

ITE/IEEE
Incident Management Working Group

New York Meeting Minutes
(December 13 - 15, 1999)

to be held at

The Polytechnic University
Library Bldg. 5, Room 433

Reservations

Marriott Brooklyn
333 Adam Street
Brooklyn NY 11201

Phone: (888) 436-3759

Monday, 13 December 1999

I. Monday Morning Session 8:30 AM to 12:15 AM

A. Welcome/Introductions Chester Chandler



"Roster NY 99.xls"

B. Agenda Revisions/Additions/Deletions/Adoption..... IMWG

- Item 1. Move New Business to 12/13/99 Afternoon*
- Item 2. Paul Thorpe to give presentation shortly after lunch on ASN.1*
- Item 3. Tom Kurihara to discuss International Standards Participation*
- Item 4. Mr. Steele's comments on P1512 will be added to the list.*
- Item 5. By general consent, Agenda Revisions were adopted.*

C. Old Business/Announcements/News Items IMWG

Item 1. Minneapolis Meeting Minutes Approval..... Wayne Gisler

- By general consensus, the Minneapolis Meeting Minutes were approved, with the understanding that Action Item NY99-1 would be completed.

Item 2. Review of Action Items Wayne Gisler

- Action Items were reviewed with the group. Items were eliminated and added to the list.

Item 3. Review of Updated Schedule / Logic Diagram.....John Corbin

- John went over his Microsoft Project Schedule conversion of the Logic Diagram created in Minneapolis.
- John suggested that the future work in the different sub-committees should look at multiple TTXs at a single meeting.
- Some members felt that it might be more effective to coordinate a single TTX that incorporated all PARs.

Item 4. Status of Consultant Support.....Tom Kurihara

- Dave Helman - Things that are holding up our Phase II money @ Mike Shagrin's level include:
 - Resolution of concerns that Phase II work is not being utilized for Phase I
 - Mike is trying to get SPG buyoff of what we're doing prior to authorizing Phase II money
 - Determining why the budget for the Phase II work is so large
 - Determining where we fall relative to the rest of the standards in the SPG's view.
- John Corbin - There is a case to be made to reevaluate the SDO that is in charge of producing this standard. Three questions need to be answered prior to this discussion being formally raised:
 - What is left, relative to the remaining budget?
 - What level of funding has gone to the consultants?
 - Where did the balance of the funding go?
- Ed Mark - We need an accounting of the budget for the Phase II work, as this will assist us as a working group in providing input to directing activities and funding coordination for Phase II.

- Andy Schoka - When SDOs were initially identified,, **none** of the SDOs had technical expertise relative to the Incident Management. IEEE offered their process as the means for establishing standards in this area, despite not having the expertise in this area. A primary part of how IEEE develops standards is through the use of volunteer participation. Providing consultant support is not something IEEE does often.
- Andy Schoka / Chester Chandler - Do we proceed with a TTX, or do we need to focus on training and implementation using what we have developed without the use of TTXs, testing, etc.
- Tom Kurihara - We no longer have consultant support for Phase I. This contract has been closed out.
- Ed Mark - TTX consultant funding was supposed to exist as part of the Phase I contract.
- Jim Mona / Chester Chandler - What is wrong with relocating and/or restructuring TTX exercise(s) such that we produce a TTX that tests **all** standards together? Justification is that, due to the introduction of additional PARs, we really needed to hold off and just have a single TTX. Both feel that this is a lot more logical than what we have planned up to this point.
- Tom Kurihara - TTX was not in the original consultant scope. Tom suggested Chester contact Jerry Walker and see how we can get down the road.
- John Corbin - Doesn't believe that a letter to Jerry Walker will provide a long term fix to future issues that will present obstacles. Does IEEE have the expertise, the desire, the commitment, and/or the involvement in incident management at this time to qualify them to develop this standard?

II. Lunch & Tour of NYC Transit Subway Operations @ Jay Street12:15 PM to 2:00 PM

III. Monday Afternoon Session2:00 PM to 7:00 PM

- A. Old Business/Announcements/News Items (Continued from Morning Session) IMWG
 - Item 1. Involvement / Participation with ITS America National Meeting.....Chester Chandler*
 - John Corbin has a position on the ITS Program to speak at a session that will discuss ATMS and the Emergency Services Coordination for ITS Standards.
- B. New Business IMWG
 - Item 1. Email of 11/19 on the ITSA Interoperability SubcommitteeJohn Corbin*
 - Item 2. Electronic Balloting of IEEE Standards – Yes or No?Tom Kurihara*
- C. Discussion of G. Thomas Steele Article regarding P1512 Standard..... Chester Chandler
 - Item 1. Article pointed out the potential problems that we have already identified relative to a working group primarily made up of Traffic Management professionals developing an incident management standard without assistance / participation of emergency services professionals.*
 - Item 2. Chester contacted him and discussed his article, eluding to the issues we have been dealing with as a working group.*
 - G. Thomas Steele
 - 703-838-3833
 - tsteele@erols.com

