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# Results in Brief

## Executive Summary

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) tasked Communications, Security, Reliability, and Interoperability Council (CSRIC) Working Group 3 (WG3) with recommending best practices for the delivery of Multilingual Emergency Alert System (EAS) and emergency information. Specifically, the scope of work for Working Group 3 was as follows:

*The Working Group will recommend best practices for the delivery of multilingual EAS and emergency information. The Working Group will pay particular attention to how communities determine their multilingual needs, and how individual broadcasters, cable service providers and other EAS Participants (including rural, smaller and less resourced EAS Participants) and their representative organizations address those needs. Areas of interest should include specific technical options ranging from translators on staff to state of the art translation software. The Working Group will keep in mind how these practices can be expanded to include other communities that require enhanced access such as those with disabilities and the functional-needs community*. [[1]](#footnote-1)

While CSRIC Multilingual EAS WG3 did not conduct or commission formal research, some members did conduct discussions with EAS stakeholders including radio and TV broadcasters originating EAS alerts, cultural communities, and reviewed literature on the subject. WG3 has expertise on the technical aspects of EAS and CAP. Much of this expertise is based on experiences and capacity in professional roles.

In general, WG3 found that multilingual capabilities, especially in the area of message origination, are still in the early stages. The experience pool is too shallow to inform Best Practices. As such, it is too early to consider any additional regulation or requirement pertaining to multilingual alerting.

WG3 eveluated whether there are any regulatory barriers to multilingual alerting in the current FCC EAS rules and concluded there apparently are none.

Subsequent to the chartering of CSRIC V, the Commission released the Report and Order in EB Docket No. 04-296, which mandates new reporting requirements regarding multilingual EAS alerting capabilities and establishes the Commission's current policy on multilingual EAS alerting. Accordingly, this Report and Order would seem to substantially supersede our assigned task to "recommend best practices for the delivery of multilingual EAS and emergency information" since it establishes new reporting rules and recognizes that perhaps the best practice is to simply gather further information regarding current EAS multilingual capabilities. Nevertheless, WG3 herein offers some additional insight into the current state of multilingual EAS.

WG3 would like to acknowledge that much has been done to advance technology and delivery systems to improve EAS delivery of emergency messaging reaching unique populations due to language, culture, contextual, disability currently not part of today’s EAS system. The use of CAP, as mandated by the FCC in 2012 for EAS Participants, has provided a set of tools that can be used to advance the information flow to wider populations. Essentially, “all crisis starts at the local level” and as a result, WG3 believes collaborations considerate of localized needs as supported by each community combined with state and federal guidance with consideration given to some or all of the recommendations collected in this document will advance a more inclusive warning and alerting information flow as it evolves in each jurisdiction.

Additionally, WG3 believes life-saving messaging needs to be supported by proactive pre-event public information programs so recipients are aware of local resources as well as the individual and community capability and responsibility for preparing and responding to life-threatening situations.

# Introduction

CSRIC V Working Group 3 was established to make recommendations for the CSRIC’s consideration in three major areas related to the continued improvement and development of the Emergency Alert System (EAS) as a secure, effective alerting tool for the American public: (1) EAS Security; (2) the provision of EAS in languages other than English; and (3) the development of an operational handbook for individual broadcasters, cable service providers and other EAS Participants.

In order to address the relevant issues, a diverse team of subject matter experts including EAS were recruited to participate in the multilingual subgroup:

* Message Originators: FEMA; NWS; Other federal agencies (e.g. United States Geological Survey), State & Local Emergency Managers; State EAS Networks
* EAS Participants: Radio; TV; Cable TV; Satellite TV; Satellite Radio; Wireline Video/IPTV
* EAS Equipment Manufacturers
* State Emergency Communications Committee Chairs and Members
* EAS Experts and Consultants

CSRIC Working Group 3 is divided into three sub-groups:

* **EAS Security** – Recommend steps for assessing any barriers to the adoption of the CSRIC IV best practices, make recommendations on incentives, both regulatory and non-regulatory for affected stakeholders to adopt the best practices, and recommend methods by which other EAS stakeholders may gain assurance that the best practices are being implemented.
* **Multilingual EAS** – The Working Group will recommend best practices for the delivery of multilingual EAS and emergency information.
* **Updating the EAS Operating Handbook** **–** Update and modernize the EAS Handbook, which states in summary form the actions to be taken by personnel at EAS Participant facilities upon receipt of an EAN, tests, or State and Local Area alerts.

