
From: [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]@nukore.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 9:01 AM
To: [REDACTED] Lewis, David
Cc: [REDACTED] O'Reilly, Thomas
Subject: RE: eGuardian files

Hi David,

I agree with [REDACTED] I think a face to face meeting with the FBI team would help clarify the meanings to the data elements in question.

Thanks
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 8:47 AM
To: Lewis, David
Cc: [REDACTED] O'Reilly, Thomas
Subject: Re: eGuardian files

David,

We could certainly map the XML, but I see some extensions (not LEXS compliant) that have been used. We would benefit from a face to face to clarify the meaning of these elements.

[REDACTED]

On Wed, Apr 1, 2009 at 8:21 AM, Lewis, David <David.P.Lewis@usdoj.gov> wrote:
Thank you [REDACTED] for the quick response. Knowing this is not in the LEXS format do you feel we could map their data element to the SS Box as we have done at other locations? I'm sure this would entail a detailed meeting between the two teams. Do you all agree?

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 8:15 AM
To: Lewis, David
Cc: [REDACTED] O'Reilly, Thomas
Subject: Re: eGuardian files

David,

I looked at the XML, I am running into lots of XML validation errors, this does not appear to be a straight LEXS / NIEM compliant document. It also seem to have been extended in an unfamiliar manner. We will have issues trying to consume this data using LEXS-PD services. We could treat this is as straight XML and consume the documents based on an understanding of the data elements.

--
[REDACTED]
Cell: [REDACTED]