

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION)
COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE ALERT)
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING)

Pages: 1 through 51
Place: Washington, D.C.
Date: September 19, 2007

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

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

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION)
 COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE ALERT)
 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING)

Commission Meeting Room
 Federal Communications
 Commission
 445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
 Washington, D.C.
 Wednesday,
 September 19, 2007

The parties met, pursuant to notice of the
 Commission, at 10:08 a.m.

BEFORE: KEVIN J. MARTIN
 Chairman

ATTENDEES:

RALPH AUBRY, Battelle
 ANN ARNOLD, Texas Association of Broadcasters
 DALE BARR, NCS
 CHERYL BLUM, TIA
 ART BOTTERELL (Via Telephone)
 MARCIA BROOKS, WGBH National Center for
 Accessible Media (Via Telephone)
 STEPHEN CARTER, Qualcomm, Inc.
 ED CZARNECKI, Spectra Rep
 LESLIE CHAPMAN-HENDERSON, FLASH
 GREGORY COOKE, CSAD, PSHSB
 BRIAN DALY, AT&T
 AMAR DEAL (Via Telephone)
 MARIAN DUNNE-TUDOR (Via Telephone)
 ALLISON ELLIS, Ericsson
 ROBIN ERKKILA, Intrado
 MARIA ESTEFANIA, ATIS
 LISA M. FOWLKES, Deputy Chief, PSHSB
 R. DALE GEHMAN, Poarch Band of Creek
 Indians (Via Telephone)

ATTENDEES: (Cont'd)

CHRISTOPHER GUTTMAN-MCCABE, CTIA, The Wireless
Association
MAHER HASAN, Sprint Nextel
GARY K. JONES, T-Mobile
ROB KUBIK, Motorola
JOHN LAWSON, Association of Public Television
Stations
THOMAS J. LYON, International Association of
Fire Chiefs (Via Telephone)
GADI MAZOR, Onset Technology
KEVIN MCGINNIS (Via Telephone)
ANTHONY MELONE, Verizon Wireless
RICHARD MIRGON, APCO
STEPHEN OSHINSKY, American Association of Paging
Carriers
JAY PABLEY, Sprint Nextel
MARK PAESE, NOAA
BILLY PITTS, NTI Group, Inc.
DEREK POARCH, Chief, PSHSB
ART PREST, Rural Cellular
Association (Via Telephone)
ANTHONY RUTKOWSKI (Via Telephone)
PATRICK ROBERTS, Florida Association of
Broadcasters
DOUG RUTLEDGE, Alltel Communications
PAM STEWART, (Via Telephone)
MATHEW STRAEB, Global Security Systems
RAYMOND STRASSBURGER, Nortel
DAVID WEBB, FEMA
JONATHAN WERBELL, City of New York
WILLIAM WERTZ (Via Telephone)
PAUL WILCOCK, Syniverse Technologies
DOUG WILEY, National Association of Broadcasters

1 MR. POARCH: And Dale Gehman?

2 MR. GEHMAN: I'm here.

3 MR. POARCH: Great.

4 MS. STEWART: You missed one.

5 MR. POARCH: Okay. And that was who?

6 MS. STEWART: I'm Pam Stewart, and I'm
7 sitting in for Brenda Kelly-Frey, K-E-L-L-Y, hyphen,
8 F-R-E-Y.

9 MR. POARCH: All right. Thank you.
10 Chairman Martin sends his greetings. He's in a
11 meeting now and will attempt if his schedule allows to
12 join us a little bit later. Our first item of
13 business is presentation and discussion of informal
14 working groups, and we start with the Project
15 Management Working Group, and Greg Cooke is
16 substituting today for Jeff Goldthorpe. Greg?

17 MR. COOKE: Thank you. Good morning,
18 everybody. This is the status report to the
19 Commercial Mobile Service Alert Advisory Committee of
20 the work of the Project Management Group. As I said,
21 I'm filling in for Jeff today, who will probably be
22 with us later this afternoon for some of the
23 individual working group meetings.

24 First, let's just briefly go over the
25 drafting schedule. We have hit all of our deadlines

1 in the drafting schedule. The May 16 final agreement
2 of the framework and deliverables and drafting
3 schedules we were able to get by the end of May.
4 Initial drafts of the CMAS from the working group
5 leaders were sent to the PMG leader and set up the
6 template of what was to be recommended, the major
7 issues to be resolved and any interworking group
8 issues that needed to be resolved, along with the
9 schedule.

10 We were able to, as it says here, coordinate
11 those issues between the groups before the end of May.

12 The second round of drafts were again delivered on
13 time from the working group leaders to the PMG by the
14 end of June, and then again by our meeting on May 19,
15 we were able to identify the final technical issues
16 and lingering draft needs and plot the course of
17 corrections.

18 Third rounds of drafts of the deliverables
19 from the working group leaders were delivered to the
20 PMG by the 9th of August, and by the 7th of September
21 the final draft recommendations were set to the PMG
22 chair. We anticipate that the final draft
23 recommendations will be delivered to the Commercial
24 Mobile Services Alert Advisory Committee by the 21st
25 of this month.

1 Then in our October meeting, the Advisory
2 Committee will be reviewing and voting upon the
3 procedures, so I just wanted to, on behalf of Jeff and
4 the PMG, thank everybody in the individual working
5 groups and the Advisory Committee as a whole for
6 putting together this really quite significant piece
7 of work. Thank you.

8 MR. POARCH: Are there any questions
9 concerning the Project Management Working Group
10 presentation? Thank you, Greg. Alerting Interface
11 Working Group, David Webb?

12 MR. WEBB: Good morning and welcome. The
13 Alert Interface Group has been working with all of the
14 working groups, primarily from the alert originators'
15 perspective during this process. We've examined
16 issues such as message content, use of the system, and
17 we've tried to represent the concerns of all
18 categories of alert originators, state local and
19 federal. We've had direct input from local and
20 federal entities.

21 The current status: We completed the change
22 request process last week. Presidential messages were
23 a huge topic, and we've decided how to handle those
24 messages throughout the commercial mobile alerting
25 system. When we look at how the messages will be put

1 together, either in freeform text, which was one
2 method that was brought up, or through a self-
3 generated message off of a specific code, we've worked
4 both of those issues out.

5 I'm sure either the UNG or the CTG will get
6 more in depth into how that process will occur, but I
7 believe it will meet everyone's needs throughout the
8 system. There is one thing on this slide. The
9 current EAS system today uses a termination message at
10 the end of a Presidential message.