## CSRIC Structure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communications Security, Reliability, and Interoperability Council (CSRIC) V | | | | | | | | | |
| CSRIC V Steering Committee | | | | | | | | | |
| Chair(s): WG # 1  Susan Sherwod  Jeff Cohen | Chair(s):  WG # 2  Francisco Sanchez  Farrokh Khatibi | Chair(s):  WG # 3  Steven Johnson  Kelly Williams | Chair(s):  WG # 4  Kent Bressie  Catherine Creese  Jennifer Manner | Chair(s):  WG # 5  Rod Rasmussen  Christopher Boyer  Brian Allen | Chair(s):  WG # 6  Brian Scarpelli  Joel Molinoff | Chair(s):  WG # 7  Bill Boni  Drew Morin | Chair(s): WG # 8  William Reidway  Thomas Anderson | Chair(s):  WG # 9  Brian Daly | Chair(s):  WG #10  John Kimmis  Danny McPherson |
| WG # 1:  Evolving 911 Services | WG # 2:  Emergency Alerting Platforms | WG # 3:  Emergency Alert System | WG # 4:  Communications Infrastructure Resiliency | WG # 5:  Cyber-security Information Sharing | WG # 6:  Secure Hardware & Software | WG # 7:  Cyber-security Workforce | WG # 8:  Priority Services | WG # 9  Wi-Fi Security | WG # 10  Legacy Systems and Services Risk Reduction |

**Table 1 - Working Group Structure**

## CSRIC V Working Group 3 Team Members

Working Group #3 members are listed below. EAS Multilingual Alerting Subgroup members are identified with an asterisk (**\*).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company or Organization** |
| Chair WG3 - Kelly Williams | National Association of Broadcasters |
| Chair WG3 – Steven Johnson | Johnson Telecom |
| Lillian McDonald \*(Multilingual Co-Chair) | Twin Cities Public Television & Emergency, Community, Health and Outreach (ECHO) |
| Jim du Bois \* (Multilingual Co-Chair) | Minnesota Broadcasters Association |
| Gary Timm | Wisconsin EAS Broadcast Chair, WI SECC |
| Adrienne Abbott-Gutierrez \* | Nevada EAS Chair, NV SECC |
| Mark Annas \* | Riverside (CA) Fire Department |
| John T. Archer \* | SiriusXM |
| John E. Benedict | CenturyLink |
| Benjamin Brinitzer | iHeart Media and Society of Broadcast Engineers |
| Robert Bunge | NOAA NWS |
| Kay Chiodo\* | Deaf Link, Inc. |
| Greg Cooke | FCC |
| Edward Czarnecki \* | Monroe Electronics |
| Clay Freinwald | Washington State University, WA SECC |
| Daniel Geist | Cox Communications, Inc. |
| Suzanne Goucher | Maine Association of Broadcasters, Maine SECC |
| Neil Graves | SNR Systems |
| Ricardo Guerrero \* | AT&T |
| Ryan Hedgpeth | DHS OEC |
| Craig Hodan \* | NOAA NWS |
| Steven C. Johnson \* | Johnson Telecom |
| Al Kenyon \* | DHS FEMA |
| Jim Klas | Wisconsin Educational Communications Board |
| Wayne Luplow | LGE/Zenith Electronics |
| Brian Murray \* | Houston Urban Area Security Initiative’s Emergency Public Information Work Group |
| Dan O’Callaghan | Verizon |
| Brian Oliger | Hubbard Radio |
| Jerry Parkins | Comcast |
| Harold Price \* | Sage Alerting Systems, Inc. |
| Austin Randazzo | FCC |
| Richard Rudman | Broadcast Warning Working Group, CA SECC |
| Francisco Sanchez | Harris County Office of Homeland Security & Emergency Management |
| Bill Schully | DIRECT TV |
| Timothy Schott \* | NOAA NWS |
| Andy Scott \* | National Cable & Telecommunications Association |
| Gary A. Smith \* | Cherry Creek Radio |
| Jeff Staigh \* | Univision |
| Matthew Straeb | GSS/ALERT FM |
| Mike Talbert | Verizon |
| Leo Velazquez | AT&T |
| Larry Walke | National Association of Broadcasters |
| Herb White | NOAA NWS (contract support) |
| Stephen Woodbury \* | Minnesota Broadcasters Association |
| Gregory Zwicker \* | NOAA NWS |

