1. Meeting to Order at 8:30 am
2. Welcome and Opening Remarks
3. Self-Introduction of members and guest
4. Staff Liaison Report and NFPA Update
5. Approval of the meeting minutes from February 2 – 4, 2011 Tempe, AZ meeting.
6. Review purpose of meeting and schedule
7. Task Group Updates
8. Update and Review Standard
9. Continue drafting Guide on Data Exchange
10. New Business
11. Date and Location of Next Meeting
12. Adjourn at 5:00 pm
NFPA Technical Committee on Data Exchange for the Fire Service
Meeting Minutes
2-4 Feb 2011
Tempe, AZ

Principles, Alternates and Guests:
Ryan Depew, NFPA Staff Liaison (via teleconference)
Ed Plaugher, Technical Committee Chair

Technical Committee Principals

Jeff Hartburger
James Middleton
Jonathan Moore
Jennifer Schottke (alternate for Russ Johnson)
Michael Weins
Marie Martinez
Sarah Ierley
Vicki Hodges
Christina Thies
Paul Morgan
Talbot Brooks
Mike Price (via teleconference)

Guests
Thurs guest: Ms. Liz Pearson, representing Mr. Paul Wormeli, IJIS Institute Executive Director
Joe Mierwa – URL Integration (via teleconference)
Dave Caroline – ESRI (via teleconference)

Wednesday 2 Feb 2011

Introductions, agenda, approval of minutes
Ed Plaugher called the meeting to order at 8:30AM on Wed Feb 2, 2011, reviewed the meeting
Agenda and facilitated committee introductions.

Commented on the importance of our work – referenced meeting last week in Phoenix wherein
the NIST Data Summit met to discuss the need for data standards for the fire service.
Firescope Ops team is aware of the work we are doing. Kate Dargan, CA state Fire Marshal
reference this committee at recent ops board meeting. There seems to be a lot of awareness.
Also reflects the importance of timing and the criticality of getting our standard draft submitted.
Ryan update:
EV Safety.org training program is about to be released, Steven Sawyer update, … Ryan will
provide additional NFPA reference information.
To be on August council agenda we need to submit by May 6.
They will assign doc number and allow us to enter cycle July 2011.
Earliest is annual 2013. Next opp is Fall 2011.
August submit Oct agenda
Committee introductions included updates from committee members on activities related to the DAT standards objectives. The projects and activities discussed universally affirmed the need and purpose of the work the committee is doing.

**Minutes approved from last meeting.**
Mike is concerned that the minutes from the Sept, 2010 meeting need to reflect that there was an issue with a need for further discussion on the use of GML vs. XML.
Jim M moved, Vicki 2nd. The minutes from 22-23 Sept with the change requested are unanimously approved.

**Discussion**
Committee began review and revision of the standard.
Significant outstanding issues include:
- GML vs. XML
- Lat/long vs. USNG

Ed suggested standard must embrace both --- much discussion about how to best represent the committee’s intentions. Jonathan requested we think of 3 things as we review the purpose of the document:
- Storage
- How you push it.
- How you pull it

Some general discussion about these issues and it was agreed we would start at the beginning and review the document section by section.
Considerable time spent on the purpose statements. Struggled with how to represent the committee’s intention for the document without dictating use.

10:30 break

**Continued review of standard draft:**
After break we worked on definitions
Break for lunch at 12:15

**1:30 Full group reconvened**
Continued to work on the definitions. Then moved on to Chapter 4.

After extensive discussion about USNG vs lat/long and how to represent the consensus of the group within the standard, the full committee established a distinction between labeling standards and exchange projection formats. This clarified the issue for everyone, and the group re-drafted section 6.2 to reflect this distinction.

The group acknowledged that Chapter 4 was intended to address the policy aspects of this issue. As a result we significantly shortened the sections in Chapter 4 to require policies are in place to require adherence to the specifications detailed in Ch 6.

We reviewed the changes and agreed to revisit the new text tomorrow. The suggestion was made to Ed that we have someone present and describe the intent of each new section to make sure the group agrees both with the intent and that the new language adequately represents that intent.

Committee ADJOURNED at 5:15 PM

---

**Thursday 3 Feb 2011**

Full committee reconvened.
Ed summarized yesterday and introduced our guest, Liz Pearson

**Contact info for Elizabeth Pearson**

COO
URL Integration, Inc.
9780 Mount Pyramid Court
Suite 250
Englewood, CO 80112-7060
http://www.urlintegration.com
Elizabeth.Pearson@urlintegration.com
Office: (303) 799-4585 x107
Mobile: (719) 650-7497
Fax: (303) 708-1737

And on the Phone:
Joe Mierwa, one of the IJIS reps to some of the NIEMS task forces and groups that make decisions about what’s in and out for DOJ, he works for URL.

Committee resumed discussion on the use of a standard exchange language.

Talbot raised the issue of how guests get invited to the committee meeting and raised the question of whether the file geodatabase is considered proprietary or not.

Jennifer responded with information on the file geodatabase open api and

The group discussed the issue extensively. The options are:

The discussion centered on whether to specify the file geodatabase as the format or describe the format specifically for each data type.

Discussion of open architectures and frameworks for formatting software that is an executable that is shared without license

Open source: software application programming code which exists in the public domain for open, often no-cost, use by everyone. The programming code may be modified or extended by any party with the ability to do so with little to no restriction.

Open architecture: the organizational data structure by which a computing system stores and communicates data is openly published for the purpose of improving access and use of data.

Liz Pearson presentation:

NIEM is the standard used in the law enforcement community. We have made some progress in this area and

The business case for NIEM

Also implementation issues from her company’s perspective.