11 Being that we are going to put this in text,
12 and it's primarily going to be a notification to have
13 you go listen to a commercial media outlet, radio,
14 television, the termination message is not needed in
15 the commercial mobile services application. However,
16 in the future should streaming video or some other
17 technology become available, that would be required,
18 and we do have a provision kind of set aside to take
19 care of that issue should the technology become
20 available to do that.

21 The other issue we looked at, and it was big
22 in discussions, was geotargeting. From the alert
23 originator's perspective, it's very desirable to have
24 very granular geotargeting such as HAZMAT incidents,
25 floods and other events. You want to notify a

1 specific group of people. Right now we're still going
2 down this path I believe technologywise.

3 I'm sure the CTG will address where this is
4 going and how this is going to be done, but we did
5 spend a considerable amount of time on this topic, and
6 I'm sure it will be an issue that we will deal with as
7 technology arises. We collaborated with all the
8 working groups on such things as retransmission
9 recommendations, gateway requirements, what the
10 default strings are going to be, what a message will
11 tell someone, what it will look like, how it will feel
12 across the systems.

13 All of the different CAP fields really came
14 into play in how a message is formatted and what it
15 means and how it's used. And that's a real
16 accomplishment for both OASIS and the people that
17 originated CAP that they made something so versatile
18 that we can use it across the whole messaging
19 spectrum.

20 Since July, we've completed the Trust
21 interface. The Trust Model, which we felt provides the
22 security required, is open enough to let everybody get
23 in and be able to participate. We didn't want to make
24 something so narrow that it would limit participation,
25 so we've "rickered" that one pretty close I believe.

1 We've also looked at how the messages are going to be
2 handled in the reference architecture.

3 The UNG and the AIG had large discussions on
4 how we would do opt out on urgency, severity and
5 certainty, and I know Gary briefed this the last
6 meeting. I don't know if he has any more to brief on
7 it at this time. Then we looked at message
8 priorities. Everybody said well we want to have a
9 priority system, or we don't. We started looking at
10 priorities from the aspect that everybody feels their
11 message is important.

12 If we had a priority system, we felt it
13 would be likely that because you feel your message is
14 important, it may be more important than someone
15 else's the priority system could get inflated, so
16 that's when we decided that the first in, first out
17 would meet the needs, and we looked at the speed of
18 the system, and quite frankly we don't have it
19 engineered to a microsecond here, but from message
20 input when you hit the "send" button to the time it's
21 delivered should be less than a minute.

22 If that's the case, there's really no
23 priority system needed because as these messages go,
24 they should just go in and go out, so we think we've
25 got that priority covered. Wow, two, lots missing.

1 Well, we did neither. Our final recommendations were
2 presented to the PMG at the September 7 meeting. In
3 total, we provided 14 major inputs and collaborated on
4 many others. I'd also like to thank the members of
5 the AIG for their participation and their efforts in
6 working this process. Thank you.

7 MR. POARCH: Thank you, David. Are there
8 any questions for the Alerting Interface Working
9 Group?

10 MR. PITTS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Billy Pitts.
11 David, I think you've properly highlighted the
12 concerns that some have with the geotargeting
13 specifications because for a large urban area. For
14 example, a county would encompass too many people, and
15 we obviously want to focus our messages to those more
16 at risk rather than a larger population. I hear
17 there's technology constraints, but it's an area I
18 think that really ought to be looked at quickly, and
19 you rightfully highlighted it. I'd be interested
20 to see where the CTG is on that issue.

21 MR. WEBB: Okay. I'm sure they will address
22 that further in their presentation.

23 MR. POARCH: Anything else? All right.
24 Chairman Martin?

25 MR. MARTIN: Thank you Chief Poarch, and

1 thank you all for both your service on this committee
2 and for your willingness to participate and try to
3 help us work through these very complicated technical
4 issues.

5 Certainly, when the legislation was passed
6 in setting up this process, and when we began it, we
7 were counting on you all to spend a significant amount
8 of time trying to help us work through these issues
9 from a technical perspective, and agreeing to shoulder
10 a large part of the burden of helping us begin this
11 process and developing a set of recommendations that
12 the Commission will be able to use in the subsequent
13 rulemaking, and that was certainly our hope.

14 While there still seems to be some remaining
15 issues, and I just heard Billy Pitts is raising
16 concerns about doing things in a more granular level
17 than beyond the county. And I certainly agree with
18 that, so I'm sure there's some additional issues that
19 will continue to end of being worked out. I think
20 that we're well on track to making some effective
21 recommendations that will allow us to begin the next
22 step of the process.

23 I just wanted to come and hear some of the
24 presentations this morning and thank you all for both
25 the time and the effort and tell you how encouraged

1 everyone at the Commission is by the work that you all
2 have done and by putting us in a position to begin
3 that next phase of the process. This was an extremely
4 accelerated timeframe that was required of everyone
5 here to work through these issues and develop a set of
6 recommendations.

7 I think that it was as difficult an
8 expectation as I've seen as far as an expedited
9 timeframe on a set of recommendations, and I think
10 that it's a testament to how well you all have worked
11 on this issue and how well you all have worked
12 together that you've been able to come forward in this
13 manner. I think it also is a good example of an
14 epitome one of the public/private partnerships that
15 can try to achieve these kind of consensus on issues
16 that can be very highly technical.

17 I appreciate everyone's efforts and the work
18 that you've done, and we look forward to continuing to
19 work with you on the process going forward.

20 MR. POARCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
21 next committee is the Alerting Gateway Group, Tony
22 Melone.

23 MR. MELONE: Good morning. As Greg had
24 mentioned earlier, we also completed and submitted
25 drafts of requirements, two drafts since the last time

1 we got together. So what I'd like to focus on this
2 morning is the work we did between then and now, and
3 then give you a snapshot of where are we at this point
4 in time, and I'll go back to the requirements that we
5 talked about.

6 I'll focus primarily on the things that we
7 either added or changed since the last time we were
8 together. The key here is that we did complete all
9 our deliverables. If you recall, the principal focus
10 of what needed to be done the last time we were
11 together was the mapping, the secret sauce as we
12 called it, in the Alert Gateway to take what the alert
13 community does and produces in CAP format and what the
14 carrier/service provided community needs on the other
15 end, and that's the essence of the Alert Gateway.

