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**Florida Department of Transportation**

**CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES**

**February 8, 2022**

**1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**Microsoft Teams Meeting**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Robbie Brown, D1  Justin Merritt, D1  Luis Hernandez, D1  Derrick Odom, D2  Jason Summerfield, D2  Robert Lacy, D2  Deedee Crews, D2  Jason Evans, D2  Alex Varela, D2  Amy DiRusso, D3  William Reynolds, D3  Kevin Mahaffey, D3  Richard Hemming, D3  Robert Briscoe, D3  Dee McTague, D4  Tushar Patel, D5 | Kyle Higgins, D5  John Hope, D5/CFX  Jovanny Varela, D5  Garrett Popovich, D5  Mark Laird, D6  Javier Rodriguez, D6  Alex Mirones, D6  Yamilet Diaz, D6  Romona Burke, D7  Zachary Arndt, D7  Mike Crawson, D7  Eric Gordin, FTE  Jermaine Da Silva, FTE  Robert Murphy, FTE  Cherie Phillips, FTE  Michael Kerpen, FTE | Umesh Subramanyam, FTE  Tony Abid, FTE  Kelley Kinney, FTE  Brent Poole, CFX  Wang Lee, MDX  Christine Shafik, CO  Deborah Fiesler, CO  Alex Brum, CO  Mark Dunthorn, CO  Carla Holmes, CO  Derek Vollmer, CO  Tucker Brown, SwRI  AJ Skillern, SwRI |

**Purpose:** The purpose of this meeting is to review and vote on statewide issues and requirements, and review JIRA issues.

**Welcome:**  Change Management Board (CMB) Chairman Amy DiRusso opened the meeting.

**Review of Previous Meeting’s Action Items:**

Chairman Amy DiRusso reviewed the list of previous meeting’s action items:

* **FDOT CO / All Districts - Derek Vollmer asked districts for input on what functionality in the districts’ WWD systems not currently in SunGuide or not following specs.**

Amy DiRusso: I believe this was answered?.

Christine Shafik: There is an effort based on this request that is taking place, so we can close this one.

Eric Gordin: FTE can work with Christine and Derek to flesh this out some more. It is definitely a priority for Turnpike.

Amy DiRusso: So, should we keep this open? Or are we going to close it.

Christine Shafik: To update the group on this, we discussed this topic in the last ITS Working Group Meeting and have also met with FHP. A draft ConOps was developed and sent out to all the Districts to discuss how FHP would like to receive notification of Wrong Way Driver alerts at the same time the RTMC receives them. We just received their answers last week. Their answer was yes, they would like to receive the alerts. Currently we are working on the means and methods of how they will receive these alerts. They want to make it very clear that they are still relying on the RTMC operators to verify whether it is a false alarm or not. We are going to update the ITS Working Group on where we are. So, this item can be closed.

* **FDOT CO - John Hope asked for a list of supported products to be provided with each release.**

John Hope: I believe that SwRI and Central Office have reported that they are going to keep the website updated with the supported list of products.

Tucker Brown: As of right now, that list is up-to-date on the website through R8.1, and we will continue to maintain that with the next releases, as well.

Amy DiRusso: So we will close this item.

* **SwRI - Revisit EM response plans and messaging related to one of the presented Jira issues and present details at the design review.**

Tucker Brown: Carla, do you remember what issue that was referring to?

Carla Holmes: Yes, that was SG-5865 - Improve EM DMS suggestions if message does not fit. It will be discussed further at the Design Review Meeting where this is presented.

Tucker Brown: Essentially what this was is if you have a response plan item, and something doesn’t fit on a sign, it shows up as blank; it used to not show up at all. There probably is a better way to show that and provide operators with information on how to take what should have been generated and fit it on the sign. This item is already through CMB approval, so if it does get voted on and makes it into a release, exactly how we do that will be discussed at the Design Review Meeting. So this one is good to go.

Amy DiRusso: So we will close this item.

Amy DiRusso: The next two items were for me:

* **District 1- Update voting members and send to Amy.**
* **District 5 - Update voting members and send to Amy.**

Amy Di Russo: I will send out the updated list of voting members to the Districts to review. I got information from D1, D5, and also from D4.