**Table 2 - List of Working Group Members**

# Objective, Scope and Methodology

## Objective

The CSRIC Multilingual EAS WG3 Subgroup was tasked to “recommend best practices for the delivery of multilingual EAS and emergency information.” Therefore, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) invited recommendations from a coordinated workgroup process, enabled by CSRIC-V WG3, which appointed a subgroup to identify multilingual warning and alerting best practices collected from case studies, pilot-programs, or other attempts to reach English as a Second Language (ESL) populations efficiently with culturally contextual emergency messaging.

## Scope

This document addresses the request for multilingual best practices by addressing the following scope:

*The Working Group will recommend best practices for the delivery of multilingual EAS and emergency information. The Working Group will pay particular attention to how communities determine their multilingual needs, and how individual broadcasters, cable service providers and other EAS Participants (including rural, smaller and less resourced EAS Participants) and their representative organizations address those needs. Areas of interest should include specific technical options ranging from translators on staff to state of the art translation software. The Working Group will keep in mind how these practices can be expanded to include other communities that require enhanced access such as those with disabilities and the functional-needs community.*

Members of the WG3 Multilingual EAS subgroup relied on input shared with us by stakeholders with experience or from case studies where jurisdictions are experimenting with the potential delivery of emergency information to increasingly diverse populations. Members of WG3 or other stakeholders include the following areas of expertise:

* Emergency Management
* EAS State Emergency Communications Committee (SECC) Chairs and Members
* Cultural and Community-Based agencies working with ESL Populations
* Radio and TV Broadcasters
* Cable TV Providers
* Satellite Radio Providers
* Satellite TV Providers
* Wireline/IPTV System Providers
* EAS Equipment Manufactures
* CAP Authoring Tool Vendors
* NOAA / NWS
* FEMA

Additionally, WG-3 Multilingual EAS subgroup members considered the following logistical and technical challenges regarding the development and distribution of multilingual messaging:

* CAP vs. Legacy EAS activations
* Human vs. Machine (automated or software) linguistic context and translations
* Pre-recorded vs. linguistically mapped vs. combined linguistic translations
* Site-based delivery of translated messaging vs. inherited and relayed delivery of translated messaging
* "Attended" vs. "Unattended" broadcast, cable and IPTV operation
* Automatic vs. Manual mode operation of EAS equipment
* Mixed use of part-time Automatic/part-time Manual operations of EAS equipment
* Decoder-only operations at Low Power broadcast stations
* Variations in EAS equipment operation
* Potential future technology and/or “information flow processes” changes currently on the horizon but not legally mandated for use (CAP, IPAWS, 3.0, etc.)
* Impacts that the cost of future technology improvements will have on EAS Participants and ultimately the public

## Methodology

The WG3 EAS Multilingual Subgroup met through weekly conference calls in May, June, July and August, 2016. A wide range of topics were discussed and available public data and case studies were reviewed, moderated and documented by co-chairs Lillian McDonald (Twin Cities PBS and Emergency, Community, Health, and Outreach [ECHO] Minnesota) and Jim du Bois (Minnesota Broadcasters Association). In addition to sharing experience and data for the compilation of this report, a glossary of terms is also provided to clarify acronyms used to clarify concepts (see Appendix).

