what, not the how. We just talked about one that's like that: it's the what, not the how.

So a lot of the technical questions that peel that onion were discussed on the 15th, as well, and were distributed to the different working groups to work on in the remaining weeks in February and March, early March.

We've got another Project Management Group meeting coming up I think on the 22nd. I mean, I could be a day off on that, but it's in that week. And the objective for that meeting is for each of the working group leaders to come back with as many answers to these questions as they can.

Those answers will be arrived at by work done in the working groups. So we've got these meetings sort of timed so that the Project Management Group meetings happen after the working groups meet. So there will be working group meetings that take place between February 15 and the next Project Management Group meeting.

In those working group meetings, those questions will be discussed. I'm sure other things will be discussed, as well. And when we meet again at

the Project Management Group meeting, I expect that we'll have some answers, hopefully a lot of answers. In those cases where we don't have answers, what we will have is project plan, or how the answers will be arrived at, and when we'll have answers.

So at the end of March, we should have additional draft conclusions that we'd be prepared to share at our next meeting. Okay.

MR. MORAN: Okay.

MS. ARNOLD: Chairman, if I could go ahead.

MR. MORAN: Yes.

MS. ARNOLD: If it would be possible to have the questions that are being asked of the various working groups disseminated in some fashion other than just going to a chairman who may or may not pass them on? Is there not some reason why we couldn't all see what the questions were or at least all see what the questions were for our working group?

MR. MORAN: No, there's no reason. I mean, the list exists, and I'll make sure that it gets distributed to each member of the working group. All right?

MS. ARNOLD: I think it would be helpful for the list to be available for people to see what's being asked of all the working groups. Everyone may

not want to go to that extent, but I think it would be helpful for it to be there.

MR. MORAN: Okay. Jeff, earlier you said that there was some information that you wanted by the end of the week. Could you clarify that, and just repeat that?

MR. GOLDTHORP: Yes. What I had asked for by the end of the week was, I went through all the draft conclusions. I did not talk about each one of them in detail, so there were some that we did not talk about today.

If, after this meeting, you have a chance to look at this closer and there's something in there that you have a comment on, or even if it's one of the ones we talked about that you want to comment on, get in touch with me. Send me an e-mail or call me by the end of the week, so that we can inject it into the process in time for the next Project Management Group meeting. Okay?

MR. MORAN: Yes, that works. Does everyone have access to everybody's e-mail address?

MR. GOLDTHORP: It should be. If it's not available, what we can do is put it up on the website, if it's not there now, I mean. We can make that available.

MR. MORAN: Okay. So I think we're to point six on the agenda: other business. Does anyone have any business to raise here regarding the work of the group?

MR. WERTZ: Mr. Chairman, I do.

MR. MORAN: Yes, Mr. Wertz from Michigan.

MR. WERTZ: Thank you very much, yes. It's not our purpose at this point, but since it came up in the very first presentation, where, on the sixth slide, the gentleman said as he was driving across Iowa he didn't know what county he was in; so therefore, he didn't know whether the alert was relevant to him or not.

In our various working groups -- again, we're not there yet, but at some point we're going to need to be -- is the issue of training. Now, will that be at some point built into this? Because what he brought up was not a technical issue, it was a training issue.

In our EAS summit last week -- and you were there, and Lisa, you were there, and several others in this room were there -- that is a continuing theme of the single largest fault within the EAS system. It's not the delivery; it's the training of personnel.

So at some point within the WARN Act or

within what we're doing, I hope that we're going to be dedicating some time to the issue of implementing it at the training stage.

MR. MORAN: I think I agree, Bill. I agree that the training in any of these systems is absolutely critical. I would defer -- Lisa, the training, though, is not within the scope of what we're doing with the standard setting right now?

MS. FOWLKES: The work of this advisory committee is essentially, it's a technical standards, technical protocol function. So I mean, off the top of my head, I'd have to go back and look at the statute to see if training is an issue that could be handled by the advisory committee.

But if it turns out that we decide that it's not something for this advisory committee to handle, it may be something that could be addressed in some other forum. For instance, keep in mind that once the advisory committee makes its recommendations, the Commission still has to do rulemaking proceedings to adopt rule so on and so forth.

So, with that we can certainly look into that issue further, in terms of what role this advisory committee would have on the issue, and if there's some other venue that the issue could be

addressed.

MR. WERTZ: Thank you.

MR. MORAN: Thanks, Lisa. Any other comments? New business, whatever? Anyone from the bridge? Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Rutkowski.

MR. RUTKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, only in looking at the website as it's currently structured, there isn't an awful lot of content. And perhaps particularly the presentations at this meeting, for example, could be placed on the website, as well as perhaps the schedule, as well. We're all sort of busy and lose track of this stuff. And going to the website for a consistent common schedule that highlights things we ought to be focusing on would be useful. Thank you.

MR. MORAN: Thank you. Jeff, we can do that, right?

MR. GOLDTHORP: We could certainly put the presentations up there. I think we can put the scheduled dates for various meetings that we're aware of. Now, keeping in mind that that can change, those dates can change, and I may not be always aware of all the changes in some of the dates. But I think we can go a long way to meet what you're describing.

MR. MORAN: Yes, Mr. Fritts.

MR. FRITTS: Just to get the word out to everyone, do we have our own website? And what is it?

MR. GOLDTHORP: I don't know the URL offhand, but what we will do -- we have all your e-mail addresses. So we'll send out a bulk e-mail after the meeting, and we'll get you the URL for the website. We do have a website, by the way.

MR. MORAN: Okay.

MS. FOWLKES: Eddie, the address is www.fcc.gov/pshs/cmsaac. So that's the address for the committee's website.

MR. MORAN: You'd better give them the e-mail, I think.

(Laughter.)

MR. FRITTS: I'm looking forward to the e-mail.

(Laughter.)

MS. FOWLKES: Or the short version is if you go to either the FCC's home page or the Public Safety and Homeland Security's home page, both pages have a link to this advisory committee's website. So if you can't remember, because I said it at 50 words an hour, that's the easier way to get there.

MR. FRITTS: Thanks.

MR. MORAN: Thank you. Any other thoughts,

comments, questions? Mr. Rutkowski.

MR. RUTKOWSKI: I couldn't avoid making the suggestion. Actually, there's a bunch of us who are working on identity management over at the ITU in Geneva.

One of the things we recently put together was a wiki. So I don't know whether that's feasible with the Commission's IT department or any volunteer help, but having an advisory committee wiki might be actually kind of an interesting way for people to collaborate. And particularly the work on common text and work towards that consensus. Thank you.

MR. WEBB: What is a wiki?

MR. RUTKOWSKI: A wiki is basically a web-based, it's web-based material in which people who have the access authority, which can be either anonymous or some subset of people who are actually sort of empowered -- for example, all of the members of this group -- to collaboratively access and edit the text. And typically and audit trail is kept. So it's a way of people to sort of work towards consensus actually in real time with a textual, web-based interface.

And of course, the classic these days, which is even getting on the press, is Wikipedia, which is

totally open. But in a more closed collaborative group, it can be fairly effective. Thank you.

MR. MORAN: Okay, thank you. Anything else? Okay. Well, then, we are adjourned for the second meeting. Thank you very much for participating.

(Whereupon, at 11:39 a.m., the meeting in the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

DOCKET NO.: N/A

CASE TITLE: Commercial Mobile Service Alert Advisory Committee Meeting

HEARING DATE: March 12, 2007

LOCATION: Washington, D.C.

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the United States Federal Communications Commission.

Date: March 12, 2007

Christina Chesley
Official Reporter
Heritage Reporting Corporation
Suite 600
1220 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4018