Item 3. Possible Recruiters

- Pam Scanlin (San Diego, on the IACP Board)
 - 619-581-9717
- Brenna Smith (National Institute of Justice)
 - 202-305-3305
 - Responsible for Project “AGILE”)
- George Ake (National Institute of Justice)
 - 301-403-4601
- Steve Hermann (Arizona State Patrol) (Michael Ritchie)
- Tim Kelly, Houston METRO
- Jim White, Harris County OEM
- Captain Paul Krisavag (Jim Mona)
- Henry DeFriese (Ed Mark) (State Police)
- Jeff Michaels (Bob Miller)
- Lt. Dan Bateman (Michigan State Police) (Kunwar Rajendra)
- Capt. Tad Sturdivant (Michigan State Police) (Kunwar Rajendra)

Item 4. Chester – We really need to organize our sub-committee and let the sub-committee leaders choose whom they need within their sub-committees.

Item 5. Jim Mona had previously indicated on the email that a pure cross section on the subgroups would not be beneficial. We will need “cross-pollination” that will involve members of the IMWG as well as the personal selections. Chester would like to see this driven by the sub-committee leaders.

D. Review / Resolution of Ballot Comments..... Chester Chandler

Item 1. [See ballot comments for P1512 Standard](#)

IV. Adjourn

Tuesday, 14 December 1999

I. Tuesday Morning Session 8:30 AM to 12:00 PM

A. Welcome/Introductions Chester Chandler

B. Review / Resolution of Ballot Comments (Continued) IMWG

[Item 1. See ballot comments for P1512 Standard](#)

Item 2. Wayne Gisler will work on a resolution to comment 195 to present to the group prior to conclusion of the meeting.

Item 3. Bob Miller reiterated that we have to get the emergency services group involved in this comment resolution.

Item 4. John Corbin agreed, and said that we will undoubtedly have to come back with members of the emergency services community to revisit P1512 during our review and development of .1, .2, .3, and a.

Item 5. Andy Schoka – this standard process is not a one-shot deal. We will have an opportunity to revise the base standard that we are reviewing. However, if we don't focus on completing the base standard (and the review comments), we face loss of credibility in all communities. We WILL have opportunity to bring in the viewpoints of the emergency services community.

C. Midmorning Break..... IMWG

D. Review / Resolution of Ballot Comments (Continued) IMWG

[Item 1. See ballot comments for P1512 Standard](#)

Item 2. Comment 199 - Rejected. The data element is referenced to an external standard, specifically, the TCIP, and is intended to provide basic reporting capabilities as a part of this base standard. As such, the size of the data element referenced is sufficient to capture individual information components during the time an incident is being responded to. This information is time stamped and identified chronologically. Data associated with a given incident can, therefore, be combined in sequence, thereby allowing the overall sequence of events over the course of the incident to be captured. Flexibility exists in the standard to identify additional data elements in individual applications to capture longer summaries of an event if desired.

II. Lunch.....12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

III. Tuesday Afternoon Session.....1:30 PM to 5:30 PM

A. Review / Resolution of Ballot Comments (Continued) IMWG

[Item 1. See Ballot Comments for P1512 Standard](#)

Item 2. Completed responses to Bob Barrett, Phil Hood, and Bruce Abernathy's Technical Comments (negative balloters).

Item 3. Tip Franklin - Battelle wants to test this standard, but it was not high on their priority list as it was not a previously balloted standard. Now that we have a balloted standard, it is conceivable that we will move up on their priority list.

B. Mid-afternoon Break..... IMWG

C. [ASN.1 Coding Standards Presentation](#) Paul Thorpe*Item 1. What is ASN.1*

- **A**bstract **S**yntax **N**otation One defines the syntax of messages to be exchanged between peer applications, independent of local representation. Encoding Rules of ASN.1 describes how application messages should be encoded while in transit between peers

Item 2. ASN.1 is:

- Case sensitive
- Has the power to express both simple and complex types
- Has types that can be constained in size and / or value
- Has more Powerful constraints possible
- Has fields/components that can be marked as optional
- Has type extensibility that allows smooth enhancements

*Item 3. ASN.1 Types include **BOOLEAN, INTEGER, BIT STRING, OBJECT IDENTIFIER, OCTET STRING, NULL, REAL, ENUMERATED, SEQUENCE, SEQUENCE OF, Genralized Time, IA5String, BMPString, UTF8String.** These are defined to do different things, i.e., **ENUMERATED** will allow you to lay in a list of selections and limit input only to that list, etc.*

Item 4. What are the Basic Encoding Rules?