# Background

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and Emergency Alert System (EAS) participants have been challenged to advance the EAS warning and alerts best practices to adapt to an increasingly diverse population and evolving technology so ESL communities receive, comprehend, and respond to life and property-saving messages during emergencies. After Action Reports (AAR) following natural disasters such as Katrina (2005) and California wildfires (2015) document the need to address public information inclusively by developing strategies to reach ESL populations with educational and emergency messaging[[2]](#footnote-2). This is in addition to U.S. citizens with little or no understanding of the English language.

In the Report and Order in EB Docket No. 04-296[[3]](#footnote-3) released on March 30, 2016, the Commission reaffirmed its “commitment to promoting the delivery of Emergency Alert System alerts to as wide an audience as technically feasible, including those who communicate in a language other than English or may have a limited understanding of the English language.” The FCC is requiring state EAS plans to include information about how EAS participants may provide alert messages to non-English speakers. EAS participants who provide alerts in languages other than English must provide information on their use of non-English alerts to their respective State Emergency Communications Committees (SECC). The Commission has made it clear that providing messages in languages other than English is strictly voluntary. The EAS Multilingual Subgroup is charged with recommending best practices for the dissemination of emergency messages in non-English languages according to the needs of local emergency managers.

# Analysis, Findings and Recommendations

## Analysis

* + 1. **Need**

The expertise of the committee did not extend to the challenge of determining need or scope. The fact that there is a need is obvious however what’s unclear is how to determine breadth, depth, and scope. While one source gives the number of immigrants living in the U.S. in 2014 as 42.2 million, the raw figure does not provide insight into how many immigrants speak little or no English. In fact, the number of immigrants who live in homes where only English is spoken, or where English is spoken very well is 49.1% overall, and 72.9% for persons younger than 18[[4]](#footnote-4).

* + 1. **Technical issues**

Today’s technology allows delivery of alerting authority originated multilingual messages to the public via IPAWS CAP. A capability for multilingual message delivery through use of multiple <info> block elements in a Common Alerting Protocol (CAP) message was incorporated into the standards that define CAP as it is used in the FCC rules:

* Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS) standard *Common Alerting Protocol Version 1.2 [[5]](#footnote-5)*
* The FEMA initiated IPAWS profile*, Common Alerting Protocol, v. 1.2 USA Integrated Public Alert and Warning System Profile Version 1.0[[6]](#footnote-6)*
* and Section 3.7 of the EAS CAP Industry Group *(ECIG) Recommendations for a CAP EAS Implementation Guide[[7]](#footnote-7)*

Real-world functional capability of this multilingual message delivery capability has been demonstrated though the IPAWS/EAS Regional testing effort, and will again be present in the national NPT scheduled for September 28, 2016.

* + 1. **Regulatory issues**

The FCC has introduced guidelines for delivering messages “beyond English” supporting multilingual EAS messaging including FCC Part 11, the FEMA IPAWS CAP profile, and the EAS-CAP Industry Guidelines. Accordingly, the FCC has noted in its EAS rules:

* §§11.55(a)(4) and 11.55(d)(2): “EAS Participants providing foreign language programming should transmit all EAS announcements in the same language as the primary language of the EAS Participant.”

In addition to abiding to FCC EAS guidelines, some emergency alert originators and/or EAS participants may choose to voluntarily provide emergency alerts in English and additional languages of which they are capable of delivering, as needed.