16 Defining all the translations, the
17 filtering, the default parameter was a huge
18 undertaking, still needed to be done. And I'm pleased
19 to say that that work has been completed, and I would
20 say that that work as David mentioned was in very
21 close collaboration with all the working groups.
22 Everyone had a hand in that.

23 The second piece of the deliverable was
24 creating the text message itself, taking the elements
25 coming in and providing a usable, intelligible text

1 message within the character limitations of the
2 technology, and that was a huge undertaking, and I'm
3 pleased to say that that was done as well. A couple
4 of things I'll point out.

5 In attempting to achieve those requirements,
6 one of the things that we at the last stages we
7 decided if expiration time was not provided on the
8 alert, we would apply a default value of an hour.
9 That was debated, and we all concluded that that was
10 probably in the best interest of the customers.
11 Secondly, we decided to allow free-format text, create
12 an environment to facilitate free-format text if and
13 when necessary, and we'll talk a little bit about that
14 I'm sure in later sections.

15 For automatic text generations, the
16 difficulty in defining the area impacted was debated
17 long and hard, and we concluded that a customer would
18 be sufficient when they get the message to just say,
19 "in your area" or "in this area." Then the last
20 piece, in order to conserve those 90 characters, we've
21 decided to limit the sender agency field to 12
22 characters, so that's what we've accomplished since
23 the last time together.

24 Let me step back to where are we? If you
25 recall, we identified requirements categorized into

1 eight different segments. I'll go through each one.
2 Basically, little change in the gateway architecture
3 with one exception: At one point we decided that the
4 Alert Gateway would interface with multiple CMSP
5 gateways. We removed that requirement.

6 At this point in time, we feel that it will
7 interface with one CMSP gateway per carrier, and then
8 it will be the service provider's requirement to
9 disburse that to multiple gateways should they decide
10 to architect their network in that fashion. Security
11 requirements have not changed, so I won't spend any
12 time on that. System capacity and performance, one
13 small change, but very significant in our design.

14 We had said 300 alerts per second. We
15 looked at that requirement and concluded that was far
16 too much, and it was not appropriate to ask the folks
17 that are going to build to these requirements to
18 design to that capacity, so we've dropped it to 30
19 alerts per second. Buffering, if you recall in
20 buffering we talking about throttling messages between
21 the Alert Gateway and the service providers in the
22 event the service provider could not distribute those
23 messages.

24 We've concluded that that responsibility
25 should fall on the service provider and the service

1 provider gateway, so language to that effect was
2 removed. So really the only thing the gateway needs
3 to do is buffer messages in the event the service
4 provider can't accept them. If the service provider
5 accepts the message, it's up to them to throttle the
6 messages in order to sustain and keep their network
7 functioning properly.

8 No change in interface and protocols on the
9 B and the C Interface, and then protocol mapping is
10 the essence of what we did the last six weeks, and I
11 mentioned earlier the progress since the last time we
12 were together until now, so I won't rehash that. The
13 profiles in the gateway for the service providers,
14 essentially what we did there was we simplified it
15 from the last draft.

16 At this point in time, the only thing the
17 gateway will know about the service provider is the
18 name, the IP addresses of the service provider gateway
19 and whether or not the service provider requires some
20 geographic limitation in terms of where they're
21 providing text alerts and where they're not. And if
22 the answer to that is yes, then what states does the
23 service provider support commercial mobile service
24 alerts.

25 In the essence, that's the profile that will

1 be established in the gateway for service providers.
2 Reporting, we extended online archiving from 30 days
3 to 90 days. That was a good suggestion. We adopted
4 it, so I don't think that's very controversial, and
5 then performance testing. The only change there, a
6 suggestion that after an unplanned or planned outage
7 it's very important that we recommend that
8 connectivity testing takes place to ensure the system
9 is functioning properly, so that was included in the
10 overall requirements.

11 Concluding, all technical issues have been
12 resolved. All the specification in essence we feel
13 very good about where we are in the draft. Okay.

14 MR. POARCH: Thank you, sir. Are there
15 questions? Communications Technology Working Group?

16 MR. DALY: Thank you and good morning. I'm
17 here to report the status of the Communication
18 Technology Working Group. First, I'd like to just
19 summarize some of the issues that we were tasked back
20 in December of last year to the CTG and just check off
21 to make sure we've covered each of the areas, which we
22 were assigned to look at.

23 First, is the recommendations for the
24 technologies and methods permitting the efficient
25 transmission of messages. As we reported back in

1 March, we have defined service provides, which
2 describe the underlying delivery attributes. Text
3 attribute being the underlying minimum provide and
4 future streaming audio, streaming video and multimedia
5 profiles.

6 The goal again as we set out was to define
7 the service profiles and the attributes of the service
8 profiles and not specific delivery technology since
9 there are multiple technologies available to support
10 the profiles. And if an operator does elect to
11 transmit alerts, they should be given the option to
12 use any of the available technologies for that, so we
13 believe we've covered the technology and methods for
14 the transmission of messages.

15 The distribution of alerts with the
16 appropriate priorities as Dave Webb indicated earlier,
17 the alerting priorities are going to be handled back
18 at the Alert Gateway and prior to the Alert Gateway.
19 We will from the service providers deliver the
20 messages in the order received and any sequencing and
21 prioritization is done upstream from us.
22 Geotargeting, and I'll cover more on this later in
23 this briefing, but the minimum requirement is on a
24 county basis.

25 Let me touch on that a little bit later as

1 to why and what is going to be done further for that.

2 We have several draft conclusions on handset and
3 device technologies, and we've also addressed the
4 needs of non-English subscribers as well as people
5 with special needs, including disabilities and
6 elderly. We've made provisions in the architecture to
7 support multiple languages.

8 Specifically, the C Interface has been
9 designed with language indicators and character-
10 encoding to support multiple languages. The message
11 has to be delivered to the service provider in the
12 language that is to be delivered, and in order to have
13 multiple languages, we believe a national plan for
14 multiple languages needs to be developed.

15 Next item is to ensure that critical
16 emergency service continues to evolve with technology
17 that supports it, and again we have taken into account
18 the future streaming audio, streaming video and
19 multimedia for future broadband multimedia networks.
20 Then finally, standards recommendations will be made
21 once all the technology recommendations are identified
22 and to which standards bodies they need to be
23 developed within.