- The **Basic Encoding Rules** of ASN.1 (BER) specify how data should be encoded for transmission, independent of machine, programming language, or how it is represented in an application program.
- BER is highly structured, prefixing all values with a tag and a length.
- Encoding requires 24 bits, i.e., Tag=0x02, Length=0x01, Value=0x06.
- “ASN.1 Complete” by John Larmouth is available on the internet at www.oss.com and is a layered approach to teaching the ASN.1 Coding Language.

D. Implementation Guide Development Activity Report..... Ann Lorscheider

Item 1. Anne has made progress, but she is still in the process of preparing the deliverables. Several [action items](#) were added that will be necessary to complete in order to assist her with making progress on the implementation guide.

E. Review / Resolution of Ballot Comments (Continued) IMWG

Item 1. [See ballot comments for P1512 Standard](#)

Item 2. Comment #1 – Accepted. Delete the word “also” out of the second sentence.

Item 3. Comment #2 – Accepted, pending IEEE technical editor review.

Item 4. Comment #3 – Accepted. Replace line 806 with “The following assignment defines the layout of the table of submessages.”

IV. Adjourn

Wednesday, 15 December 1999

- I. Wednesday Morning Session 8:30 AM to 12:00 PM**
- A. Welcome / Introductions Chester Chandler
- B. [Veridian Presentation](#) (see Secretary Records for Handouts) Carol Thielman
- C. Introduction of John Falcocchio Ed Mark
- D. [COMCARE Presentation](#) (see Secretary Records for Handouts)..... [Dave Ayward](#)
- 888 17th Street, N.W., 12th Floor
Washington D.C. 20006
Phone: 202-429-0574
Fax: 202-296-2962
 - daylward@comcare.org
- E. [Polytechnic University Urban ITS Center Presentation](#) John Falcocchio
- F. [Strategic ITS Deployment Plan for New York City](#) (see Secretary Records For Handouts)..... Charles Ukegbu - Chief of Policy and Technology Coordination
- Item 1. Charles was the person who participated heavily in the NYC Transit Strike resolution.*
- Item 2. Charles' group pulls traffic management information together, but he has to ship it to a central location to have it distributed to the public. They are working to use technology, especially the web, to disseminate information seamlessly between these groups.*
- Item 3. Presented his plan the area's alignment with the National Architecture, along with various handouts.*
- NYC ITS Brochure
 - Hardcopy of slideshow
 - Transit Strike Flyer
 - Summary of Recommendations for the New York City Area Intelligent Transportation System Early Deployment Plan
- Item 4. Maintenance of Bridges in New York City alone is \$1 billion.*
- II. Lunch.....12:00 PM to 1:00 PM**
- III. Wednesday Afternoon Meeting1:00 PM to 3:30 PM**
- A. Movement to Establish Coalition of IM Professionals John Corbin / Tip Franklin
- Item 1. John et. Al. Has established a proposal to various federal and professional services organizations to initiate communication between the emergency services community and traffic management professionals.*
- B. Future Meetings and Discussion of Administrative Issues IMWG
- Item 1. Scheduling of Year 2000 Meetings for IMWG*
- Orlando Meeting is presently set for 3/6/00 to 3/8/00.
 - The thoughts are to coordinate on the front end of the NENA meeting.

