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**ISO and coordination activities**: Ongoing challenges. WG9 is influences, but per Frank we must go in as experts and build consensus in the meeting. Possible avenues are current/past participant with multinationals: Oracle, IBM or HP? Frank and Dave explained the need to build broader consensus by building other project editors involved, e.g., China – partly political motivation.

June 4 is next INCITS meeting

Dave asked Frank to merge in his 3 points justifications for multi-part into the existing draft.

Need to engage other TAG members, e.g., through Oracle overseas offices, or sometimes governmental peer-to-peer engagement.

Duplication in the document: There are some complaints about this from the public comment. The group consensus is that (paraphrasing) this is a necessary evil intended to keep each standalone document readable. We should forward the comment to Laurie in case she can address it.

**Vol 6** We need more help with Vol 6 now that Orit is gone. We discussed how to shift duties from Orit to others in the group. Russell Reinsch offered to help and opened a dialog with Dave. (There is concern that Dave will be overloaded.)

**Vol 7**. This Vol languished in V1. It was to be a roadmap per Dave. Big Data maturity model? Design patterns as a standards gap? Underwood suggested we should try to spin off some small pieces that we can do for later. E.g., deeper dives on specific topics. Governance, Audit. Implementation approach? DevOps. How do I implement? How do I start up an RA? PW Use cases for backdoor hacks? Dave: orchestrator level, S&P maturity level? Where do I fit as an organization? Where do I start? What should I begin to work on?

There was a parallel conversation about S&P considerations for Vol 7. Tim mentioned issues outline3d at the recent RSA Conference summary. Tim cites a number of issues related to S&P from human and social context; that perimeter defense fails (relevance to Vol 7; no survival from APT). PW had a “levels” of implementation take-away from that conference. What should the first conversation be about how to engage people in building a Big Data system?

**Use Case Template** RE the Use Case – How to connect to the RA? Should we? There was a discussion about whether the RA should be a lens through which we present the use case, or whether this would get in the way of obtaining the use case.

Frank: Business Process Interop, security interop, data interop, service interop – as a possible outcome of facilitating via an RA. Separate from as-implemented. Frank mentions “implementation performance statement” is a declaration of conformity in standards area, even beyond IT. An ICS in IT – a pro forma ICS is a form that loosely depicts the standard. Useful b/c only conforms to a piece of an RA. Piyush actually contracted this out so that people were interviewed. Frank suggested an approach that presented frameworks through the example of the IEEE 1484.1 presentation of use case via Yourdon (or other formats) – i.e., box/bubble/line simplifications. Examples from that document are for instance Annex F.6 diagrams. See Annex E in the IEEE document; Pro Forma Implementation Conformance Statement. Each line item corresponds to a high level functional element.

There was further discussion of how to pursue this while enhancing the survey, creating more accessible content and providing material for Vol 7. There was a positive response to the suggestion.

**TODO** Distribute Geoffrey and Piyush documents to the broader group.

**Web chat log:**

**Ann Racuya-Robbins (Private)**: 2:01 PM: Just got back from a week in Amsterdam. I am working to catch up on all.

**Russell.R (to Everyone)**: 2:02 PM: I can help with tags

**David Boyd (to Everyone)**: 2:14 PM: Frank - right on!!!! - But the activities of those layers need to be covered in the implementation.

**David Boyd (to Everyone)**: 2:14 PM: Concur on common framework for discussion and exchanging information is a core goal of a Reference Architecture.

**Mangold, Marcia (to Everyone)**: 2:18 PM: Just make sure that the tags do not include acronyms without explanations. I was a little lost there. <smile> I will take a look at the tags, once you have got them together...

**Ann Racuya-Robbins (to Everyone)**: 2:24 PM: Can we get access or links to this document.

**Mark Underwood (to Everyone)**: 2:33 PM: Ann- Ask Frank - not sure as it's an IEEE stds doc

**David Boyd (to Everyone)**: 2:34 PM: Frank - great discussion. This has me thinking (which can be scary).

**Mark Underwood (to Everyone)**: 2:37 PM: Useful approach perhaps for Vol 7 and also for overview

**Ann Racuya-Robbins (to Everyone)**: 2:41 PM: Interesting approach Frank

**David Boyd (to Everyone)**: 2:44 PM: And filling out that page is a lot harder than it looks for a complex system. But in terms of understanding your system the knowledge gained from that work is very valuable.

**Tim Zimmerlin (to Everyone)**: 2:45 PM: Dave, yes. Survey designers must slowly walk their subjects by "leading questions" that both inform and illustrate what is meant.

**Mark Underwood (to Everyone)**: 2:47 PM: The survey is a proxy tutorial in the RA to some extent

**David Boyd (to Everyone)**: 2:50 PM: Have to run folks. GREAT discussion today. Frank, we need to propose a ref arch pro-forma conformance statemetn for the NIST 20547 document.

**Russell.R (to Everyone)**: 2:56 PM: great discussion

**Russell.R (to Everyone)**: 2:58 PM: I would like a copy

**Ann Racuya-Robbins (to Everyone)**: 2:58 PM: Thank you Mark

**pat anderson (Private)**: 2:58 PM: i would like a copy