Her company URL integration deals with these issues all the time.

IJIS: Paul Wormeli is the exec dir. Promotes public private partnerships. Members are companies. Many cad vendors are members. Heavily influenced by law enforcement cad vendors. URL has strong ties to and commit

Workflow driven info exchange. It’s about getting the info to the folks on the line. We work with the vendors implementing NIEM.

The application provider community is on board.

This doesn’t define policy – each community needs to define the policies about what to share when. NIEM is very business process related.

NIEM does accommodate geospatial needs. NIEM makes heavy use of xml and accommodates metadata.

Dave Caroline and Mike Price joined the call. The NIEM core is under control of the technical architecture committee.
1. We would have to have a 2 step process. We flesh out our own requirements
2. Committee would decide which elements are part of core

NIEM program management office would have to manage that process. HHS just came on and that happened in about 6 months.

Each domain decides on the elements it wants and then the elements need to be reconciled with the existing standards.

For justice reconciliation is done by GA tech research institute. It is unclear as to whether development of GML was done with experts in the field. The actual requirement that NIEM had to accommodate is how do we take advantage of other things that are in widespread use without having to recreate. In a sense a lot of it is outside of NIEM– there are links

NIEM is symmetrically driven – it is a common schematic structure – it defines how you describe an element -- how you choose to implement that concept in your own environment is up to you.

Piecing together content that describes the keyload that is exchanged. In defining that there is a series of steps: ie developing, how you use it, how you extend it, use of constraints and how you address those.

Standard is published and then it’s up to a software vendor to import that standard in the competitive IEPD --

NIEMS describes the playground. NFPA describes the swings.

Large training classes, resources are there to support people in the community to make it real.

We did get some good clarity on the distinction between GML and XML.

It’s a proven modeling process.

It’s very much focused on an identified exchange between two or more agencies. It’s a well documented and successful and proven methodology for describing exchange models.

Proven methodology behind it.

NIEM benefits:

- Grant funds are conditioned with NIEM requirements
- Vendor community focused on it
- Practitioner groups such as APCO on board with it
- Resources such as cad to cad exchange are already developed.

IEPD establishes the normative artifacts for creating and implementing specific NIEM components.

In the justice world there is a whole way of describing what info you want to exchange. There are tools available to identify what tools you want to exchange and how.

Tries to be broad and support many disciplines.

Committee broke for lunch at 12:00 and reconvened at 1:00

Talbot presented the file geodatabase concept to illustrate the intention behind both the labeling
and symbology and to illustrate the distinction between file geodatabase as an esri format vs. open architected data format definition.

The committee then continued its review of the standard by section with Jonathan facilitating. Beginning at Chapter 5 where we left off yesterday. Committee restructured the security section to better reflect the intention of both internal data and system security as well as securing the data exchange environment.

The committee also carefully considered the role of the NIEMS standards and the relationship between those standards and the GML/XML standards.

It was agreed to leave the decision at GML for the geographic information and XML for the non-spatial data.

After a break the committee reconvened to continue discussion on Chapter 6.

Cleaned up and reorganized the date and time stamping

Committee discussed at length the issue of calling out specific applications and stressed the importance of not suggesting these are exceptions to the standard but rather they are specifically called to comply. Those specific applications were identified as cad, cad to cad, and records management systems to specifically state that they comply with the standard.

Full committee ADJOURNED 5:00 PM

**Friday 4 Feb 2011**

The full group convened at 8:30 AM.

Ed convened the meeting at 8:30 and Ryan started the meeting with the following notes:

1. New staff assigned to public fire protection division as follows
   - Tom McGowan – Professional Qualifications
   - Orlando Hernandez – Emergency Management

Steve Sawyer working from home and will continue to provide support during the drafting process.

We will keep Ryan as staff liaison at least until document is in cycle, and probably through the end of the year, Orlando Hernandez will likely take over and attend our next meeting.

2. Restraint of trade issue: committee was concerned and if Ryan needs to pursue with legal department they can do that.
3. Clerical: need to review some of the definitions

Credits and references: specifically GML: we copied and pasted, need to make sure we reference so we are giving credit where credit is due.
Committee resumed discussion

The committee resumed its review of the standards document. Began by reorganizing and cleaning up the items in Chapter 4.

We moved specifications regarding the data types (spatial and non spatial) to chapter 5.

Committee continued discussion regarding data types and clarified descriptions of the items moved to chapter 5.

The full committee added new terms to the definitions list and completed the definitions list.

After lunch we resumed discussion about the content of the standard.

Process review:

Today we finish this draft and send it to Ryan.

NFPA staff will clean it up by Feb 21. Sends it to DAT committee for review.

We have to get consensus agreement to move it to the council, balloting is required at this point.

Contrary to what was discussed at the meeting, upon further investigation, a ballot is required prior to being submitted to the Standards Council.

May 6, 2011 is the deadline for submittal to the council. Once the document is reviewed and approved by the Standards Council, this establishes the formal process for changes.

Starting with proposals we have to go to ballot for all changes.

The full committee agreed the next meeting will be held in either Austin or St. Louis on July 26 – 28, 2011 with travel on July 25 & 29.

Remaining committee members finished the Appendices and references.

The committee expressed special appreciation to Jonathan Moore, the Standards Subcommittee chair for his diligence in compiling, reviewing and recording the committee’s work during this session.
11:00 wrap up. The Guide Subcommittee discussed.

The Committee ADJOURNED at 12:30 PM

Respectfully Submitted by
Jennifer Schottke &
Ryan Depew, February 16, 2011

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++