- Kurt / Dave Helman - Travel approvals to will be tough to accommodate with this meeting set where it is.
- John Corbin - We need to have an Administrative Team to deal with administrative issues prior to the working portion of the meeting in order to facilitate the coordination of schedule, funding, etc. Why can't we have an Administrative Issues Monday, a Presentation Friday, and a Working Tuesday through Thursday? John recommended that this approach be applied to all future meetings, and volunteered to be a part of this team. Tip Franklin concurred, but said that he, Mike Ogden, and many of the other volunteers, would definitely not be able to be able to participate for a full 5 days. They could participate in technical, working group type of stuff. No decision was made.
- Ed Mark – We have to get the SDOs more involved in our process. A lot of problems that we have are relative to keeping all of the SDOs on the same page, funding and otherwise. This is very difficult if the only information they are receiving is through their liason with their individual IMWG members. Ed feels that it is time for a meeting of SDOs and resolve the issues associated with our IMWG. If IEEE is not wanting to and / or sees no value in putting in the effort required to assist the IMWG with meeting the schedule set forth by the IMWG, then a change in SDOs needs to be considered.
- Tom Kurihara – Jerry Walker, in conversations with Tom, says that he really doesn't know what we are doing relative to feedback he is receiving from FHWA, whether or not we are succeeding, etc. The reports he receives from our IMWG are very well received, and he understands what the IMWG is doing. He is not aware, however, of the issues that exist relative to FHWA's position on the Phase I / Phase II funding.
- Ed Mark – Suggested that we put a recommendation in Chester's letter to get together with IEEE to go over the budget for completing work on the TTX. We simply have to proceed with this testing. We have \$75,000 left in IEEE's budget, we need to make the TTX happen. Ed said he would gladly get together with the appropriate parties to budget the remaining funds and make this happen.
- Ed Mark – Suggested that we also include a recommended to get IEEE mobilized on the Phase II budget. We should urge them to establish, once and for all, their commitment to our IMWG so that these similar issues do not arise at a later date. We cannot have our ability to plan IMWG activities is limited in the manner that it has been
- Chester – Stated that he's been making pleas relative to IEEE to please fund what we have planned. The teleconferences haven't worked. Would a face-to-face meeting be time well spent? Is it necessary at this time?
- IMWG – Do we need to look at shopping SDOs? Can we do that from an FHWA standpoint? The leadership, the advocacy to resolving our funding issues should come from the sponsoring SDOs. It is widely perceived that IEEE is not providing that leadership at this time. If IEEE can't take the lead in resolving the current funding issues, it is realistic to expect that another SDO needs to take the lead in continuing what has been started. **We can't do anything else relative to preparing a TTX, etc., without funding!** Only after we get funding can we really consider and/or plan for when we can bring in the public safety professionals. Otherwise, we risk losing a lot of credibility.
- Michael Ritchie – We cannot, in good faith, go out and recruit others in the emergency services. Mike won't without having these questions answered.
- IMWG – General belief is that we need to respond to this situation as a group. A letter to Jerry Walker on behalf of the group, cced to the IMWG members as well as the sponsoring SDOs, as a group, not as several individuals, appears to be the next step that needs to be taken to break the log jam preventing funding of our effort.

- Chester / John – If funding comes into place immediately, everything goes as shown on the Gantt Chart. If funding comes into place after one or two months, we will probably have to defer the March meeting.
- Jim Mona / Tip Franklin – We need to schedule our activities, regardless of the letter that is sent. Let someone else push our events off. But simply let IEEE know the consequences of their inability to complete pulling funding together.
- Chester – Scrap the March meeting. We can talk about deferring it if that is how the IMWG wants to present it, but he does not believe we can have this meeting at this point. He committed to, working with the Ballot Review Sub-Committee, getting the negative ballot comments addressed and meeting the February 18th comment revision date.
- **John Corbin formulated this motion – The IMWG should be represented at Orlando at the NENA conference, with a contingent to be named later. Jerry Althaus seconded. Motion PASSED unanimously.**
- **Bob Miller formulated this motion - The March TTX drill should be postponed at the discretion of the chair. Mr. Aufschneider seconded. 8 For, 1 Against. Motion PASSED.**
 - *Andy Schoka noted that no TTX planning has occurred to date that has been brought before the IMWG. This motion, while may be needed to change our schedule, will still not affect our ability to have the TTX, as we simply have not gotten around to planning it.*
 - *Michael Ritchie has done some preparatory work and is prepared to present this work at such time as it is appropriate.*
- **Ed Mark formulated this motion – The Chair of the group will request a meeting as part of his letter to IEEE. The purpose of this meeting will be to budget for a full meeting/workshop to occur as soon as possible, but no later than July 1. The purpose of this meeting will be to provide for outreach to occur such that a full representation of HazMat, Public Safety officials, etc., can be obtained for the purpose of the TTX. Further, at the will of the group, the letter should recommend that the meeting/workshop be paid for out of the existing Phase 1 Budget. 5 Yes, 3 No, 1 Abstain. Motion PASSED.**

Item 2. Year 2000 meetings are scheduled to occur as follows:

- 2nd Quarter Meeting - May 15-17, Location to be determined
- 4th Quarter Meeting - October 30 – November 1, Location to be determined.

Item 3. Teleconferences are planned for completing resolution of ballot comments on:

- *Friday January 7th, 2000 between 11:30 AM to 4:00 PM, EST*
- *Friday January 21st, 2000 between 11:30 AM to 4:00 PM, EST*

- C. Review of [Action Items](#) Wayne Gisler
- D. Closing Remarks..... Chester Chandler

IV. Adjourn