**OASIS CAP Profiles Sub Committee Meeting Notes**

**11 May 2011**

Attendees

Sukumar Dwarkanath

Elysa Jones

Gregory Trott

Rob Torchon

Rex Brooks

Gary Ham

Scott McGrath

Patti Aymond

Werner Joerg

Gary Timm

4 May 2011 Meeting Minutes

Minutes amended to reflect moving and seconding of previous meeting’s notes. Elysa moved and Greg seconded to approve the amended minutes. Minutes approved by unanimous vote.

Action Items from 4 May Meeting

- Elysa will check with Jamie at OASIS on the joint document ownership question. [See next item below.]

- Elysa is planning to have an Outline to present to the SC by our next meeting. [It was emailed out.]

- Sukumar or Elysa to add this new meeting to Kavi. [Done]

Discussion

Elysa suggested with Scott on the call we should discuss the OASIS process outlined in the recent email from Jamie Clark. This deals as well with Elysa’s action item on joint document ownership.

There was discussion over how far in the OASIS process to take the Australian Profile, with Elysa noting that the IPAWS Profile went beyond CSD to the CS step, but not to a full standard. This gives the advantage of a public review, which she felt could all still be accomplished by the end of June.

Greg said he had read Jamie’s email, and he supports using the OASIS process where possible. Greg explained his process: at the end of this week they will start a 20-work-day review in Australia and at the end of June he will have the stakeholder input. The process is to finish by end of this calendar year.

Elysa noted that Jamie’s email said OASIS staff will help contribute the profile to a national standards body. She said the Canadian standards body is interested in this as well. That is not the normal process, but it has its advantages.

Greg clarified that if he uses Standards Australia, their standards body, it would require a copyright and the standard must then be purchased for use, so that is why he is taking the OASIS route.

Scott clarified that OASIS doesn’t necessarily prefer going to a national standards body, but OASIS is happy to work with us on that if desired. He noted ISO and ANSI both charge a fee to use their version of EDXL, but at OASIS it is free with no copyright.

We are leaning toward carrying the Australian Profile to CS level. Rex asked for a clarification that we then favor a public review. The group agreed, yes, we do. Greg was concerned about the timeline.

Elysa described the process: the TC approves the profile, it is issued as Public Review Draft, it goes out for 30-day public review, any public comments are addressed, it then goes through a 15-day public review on any changed items before the TC’s CSD vote.

Scott noted that the committee must address any public comments, but can merely thank them for the comments and say they will be considered in the next version of the profile. He feels an international review would be valuable. Sukumar agrees, saying the public review yields a broader discussion forum and a stronger end product.

Elysa commented further on Greg’s timeline issues, saying that the OASIS template format is just a boiler plate and it could be ready next week, with a TC vote possibly on May 24th. That takes us to the last week of June for the vote to a CSD.

Further regarding the timing, Werner added that the template request should take about a week. Scott commented that OASIS response times are improving due to more staff hours on TC Admin activities.

*Elysa made a motion to go forward with the Committee Specification (CS) level for the Australian Profile. Rex seconded, and the SC adopted the motion in a unanimous vote.*

**ACTION ITEM: Werner is to make the template request for the Australian profile.**

**ACTION ITEM: Elysa is to check on a new call PIN, as others were trying to conduct a call as well.**

Elysa moved and the group concurred to adjourn at 4:41PM EDT due to the call conflict. Next call: 5/18.