24 As far as our status, the CTG has completed
25 conclusions for all of the outstanding technical

1 issues. We've had monthly multiday face-to-face
2 meetings, interim conference calls. Since the last
3 report, we've held 16 multihour conference calls.
4 We've been coordinating well with the other working
5 groups, AIG, AGG and UNG, and we've provided
6 significant input into the third draft of the
7 architecture and recommendations document.

8 Overall, this group has done an incredible
9 amount of work in our estimation. There has been over
10 316 document numbers assigned with over 622 revisions
11 to those documents. So again, I'd like to just give
12 appreciation to all the effort that's been done within
13 the members of the CTG.

14 The geotargeting issue, as we mentioned, the
15 minimum geotargeting geography for CMAS alerts, the
16 recommendation coming from the CTG is the county
17 level, and there are reasons behind why the county
18 level was chosen.

19 Some wireless technology are at propagation
20 areas for systems such as paging or multicounty cell
21 sites may greatly exceed a single county, so it's
22 difficult for all technologies to go below a county
23 level. That said however the CTG did recognize that
24 smaller target areas are a good goal. A service
25 provider that has the technology capabilities can

1 elect to target smaller areas, to predefined areas
2 that are smaller than a county whether it be a city, a
3 metro area.

4 These would have to be identified by either
5 GNIS codes, polygon or circle information that's
6 delivered over the C Interface to the service
7 provider. We understand it is desired more flexible
8 geotargeting to alert areas involved as the technology
9 advances. One other point on geotargeting is the
10 service provider should not be required to dynamically
11 match alert geography to RF coverage areas due to
12 technology limitations within the service provider
13 networks.

14 Working with the User Needs Group, we also
15 have identified the technical characteristics of the
16 Audio Attention Signal. The public is familiar with
17 the EAS tone today from radio and televisions. It's
18 the two-tone combination of 853 and 960 first signals.

19 For mobile devices, we've chosen to use a similar
20 signal with polyphonic devices using the two tones
21 that are used in the EAS system and devices that are
22 not capable of polyphonic tones would use a single
23 tone lower than two and a half kilohertz.

24 The tone will be an 8- to 10-second duration
25 and will have a temporal pattern if the device is

1 capable. The User Needs Group has told us that a
2 temporal pattern is more likely to get attention from
3 the user than just a steady tone, so the pattern
4 chosen would be two seconds on, then a half second
5 break, another second on, half second off, and then
6 another second on, and that pattern would be repeated
7 twice to give that 10-second duration.

8 The Audio Attention Signal that we're
9 defining would not be available on the handset for the
10 users to choose it as a ring tone, for example, or for
11 any other use. In addition, there will be a vibration
12 cadence for devices that are capable of supporting
13 vibration, and the default cadence for the vibration
14 will be the same as the Audio Attention Signal. One
15 of the other areas that we were asked to investigate
16 was the battery life issue.

17 There have been numerous reports in the
18 industry over the years that cell broadcast had a
19 negative impact on battery life. The CTG analysis has
20 confirmed that battery life is a potential issue with
21 cell broadcast. Each technology is going to implement
22 text broadcast messaging differently, and each
23 technology is deployed with different hardware and
24 software as well as different standard releases, and
25 all of these will come into play as far as the battery

1 impacts.

2 The analysis done primarily by the vendors
3 that are members of the CTG determined that a state of
4 the art infrastructure deployment and state of the art
5 mobile devices potentially could see an impact of 40
6 percent or more, which is consistent with other
7 industry reports that have been out there, so that's
8 the bad news portion of it.

9 The good news is the impact to mobile
10 battery life can be managed by the service provider
11 through careful selection of a number of parameters
12 including the initial system network parameters, their
13 latency, the retransmission intervals and the number
14 of times the device alerts the user. There are some
15 factors outside carrier impact that will be impacting
16 battery life. That would be the number of languages
17 supported, the number of alerts sent and the alert
18 duration.

19 With modifications to the network
20 infrastructure, the mobile devices and standards and
21 proper selection of the criteria, the reduction of
22 battery life due to monitoring cell broadcasts for
23 alert messages can be less than 10 percent of today's
24 capability, so that 40 percent can be taken down to 10
25 percent or less. Modifications to the devices,

1 network infrastructure and standards are required in
2 order to ensure that the battery impact is minimal.

3 As already mentioned, the battery life is
4 also dependent upon the number of alert messages
5 transmitted. We are recommending that the alert
6 aggregators support a policy of ensuring that we don't
7 send too many messages to the service provider, that
8 again we adhere to the imminent threat to life and
9 property definition of a commercial mobile alert, and
10 also that the policy for rebroadcast and so forth are
11 such that it does not adversely impact mobile batter
12 life.

13 The service provider should give
14 consideration to modifications of the network
15 infrastructure devices and standards in order to limit
16 the reduction. Moving on to the C reference interface
17 point, this is the main interface between the
18 government Alert Gateway and the service provider,
19 CMSP gateway. It's XML-based protocol across that
20 interface. A mapping of the CAP to C reference point
21 to E reference point has been completed by the CTG.

22 C reference point being again that interface
23 from the Alert Gateway to E reference point being the
24 interface out to the mobile device, and the protocol
25 is shown in the diagram. I'm not going to go through

1 each and every element in here, but essentially we've
2 modeled it in an XML-based format.

3 We've also looked at the CAP elements, which
4 David described earlier coming in from the alert
5 originator's side through the Alert Gateway and on to
6 the C reference point's elements and have defined a
7 mapping on those CAP elements will actually map to the
8 C reference point and which elements would be used and
9 which elements would be provided by the Alert Gateway.
10 In summary, the CTG has successfully completed the
11 tasks as were defined in the initial meeting back in
12 December of last year.

13 Again, I want to thank each member of the
14 CTG. There was a lot of hard work and dedication put
15 in over these past months, and I think we came to a
16 very good solution. Thank you.

17 MR. POARCH: Thank you, sir. Are there any
18 questions? Go ahead, Mr. Chairman.

19 MR. MARTIN: I was actually going to ask
20 you, Bill, if you could have elaborated on some of
21 your concerns on the countywide basis? I was trying
22 to make sure I understood those and appreciate those a
23 little more.

24 MR. PITTS: Well, obviously if you were to
25 take Long Island, I don't know many counties in New

1 York very well, but if you look at countywide, you
2 would be grabbing multimillions of people with a
3 message whereas maybe in New York they want to just
4 focus on where there's a water main break or a
5 specific area that they're trying to really limit
6 their calling to those who are at risk.