* + 1. **Use Case: Minnesota IPAWS/Multilingual Project**

A multilingual EAS project in the state of Minnesota provides a recent example of how both alert originators and EAS Participants can voluntarily collaborate to serve non-English speaking populations in their area. The pilot project successfully demonstrated a CAP-based alert with four languages: Spanish, Hmong, Somali, and English. Important to its success was the accompanying community engagement campaign, designed to ensure that the targeted populations understand how to access emergency information and act upon it.[[8]](#footnote-8)

## Findings

The committee separated its discussion into three parts, message origination, message transport, and message delivery to the audience. The committee made the following observations:

Message origination

* Message origination tools, that is, the ability to encode CAP messages with multiple languages, including text and audio, exist. The problem is in acquiring the multilingual content. WG3 finds, based on daily experience with the CAP system, that message origination, even in English, is still a work in progress. Providing text, properly formatted for a Radio/TV/Screen audience (with careful use of abbreviations and jargon) requires training. Adding the additional complexity of providing translations to alternate languages adds additional barriers to adoption of multilingual alerting.
* The selection of which communities to serve, who is responsible, and who pays, is a very local issue. The greatest possible latitude should be given to originators in how this is accomplished. The FCC can have little direct control over how or if this occurs. The commission’s role, at this early stage of adoption, would be to assure that the rules allow for a variety of presentation methods, and in particular, to continue to support the concept of allowing the use of CAP to providing alternate languages, but to allow the presentation of those languages to take place outside of the strict EAS format of header, audio, and end of message, and to use the header, audio, end of message, then alternate language(s) concept.
* The EAS Participants, in their role as a conduit between originators and the audience should be encouraged, but not required, to participate in local efforts to use multilingual text and audio when available.
* The cost of always-available (24-7-365) human translation, on a station by station basis, is a staffing model and logistical expense that are not affordable or implementable at this time for individual EAS Originators. Additionally, the technology for statistical machine translation remains under development making it problematic as an emergency application at this time. The use of pre-translated, pre-recorded messages based on event type is an alternative that has been used in some cases with customized messaging. However, the committee did note the existence of message origination tools in initial deployment that provide ability to transcode EAS messages into multiple languages, as well as other tools with the capability to deliver American Sign Language (ASL) or multilingual content in alternative delivery methods such as the internet or social media as separate ventures from EAS origination. WG3 is also aware that the automated NOAA Weather Radio (NWR) programming system supports Spanish language broadcasting and the delivery of EAS information: Five Weather Forecast Offices (via seven transmitters) currently use Spanish language as the primary broadcast in areas with large Spanish-speaking populations and other Offices can choose to add Spanish language information, to supplement the delivery of information on English-language NWR stations.

Transport Technology

* The Common Alerting Protocol (CAP), where available, provides a sufficient mechanism for transporting multilingual content from alert originators to EAS participants.
* FEMA IPAWS can pass multilingual CAP messages from alert originators to EAS participants. FEMA has originated several messages, including recent regional “National Periodic Test” alerts, where alerts are available in English and Spanish versions.
* Other originators at the state and local level have conducted multilingual tests through the IPAWS system, including a four-language test in Minnesota.

Delivery to the audience

* Multilingual support, in particular the delivery of text and provided audio, is a capability of much of the CAP/EAS equipment in the field. When alternate language text and audio is provided, the role of the CAP/EAS device is simpler – select the proper text and audio file, and display/play. The current IPAWS implementation of CAP supports the use of a limited set of UTF-8 characters in text elements. However, display of particular languages is limited to the character sets supported by the display devices.
* Use of Text to Speech (TTS) with multiple languages is supported by some devices, and with some languages. Users must typically load the alternate languages they intend to use into the device – not all languages/dialects are available on all devices, and some languages aren’t available on any device.
* Some CAP/EAS equipment permits the EAS participant to replace the incoming audio with other audio, possibly in a different language, allowing for local replacement of one language with another.
* Multilingual support using universal intermediary devices (CAP converters) is problematic because the EAS device controls the output but receives only EAS data from the converter. There is no multilingual support in the legacy EAS protocol so a CAP converter/Legacy EAS pair does not have the ability to carry more than one language.
* Less-resourced, or even adequately resourced, EAS participants are in general unable to bear the cost of human language translation services in the context of CAP/EAS. Participants should be encouraged, but not required, to relay alerts in the languages of their choosing, based on their audience, when the desired languages are available. If a required alert in not available in their desired alternate language, the English version must be played. If the Participant is able to provide the emergency information in an alternate language or format, but is unable to do so within the context of EAS (for technological or infrastructure reasons) they should be encouraged to provide the information as part of their regular broadcast.

