# Comments to the draft EAS-CAP Profile Recommendation

1.  Matching SAME alert format.  (missing references)
    a.  Trying to match the EAS Message header data with the CAP elements, which of the data elements <sender> or <senderName>  will match the SAME "LLLLLLL" data format?.
2.  Regarding Flexible geographic targeting
    a.  Would other CAP data elements including (area polygon, circle, altitude and ceiling) are expected to be supported in future iterations of the EAS-CAP profile?
    b.  Should broadcasters plan to support the CAP data (Area Polygon, circle, altitude and ceiling) elements in the future?
    c.  On page 5, VII-C.3, would the <area><geocode>element include multiple <value> elements when alerts include multiple FIPS codes?
    d.  On page 10, VIII.E, if the EAS CAP alert includes multiple EAS county location codes (FIPS), would there be a need to check for the validity of the FIPS. In addition, what are the expectations if there are any errors with the FIPS code, should the message be rejected?
    e.  On page 14, VIII-O.8, if the text included from the CAP required elements is longer than the allowed text, the deletion shall be described by an ellipsis ("…"), which part of the CAP elements should be ommitted, the first part of the sentence or the last part of the sentence?
3.  Regarding multilingual capabilities (Serving the needs of non-english speakers)
    a.  On Section VI.C. ECIG opted to wait for forthcoming decisions made by the FCC before addressing the issue.  However, we would like to know ECIG currect ideas of how would multilingual alerts be handled with the EAS-CAP profile?
    b.  Regarding the rendering of both text-to-speech and video display, we would like to know your ideas of how other languages will be supported.   In other languages, word to word translations do not reflect the correct meaning of the sentence and will not be relevant to recipients of the alerts.
    c.  Regarding multilingual capabilities, if multiple languages are supported, then can we include a requirement that the audio file of the alert in other language must be included?
    d.  Are there expectations that multiple languages (more than 2) are going to be supported?   If yes, how many languages are expected?
    e.  Regarding the transmission of audio alerts.
        i.    What at is more important, playing the EAS audio message from the beginning as the message is received multicast/streamed or playing it right away as it is received?
        ii.   What is the maximum delay acceptable to play this audio file?
4.  Multi-audience messaging. (Serving the needs of persons with disabilities)
    a.  On Section VI.E. ECIG considered the text to speech technology to be used as an alternative for getting EAS audio on the air if there is no attached audio supported.  Would there be any additional expectation from ECIG for multi-audience support.  Is there a need to support additional devices for persons with disabilities?
    b.  According to the CAP standard, the audience is used to describe the intended audience of the alert message.  The audience can be public, internal or for a specific region.   In the CAP to EAS validation table, in the notes section, the messages with a value other than Public SHALL be ignored.  Are there any other expectations by ECIG on how to support multi-audiences?
5.  Phased and delayed effective times and expirations.
    a.   ECIG did not make any references to phased and effective times and expirations in the first draft.  Are they expecting that broadcasters can support this feature in the future?
    b.   Would the data elements for effective and onset data elements be discarded if they are included in the CAP alert message?
    c.   If the feature is required, can it be supported by encoders having timers that will track effective times and expirations?

# Comments to the draft EAS-CAP Profile Recommendation

    d.  Can you provide a scenario when the phased and delayed effective times will be used?
6. Enhanced message update and cancellation features.
    a.  On Section VII.K.1.  ECIG recommends discontinuing further relay and display of original content display and **display** new updated message content.  What is the expected behavior to the end customer, replace existing alert with new alert without any warning or explanation to the customer? Or,  if there is a need to include comments to the customer, which CAP data elements will provide that information.
    b.  On Section VII.K.2. ECIG recommends discontinuing further relay and display of original content display and **abort** any pending relay of the original content. What is the expected behavior to the end customer, stop transmitting the alert and try to provide explanation to the customer? What text/audio is expected to be transmitted to customers?,  which CAP data elements will provide that information.
7. Facility for digital images and audio.
    a.  ECIG does not make references to supporting digital images. In the CAP to EAS validation table (page 26), the <resourceDesc>CAP standard element name has samples of resources such as "map" or "photos", however the CAP to EAS mapping notes  only refers to this data elements as audio files.   Is that the expectation from ECIG?
    b.  What are the expectations from ECIG if digital images are included with the EAS alert message?.
    c.  What are the expectations from ECIG for the <derefUri> and <digest> data elements?
    d.  Can you provide an expected scenario to support digital images with the CAP alert?  Who will generate the digital images when the alert is generated?