7 Until we can break that down into smaller
8 polygons and smaller areas, a lot of our urban areas
9 will probably decide not to use this technology
10 because the coverage would be greater than really
11 where they want to focus. And we've over and over
12 said that we do not want to create a cry wolf syndrome
13 where people believe that they're being notified too
14 many times.

15 There's of course no validation to them that
16 they're actually at risk, so I'm really speaking more
17 to the urban areas, and, Mr. Chairman, if I might,
18 that's why I was trying to understand this sentence
19 that says essentially that, the provider should not be
20 required to dynamically match alert geography to RF
21 coverage areas due to technology limitations within
22 the network.

23 I was going to ask Brian from my
24 understanding if what he means by that is it that if
25 the network is currently busy with people on the

1 phone, for example, or doing other things that the
2 area of coverage of the network wouldn't necessarily
3 match what it would be on a map in a static sense if
4 you were just to draw lines around the area of
5 coverage of each one of the cellular providers in that
6 area?

7 I needed a further explanation, but I think,
8 Mr. Chairman, specifically to what your question to me
9 is, it's the impact in urban areas and how useful a
10 tool this could be to try and target to those at risk.

11 MR. MARTIN: Well, I'll see if Brian has any
12 response on behalf of the group or not, but I guess I
13 would emphasize that I know this issue was raised I
14 think with the Commission by some folks on the Hill as
15 well. And I think this is a critical issue that I'm
16 certainly concerned about saying that there would be
17 no other requirement beyond the county level because
18 of the potential impact.

19 I certainly think that we don't want to set
20 up a system in which large urban areas would be
21 unwilling to use it because of this concern, so Brian
22 may have some response now, or maybe this is the one
23 issue that we can ask the group to maybe go back and
24 try to address on a very short timeframe and make sure
25 they've taken into account some of the concerns that

1 Billy has raised.

2 MR. DALY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 First, to address Billy's question, yes. It really
4 isn't dependent upon who is on the phone and who is
5 not. It's really the issue with dynamically matching
6 to RF coverage areas because if you take a map and
7 draw a polygon or a circle, it's challenging to figure
8 out what cell sites are covering the area within that
9 circle or polygon on a real-time basis, and that's
10 where the challenge comes in.

11 The technology needs to be evaluated to see
12 what can be done in order to get down to those
13 geographic areas. We're looking more at a static
14 definition. If you look at the previous bullet where
15 it says to identify a predefined list of cell sites,
16 so if there was a city or metro area using polygon
17 circle or GNIS codes that had a predefined list of
18 cell sites, some operators may elect to transmit based
19 on those predefined list of cell sites without having
20 to dynamically match into an area.

21 MR. PITTS: Okay. To try and understand if
22 I might, Brian, so this is the impact of
23 multicarriers, many carriers in an area with different
24 cell sites. So the originator sees a specific area
25 that they want to cover, an 8-block area of New York

1 City or something like that, he doesn't have knowledge
2 of where the cell sites are himself because this is
3 being transferred through the gateway to the carriers
4 themselves?

5 MR. DALY: Correct.

6 MR. PITTS: And what you're saying is
7 collectively, no one really knows whether or not they
8 could match that coverage at any given time, is that
9 it?

10 MR. DALY: Well, each operator will be
11 responsible for determining what cell sites the alert
12 needs to be sent out. And for the operator to
13 dynamically try to figure out, given a polygon, which
14 cell sites are in that area will provide the best
15 coverage within that area at any given time is a
16 challenging task, especially when you're considering
17 national operators that may have to deal with 60,000
18 cell sites, let's say.

19 It could be any grouping of those 60,000
20 cell sites on a real-time basis trying to figure out
21 which cell sites have to be mapped into that alert
22 areas is extremely challenging. And this is an issue
23 which we've wrestled with within the CTG quite a bit,
24 and we understand the need to get down to smaller
25 areas. That certainly is an understanding, and there

1 is a desire.

2 However, the operator consensus is that the
3 county level at least for initial deployment seems to
4 be the most efficient way, and then as technology
5 advances and as operators get more familiar with the
6 alert characteristics, to get down into smaller areas.

7 I just want to also point out that some technology,
8 especially pagers, cannot get down to those smaller
9 areas either.

10 MR. PREST: This is Art Prest. I'd like to
11 make one other comment if I could?

12 MR. PITTS: I'm sorry. I just have one
13 quick question first. But the paging, can they all
14 get down to the county area?

15 MR. DALY: Paging? Yes. The indication is
16 county area, and that's why county was chosen.

17 MR. PREST: This is Art Prest. I want to
18 make one comment. I think the freeform text goes a
19 long way to answering Billy's question. In fact, you
20 can, based on what we defined at this point, provide a
21 message that would tell you where that problem was.
22 For example, you can say central Manhattan, such and
23 such corner, stay away, steam pipe explosion.

24 To me, more information is better than less
25 information, and if I'm anywhere in that area or

1 headed toward that area, I'd just as soon know and not
2 just have that message go to an 8-square block area.
3 That would be true also in the case of Virginia Tech.
4 If the authorities had handled that correctly, they
5 could have sent out a message "shooting at Virginia
6 Tech, stay away." If I was in that county, I would
7 want to know that there was a shooting at Virginia
8 Tech.

9 You'd know where it was, and I don't think
10 it would cause that many problems. Yes, there are
11 going to be those people if we send out too many
12 messages all the time, will have that cry wolf
13 syndrome where people will say I'm tired of these
14 messages, and that might be happening, but I'm
15 convinced I'd rather know.

16 MR. BOTTERELL: Mr. Chairman?

17 MR. POARCH: Yes, go ahead.

18 MR. BOTTERELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm
19 sorry. Are you hearing me?

20 MR. POARCH: We can hear you. Go ahead.

21 (Telephonic interference.)

22 MR. BOTTERELL: Very good. Thank you. This
23 is Art Botterell. I'm Community Warning System
24 Manager for the County of Contra Costa in California
25 and a member of the Access Interface Working Group.

1 This issue has brought the committee I think to a bit
2 of a dilemma, and I'm speaking of the -- issue. I
3 think everybody agrees that disasters don't have zip
4 codes and that we need flexible and precise targeting
5 of the messages.