Trends

FEMA reports increasing numbers of emergency management organizations are signing up for access to the IPAWS system. Some are beginning to use CAP message generation tools. While some of the origination software systems include multilingual message preparation, FEMA does not currently track the number of originators that use that capability. For its part, FEMA has used two languages in recent regional National Periodic Test messages, providing both English and Spanish text and audio.

## Recommendations

Many states are facing challenges with reaching ESL populations; demographics in the United States indicate continued growth in ESL residents. More technology is becoming available to accommodate ESL and disability alert and warning recipients.

The technology to transport and deliver multilingual messages, though evolving, exists today. The FCC, FEMA, and EAS Participants need to perform additional outreach, both outward toward the community and alert originators, and inward, to assure EAS Participants that there are low cost and low effort ways to accomplish multilingual EAS alert delivery.

However, technology is only a small part of the problem. The amount of actual experience from alert origination and alert delivery is growing, but is still very small. Based on current activity, WG3 notes that implementations of multilingual EAS messaging is dependent on resources and collaboration as prioritized by each community. With this as a general backdrop, WG-3 offers the following recommendations:

* WG3’s primary recommendation is that the Commission refrain from creating additional regulations pertaining to multilingual alerting.
* The use of non-English (or multi-lingual) alerting should remain voluntary for EAS Originators and EAS Participants.
* The Commission remains technologically neutral and continues to allow, but not require, experimentation and development by EAS stakeholders on all types of multilingual functionality with collaborative leadership determined by local communities.
* The multilingual challenge cannot and need not be solved in a single, initial implementation.
* To facilitate multilingual emergency messaging for ESL populations, consideration could be given to a community-based approach with consideration of the current ESL population in each jurisdiction by verifying demographics from authoritative sources.
* Government partners should continue to make state and local emergency managers aware of CAP technology and its capabilities.
* Alert originators should leverage CAP for multilingual support.
* The FCC should allow, but not require, CAP devices to immediately survey IPAWS upon receipt of a broadcast EAS message, in order to determine whether a matching CAP message exists with ESL content, and use that CAP message instead. Doing so, would create negligible delay, with the benefit of more informative messaging as a broadcast EAS message is received first.
* The FCC and FEMA should collaborate on a process to keep alerting originators and government (content creators) partners informed of multilingual capabilities in the existing EAS system.
* The FCC should use the tools and capabilities that exist to facilitate the delivery of multilingual alerts on a voluntary basis, noting that the current EAS system has the capability to release multilingual messaging and that these services continue to be voluntary.

# Conclusions

Though it is premature to promulgate a set of Best Practices because work to date remains in early stage, WG3 concludes that CAP does offer sufficient multilingual transport capabilities and should be leveraged to provide multilingual EAS. Further, IPAWS provides sufficient support for multilingual CAP to be used as a base for multilingual EAS. Participation in multilingual alerting should remain on a voluntary basis for EAS Participants, and the current Part 11 rules are sufficient to allow multilingual EAS to grow.