6 On the other hand, industry apparently has
7 some technological constraints. In our zeal to try to
8 solve this, there was a discussion of accepting
9 predefined static smaller zones. From a practitioners
10 point of view, I would suggest that that's really not
11 a good idea. It may be a short-term expedient, but
12 again we can't determine a priority which eight blocks
13 of Manhattan are going to have a problem.

14 What we've tried to do I think in
15 collaboration with the CTG is craft some language that
16 permits the use of static determination of cell site
17 groups in the near term but that also puts it on the
18 record that a more flexible scheme is more desirable
19 and should be evaluated in the future. We certainly
20 did not want to set a precedent or any sort of an
21 assertion that static addressing was really a good
22 solution. It's merely what was available in the near
23 term.

24 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I wanted to respond
25 to a couple of comments, and I certainly think that

1 more information to more folks is better than less, so
2 I agree with the sentiment that was expressed. I
3 think though that the concern that I heard Billy Pitts
4 raising is that some might not participate at all
5 because of a concern that the county was too broad an
6 area.

7 I think that there still might be some other
8 issues that we could find a way to address, for
9 example, maybe even giving some of the warning
10 decisions rather than the carrier to do it at a
11 smaller level to some of the public safety
12 organizations whether they want to have a static
13 smaller area than just a county. But I certainly
14 think that we could have some other discussions about
15 ensuring that we don't want to deter people from
16 actually participating by choosing too large an area.

17 I thought that was the issue that I thought
18 I heard Billy Pitts raising, so again maybe there's
19 just something we can discuss some more on this issue.

20 MR. POARCH: Brian, could we ask your
21 committee to go back and have some additional
22 discussions on this? Billy, if you would be willing,
23 we can telephone-bridge you in to participate in those
24 discussions, and any other person on the committee
25 that wants to have those discussions if you'll let

1 Lisa Fowlkes know, I will coordinate to make sure that
2 we get you invited.

3 We'll get you bridged in so that we can make
4 sure that the issues that have been raised today we
5 clearly discuss them before we come forward next
6 month, okay?

7 MR. DALY: Yes, sir.

8 MR. PITTS: Mr. Chairman, if I might? Art
9 made a great point. There were two points. One is a
10 lot of people know what's going on so that they can
11 avoid the area, and he was standing up and supporting
12 the freeform text because that gives you the ability
13 to sort of end the message, sort of target the area
14 that is affected so that people know that.

15 The other concern is that if we use a text
16 screen approach that the messages won't be that
17 targeting, and that results in more of a cry wolf
18 syndrome where people really don't understand what the
19 alert is about specifically. So I support Art also on
20 the freeform text aspect of this because it would
21 really facilitate what you're trying to do with your
22 messages.

23 MR. BOTTERELL: That was Art Prest that you
24 were supporting, not Art Botterell, right?

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. PITTS: That's correct. That's correct,
2 Art. You're not a freeform text guy. I'm also power
3 of the voice, and I think you like text to voice
4 messaging, but that's not the point here. I was just
5 supporting what this Art said in terms of freeform
6 text. I stand corrected.

7 (Multiple voices.)

8 MR. BOTTERELL: Yes -- the intro supposed to
9 be the actual people, who are having to originate
10 these messages.

11 MR. POARCH: Okay. Thank you all very much.
12 This is certainly an important issue that we need to
13 continue to discuss and try to work to get a
14 compromise that works both for the members of the
15 community that will be receiving these messages that
16 may potentially be going into areas that could not be
17 there when the message originates as well as what's
18 good for the public safety community and the industry
19 as a whole. We feel confident that you'll be able to
20 do that, and we appreciate that. The next group is
21 the User Needs Working Group.

22 MR. JONES: Good morning. At least I know
23 it wasn't anything I said that made the chairman
24 leave. I'm going to report this morning on the
25 activities of the User Needs Group. I am the deputy

1 chair of the group, so I'll be reporting on behalf of
2 the chairman of the group, Jonathan Werbell. We've
3 had some successes in the User Needs Group, and I'd
4 like to highlight some of those for you.

5 I always think that highlighting successes
6 is a great approach in a committee environment because
7 we have a lot of them. As you've heard, the groups
8 have been working through the three drafts of the
9 recommendations, and we believe our group has
10 completed all the deliverables that we were assigned.
11 Some of the things we've addressed were the needs of
12 the user. Now, that's both the general user as well
13 as needs of disabled and elderly users.

14 We developed an opt out process that we
15 recommend to be used. We developed customer
16 notification language for the carriers, who either
17 decide not to transmit messages or to transmit
18 messages in part, and I'll explain that a little bit
19 more in a moment. We worked on the message generation
20 parameters, the presentation parameters around how the
21 messages would be presented to the user.

22 We had our input to the development of the
23 Audio Attention Signal and the vibration signal, and
24 we considered not only the text profile that we'll be
25 using in the initial implementation of the service,

1 but also future message profiles. A lot of the things
2 the User Needs Group did, a lot of the deliverables
3 that we had are actually recommendations that we made
4 to other groups.

5 We worked very well with those groups in
6 collaboration, and a lot of the findings that we had
7 dealt with, user needs and the user expectations, then
8 were funneled to the other groups to actually be
9 developed into their technical recommendations. All
10 right. Some specifics.

11 As I said, we developed requirements and
12 recommendations for individuals with special needs,
13 but we found that most of the requirements benefit all
14 of the subscribers, not just those with special needs,
15 the things like the common Audio Attention Signal that
16 you've already heard about, the cadence for the signal
17 and for the vibrating cadence. We had a
18 recommendation on what to do with the message after it
19 is displayed on the handset, how to save that.

20 There needed to be a simple command, not
21 something very complex. We found that in the message
22 presentation the most important information needed to
23 come first, the language needed to be simple, avoid
24 abbreviations when possible, and we also recommended
25 that a speech version be available for users that are

1 sight-impaired, so we're encouraging operators, who
2 provide the service, to provide the test to speech
3 conversion in some handsets.

4 We investigated how to facilitate alternate
5 delivery mechanisms for small populations that have
6 particular needs and might have need for a special
7 device, and as I said, we detailed most of the
8 requirements for the text profile. However, we did
9 come up with some general requirements for the future
10 profiles. As you heard earlier, we worked with the
11 Gateway Group and the Technology Group to develop
12 recommendations on how a subscriber can opt out of the
13 service as provided in the Warrant Act.

14 We came up with three classes of opt out
15 capabilities so that a user would have the ability to
16 opt out of all but the Presidential-level messages,
17 all but the most extreme alerts and AMBER alerts.
18 This general recommendation is meant to be advice to
19 the vendors and the carriers on the levels of opt out,
20 but the actual implementation of those choices, how
21 it's actually implemented in the handset and displayed
22 on the handset is left up to the individual carrier
23 and their vendors.

24 One very important aspect and a job we took
25 very seriously was to develop the recommendations for

1 the notification language that would notify the
2 subscribers in the two cases that were identified in
3 the WARN Act when a carrier who does not intend to
4 transmit the alert message at all. And we came up
5 with some specific language meant to be given to that
6 carrier's subscribers and published as a notice to
7 that carrier's subscribers.

8 That language is shown in the slide here.
9 We also developed language for a carrier, who intends
10 to transmit the emergency alerts in part, and we
11 defined in part being either in part of his coverage
12 area or on part of his handset offering. So if a
13 carrier decides to opt in to delivering the emergency
14 alert and does it in a phased-in process, a rolled-out
15 process where he begins in some areas but not in
16 others, then we've developed language to notify the
17 subscribers of that.

18 There was no requirement to develop language
19 for carriers who opt into the service and deploy it
20 ubiquitously across his network, so no language was
21 developed for that. In conjunction with the other
22 working groups, we developed a recommendation on the
23 message elements. Now here let me deviate just a
24 little bit because we've had a change here. This
25 occurs when you're in a dynamic environment, which all

1 have been.

2 All the groups have been working very hard,
3 so we over just the past few weeks had discussions on
4 the elements and how they would be presented to the
5 user. And we found that because of the change that we
6 made in defining the affected area and defaulting to
7 text that says in this area that when we put the
8 message together, it didn't make sense Englishwise.

9 What we decided to do and agreed upon in a
10 joint meeting of our group with some representatives
11 from the other groups is to swap around the area
12 affected and the recommended action, so instead of the
13 slide showing you what it has now, the file elements
14 and the order in which they will appear in a developed
15 message. And we'll talk about that in just a minute
16 is what's happened, what's the emergency alert in this
17 area, what the recommended action would be, the
18 expiration time and the sending agency.

19 In the example shown here in the way it
20 would appear now, it would be tornado warning in this
21 area, take cover immediately until 3:00 p.m. eastern
22 daylight time, so that's a change that we weren't able
23 to make in the presentation slide. We consulted with
24 the other working groups as I said on several things
25 that are now incorporated in their recommendations.

1 As you hear from Brian, the Audio Attention Signal,
2 the cadence to be recommended to the FCC, the acoustic
3 parameters, duration, the frequency.

4 We developed the text streams associated
5 with the message developed from the CAP fields, but
6 another thing that we've worked on just recently, and
7 as you heard from the Gateway Group is we have put in
8 a very good ability for the message initiator to be
9 able to generate a free text message. We're proposing
10 that some parameters be set in the Alert Gateway so
11 that the gateway can look at that message, see that it
12 meets some criteria in message length and other
13 criteria that makes an effective message.

14 If it meets those criteria, then that free
15 text message is passed on. If it fails, rather than
16 not have a message, then the default would be for the
17 Alert Gateway to go back to the CAP fields and pull
18 out the selected CAP fields that we've enumerated and
19 develop a canned message, so we have the ability to do
20 a free text message. If that free text message fails
21 for any reason, we have the ability then to develop a
22 canned message that would then go out as the alert.

23 As I said, we've worked on some future
24 message profiles. The audio alert messaging, video
25 alert messaging and multimedia in preparation for

1 technology development, for technology enhancements
2 that we all hope will be able to be utilized in the
3 future in emergency alerts. As I said in the
4 beginning, the User Needs Group feels like that
5 they've accomplished the job that was assigned to
6 them. I'd like to thank the members of the group.

7 We had a very diverse group, who had a lot
8 of good input, a lot of views that came from this vast
9 range of experience in the folks that participated,
10 and I want to thank them very much. I'd also like to
11 thank the FCC for the staff that they provided for us
12 and the input that we got, the assistance we got, the
13 environment that they created, so that we could
14 effectively work. Thank you.

15 MR. POARCH: Thank you, sir. Are there any
16 questions for the User Needs Working Group? Yes,
17 ma'am.

18 MS. ESTEFANIA: I have a question. Gary,
19 your requirement for your three opt-out options, just
20 on the surface of it that doesn't look completely
21 consistent to me with the AGG's buffering decision to
22 have one queue for Presidential-level alerts and
23 another one for everything else and process those
24 sequentially as received per the originating gateway.
25 Is there an inconsistency there? Have you had any

1 discussions with the AGG? How are they going to get
2 the capability to separate out the AMBER alerts and
3 all but the most serious alerts is going to be there?

4 MR. JONES: We're talking about two
5 different processes.

6 MS. ESTEFANIA: Okay.

7 MR. JONES: And yes, we communicated with
8 all the groups quite a bit. The process and the
9 mechanisms for doing the opt out is in the handset,
10 not in the network.

11 MS. ESTEFANIA: Fine. Thank you.

12 MR. JONES: Yes.

13 MR. POARCH: Any other questions? Yes, sir?

14 MR. PITTS: Billy Pitts. I think I had too
15 much coffee this morning, but I did want to bring up a
16 concern that we raised, and I think we've at least
17 tried to address it by putting language in our section
18 that says this ought to be looked at, but it's
19 increasing some of the responses. If you're going to
20 use a text message, to Art's point, we do not have
21 such a thing as avoid area in the response.

22 We have evacuate, we have shelter in place,
23 we have a few responses that would be taken as Gary
24 said out of the field for response and put in the
25 message. I think it's important for the FCC to look

1 at relatively quickly whether or not additional
2 responses should be put in such as avoid area, and I'm
3 sure that the other Art on the phone is probably
4 looking at this, but we found that we're ending up
5 using a lot of optional CAP fields.

6 I think that OASIS as they're on this
7 ongoing evaluation of CAP is probably going to look at
8 maybe making some fields more mandatory or looking at
9 which should be optional and which shouldn't be
10 optional and I would leave that truly up to Art and
11 them to figure out.

12 MR. POARCH: Okay. Thank you, sir.
13 Anything else? Okay. Lisa will briefly discuss the
14 voting procedures that you should have received prior
15 to today's meeting.