## Appendix: Definitions of Terms

*Definitions of the following terms are meant as guidance for SECCs in applying the use of these terms in the drafting of State EAS Plans, in order to gain uniformity in the understanding and application of such terms across all State EAS Plans. The inclusion of definitions of these terms in this report should not be construed as a recommendation for their inclusion in the FCC EAS Part 11 rules. These definitions are presented here solely as a guideline for SECC use.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activate | *(verb)* Describes the process of originating the transmission of the EAS header codes, attention signal, emergency message and EOM code that also complies with the visual message requirements of 47 CFR. § 79.2(a)(2). |
| Authority | *(noun)* Describes the source of responsibility and the right to activate or request activation of an emergency alert on the relay network, utilizing the traditional or legacy EAS dissemination or the Common Alerting Protocol. The source of authority for EAS resides with federal, state, county and local emergency management and public safety officials as outlined in EAS plans. |
| Capability | *(noun)* An attribute describing the technical ability of an entity, possessing the equipment to activate code and voice a legacy EAS or CAP message, upon the request of an authorized entity, on the relay network. This ability may reside with a government agency, a CAP vendor who provides this service or a broadcast entity. This relationship structure is outlined in the EAS plan. |
| Closed Circuit  Test | *(noun)* Tests that do not reach the public, but do allow for reception by EAS participants for logging and evaluation. |
| Gatekeeper | *(noun)* The entity, as identified in the EAS plan, having ultimate authority to request activation (e.g. state/local emergency management, state police and local public safety) and the responsibility to insure that the requested activations meet the standards of acceptability as to not saturate the system with unwarranted activations. |
| Initiate  Multi-Lingual  Multi-Platform | *(verb)* To begin an action that results in activation for legacy EAS or CAP messages, by or at the request of federal, state, county and local emergency management and public safety officials as outlined in EAS plans.  *(noun*) An attribute describing the ability to use more than two languages for communication, or (of a thing) written or spoken in more than two different languages.  *(noun)* The secure delivery of media, information and applications to any device, regardless of transport, distribution system or user interface, providing the consumer with seamless, integrated and interactive access and management of communication services. |
| Originator | *(noun)* Refers to the authorized party who requests the activation of the legacy EAS or CAP message. It specifically refers to the ORG code outlined in 47 C.F.R. § 11.31. |
| Relay Network | *(noun)* Describes the links and paths from warning origination points to EAS Participants for legacy EAS and CAP messages. |
| Response  Translation | *(verb)* A descriptive for the actions an emergency management asset brings to bear to manage an emergency to a quick and successful outcome.  *(verb)*  The act or process of translating something into a different language. The act or process of changing something from one form to another. |

1. 1 CSRIC V Working Group Descriptions and Leadership https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/advisory-committees/communications-security-reliability-and-interoperability#block-menu-block-4 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. WG3 is aware that organizations representing community based groups, including the MMTC, have petitioned the commission and other parties to consider the special needs of multilingual communities in the alerting process. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\_public/attachmatch/FCC-16-32A1\_Rcd.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Pew Research Center. “Statistical Portrait of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States”, April 19, 2016. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/04/19/statistical-portrait-of-the-foreign-born-population-in-the-united-states/> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/cap/v1.2/pr03/CAP-v1.2-PR03.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <http://docs.oasis-open.org/emergency/cap/v1.2/ipaws-profile/v1.0/cap-v1.2-ipaws-profile-v1.0.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <http://www.eas-cap.org/ECIG-CAP-to-EAS_Implementation_Guide-V1-0.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Additional project information can be found at Ellen Shelton and Thalia Hall, “Real-Time Warnings and Alerts for Non-English Speaking Communities: Evaluation of Best Practices in Community Outreach and Engagement in the Minnesota Multi-Language Messaging Initiative, July 2015. <https://www.wilder.org/Wilder-Research/Publications/Studies/ECHO%20Minnesota%20-%20Minnesota%20Multi-Language%20Messaging%20Initiative/Real-Time%20Warnings%20and%20Alerts%20for%20Non-English%20Speaking%20Communities.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)