16 MS. FOWLKES: Thank you, Chief Poarch. You
17 all, who are here present in the meeting room, should
18 have a copy of a document called draft voting
19 procedures for final CMSAAC meeting. Those of you on
20 the phone should have a copy of the document that I
21 believe is dated September 18, and that was the
22 corrected voting procedures that was sent out
23 yesterday.

24 Those of you in the meeting, you have the
25 latest version, and I'm just going to go over this

1 very briefly in terms of what the proposed procedures
2 are. As all of you probably know, the Project
3 Management Group is responsible for getting to the
4 entire committee membership a draft set of
5 recommendations that would ultimately be voted at the
6 October meeting.

7 Under Item 1, the Project Management Group
8 would be required to get that out no later than seven
9 business days before the meeting. Since the last
10 meeting is October 3, that would put it at
11 September 24. Under Item No. 2, if a member doesn't
12 receive their copy of the draft recommendations by the
13 seventh business day or September 24, they would let
14 the PMG group leader designee know. That's Jeff
15 Goldthorpe.

16 If he doesn't hear from anyone by
17 September 26, which is the fifth business day, he
18 would presume that people we haven't heard from in
19 fact have a copy of the document that would be voted.

20 Committee members would be allowed to submit
21 amendments, propose revisions to the draft
22 recommendations. They would submit those to the PMG
23 group leader designee, which is Jeff, but no later
24 than September 28.

25 Members would participate and may

1 participate in the adoption meeting in person, or if
2 someone can't be physically present, they could
3 participate by telephone bridge or in such other
4 manner as approved by the committee chair. Committee
5 members who can't vote either physically or by
6 telephone bridge could vote by proxy. Any amendments
7 or revisions to the draft would become part of the
8 record.

9 They would require a simple majority of
10 committee members participating in the adoption
11 meeting to pass. Before the conclusion of the final
12 meeting, the committee members would be asked to vote
13 on the amendment as well as the final draft set of
14 recommendations, which of course would incorporate any
15 amendments that were passed. Voting would be by hand
16 count for those present and by simple yea or nea for
17 those, who are participating remotely.

18 The committee chair would retain editorial
19 privileges for nonsubstantive edits to the
20 recommendations and to incorporate amendments. Of
21 course, if there are any amendments, and they pass, we
22 can't give the Commission a report and then a stack of
23 amendments. They have to all be incorporated into one
24 document.

25 MR. POARCH: Thank you, Lisa, for explaining

1 that because we wouldn't have understood it if you
2 hadn't said it. I know that's what you're thinking.

3 Once the October meeting is done, we have
4 our approved recommendations, our approved amendments.
5 They would be incorporated. Nonsubstantive edits
6 basically means things like if we see a typo, if we
7 see a citation that needs to be corrected. It doesn't
8 mean we're going to slip something substantive in
9 there to change the recommendations that the committee
10 has approved of, so that basically is the overview of
11 what the voting procedures would be for the October
12 meeting. Are there any questions concerning the
13 proposed voting procedures? Yes, sir?

14 MALE VOICE: I have one. Chief or Lisa, I
15 see that the date for submitting amendments, it looks
16 like it's going to be the 28th, which is in advance of
17 the meeting. Is the goal to get all those amendments
18 out to the group in advance of the meeting so we can
19 look at the amendments as a group prior to actually
20 having to vote on them so we're not sort of voting on
21 the fly?

22 MR. POARCH: Absolutely.

23 MALE VOICE: I'm assuming that's the
24 expectation?

25 MR. POARCH: Yes.

1 MALE VOICE: Okay.

2 MR. POARCH: Other questions? We need to
3 vote to adopt the proposed voting procedures, so at
4 this time I'll entertain a motion from someone to move
5 to adopt these if you would, please?

6 MR. GUTTMAN-MCCABE: I move to adopt.

7 MR. POARCH: Motion from Chris. A second?

8 MALE VOICE: Second.

9 MR. POARCH: All those in favor signify by
10 saying "I."

11 MOST: I.

12 MR. POARCH: Anyone opposed.

13 MALE VOICE: I.

14 FEMALE VOICE: I.

15 MR. POARCH: Thank you very much. Next
16 steps, Lisa?

17 MS. FOWLKES: Okay. Now that the voting
18 procedures have passed, the next steps will of course
19 be as per Chairman Martin's comments earlier today.
20 We will be asking the Communications Technology Group
21 and Billy and any others, who have a view that they
22 want to express on the geotargeting issue, to try to
23 get together and try to see what you can work out as
24 quickly as possible.

25 If there are any other people, who are

1 interested in that issue and want to participate in
2 that discussion, I'm going to hang around after the
3 meeting. I know I'm usually the first one to
4 disappear, but I'm going to hang out after the
5 meeting. If you could, come up to me and let me know
6 so that I can pass that information on to Brian and
7 others that need to know, and I'm talking about
8 committee members who are interested in that
9 particular issue.

10 Other next steps are we're continuing to
11 work to get the draft ready to be sent out to you no
12 later than September 24. You guys review it. If you
13 have any amendments, to get those to me or rather to
14 Jeff Goldthorpe by September 28. I understand that
15 some of the informal working groups may be meeting
16 after this meeting, so I'm assuming that FCC staff
17 have rooms or whatever where those people will meet,
18 so whoever your FCC liaison is, you can get with them
19 afterwards to have your meeting, and that's it.

20 MR. POARCH: Thank you, Lisa. Is there any
21 other business to come before the committee today?

22 MR. BOTTERELL: This is Art Botterell. Can
23 you all hear me?

24 MR. POARCH: Yes, sir.

25 MR. BOTTERELL: Good. Since I'm not there

1 to catch Lisa after the meeting, I'd like to ask you
2 to please put me on your list for that discussion.

3 MR. POARCH: We'll certainly do that.

4 MR. BOTTERELL: Thank you.

5 MR. POARCH: Anything else to come before
6 the committee? Again, thank you very much for being
7 here today. Thank you for your work. We've got a
8 quick turnaround between now and October 3, and we
9 look forward to seeing you then. The committee stands
10 adjourned.

11 (Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the meeting in
12 the above-entitled matter was concluded.)

13 //

14 //

15 //

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

1 //

2 //

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

DOCKET NO.: N/A
CASE TITLE: FCC Commercial Mobile Service Alert
Advisory Committee Meeting
HEARING DATE: September 19, 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 Federal Communications Commission.

Date: September 19, 2007

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

Heritage Reporting Corporation

(202) 628-4888