* **FDOT CO / SwRI - Revisit SG-5849 - New Report – Cameras that haven’t been used at SSUG for further investigation of additional functionality. Update scope and LOE.**

Tucker Brown: This is an issue we talked about at the last CMB. It was tabled based on some changes that were requested and we needed to go back and get a new LOE. This will be presented today, as well, so that action item can be closed.

* **SwRI - Update scope and LOE for SG-5143 - Make Chronology report be able to be generated entirely or only in sections of interest**

Tucker Brown: This item was voted on at the last CMB. We will be presenting it today as an FYI with the updated LOE. This item can be closed, as well.

* **All Districts - Send Christine Shafik their input on any lessons learned during configuration and deployment of SunGuide 8.0.**

Christine Shafik: We can close this one for R8.0.

* **All Districts - Create Jira tickets and send Christine Shafik any priorities to be scheduled for SSUG for consideration to be included in next major release.**

Christine Shafik: We can close this one, as well. We got the District’s input on your priorities.

**SunGuide Software Update**

Christine Shafik: As you all know, we released R8.1 back in November. Hot Fix 1 was released in January. We also released Hot Fix 6 for R8.0 in January, as well. All districts have the green light to move forward with deployment. I’ve gotten notifications and emails from multiple districts that you have deployed or are about to deploy. This release is going to be in very good shape from what I’ve heard so far from the districts that have already deployed it. They are praising how smooth it is, and have not reported any major issues. So, I encourage anyone who has not deployed yet to move forward with it. Keep Centra Office in the loop for coordination purposes. We do not recommend that multiple districts deploy R8.1 at the same time, so please touch base with us before scheduling your deployment.

R8.1 Hot Fix 2 is in the development phase. It is going to have a lot of enhancements, as well as a lot of bug fixes. It is not finalized yet, because we are adding stuff as we go. But some of the items on the screen are the enhancements that will be included for sure.

This slide shows some of the bug fixes. It is not finalized yet, but once it is, you will have it statewide.

A couple of meetings ago in the ITS Working Group, we shared that we recommend that all vendors and devices go through a consistent process for integration into SunGuide. We were asked to put this together and send it out to the districts and post it online. We’ve been working on this, and have worked with TERL and have come up with the chart that you see on the slide. The process is also documented, and there is back-up documentation that goes with it. Both of these are posted online. (Showed on slide.)

Tucker Brown: This is the Supported Protocols page we were talking about earlier. There are two hyperlinks: the first one links you to the actual document, and the second one links to the flowchart. So you will have access to both of those from the SunGuide website.

Christine Shafik: Based on your recommendations, we have separated the map tiles from the big release, and released the new map tiles yesterday. This covers updates from all quarters in 2021. If you have issues or any trouble installing this, please let us know, and we’d be happy to help.

Tucker Brown: In the Read Me, if you are just going to do a tile replacement and are going with the new tile set, that is typically just a swap-out. Those are pretty easy. There is an option in ReadMe to run a side-by-side comparison if you are looking to do a comparison of the old and new tile set, or just want to have them available. The Read Me explains how to do that. It involves basically updating configuration. If you have any trouble with that, just let us know.

Jeremy Dilmore: Can you go back to the list of standard protocols in SunGuide? Is there a list of all the NTCIP objects or drivers that are supported in case we have a device that may support NTCIP, but that particular NTCIP may not be supported by SunGuide? NTCIP is very broad and we may have devices that are compliant with the standard, but SunGuide may not have implemented those particular objects.

Tucker Brown: No, they are not publicly on the SunGuide website. Central Office or TERL may maintain those?

Derek Vollmer: From a device perspective, we don’t require NTCIP. We have supplemental requirements that we link to from the standard spec that lists all the objects that the device needs to support. It doesn’t necessarily mean that it lists what SunGuide supports.

Jeremy Dilmore: Derek, I was mostly concerned that, like if we had a TSP or a non-standard device. That is the biggest risk for a project-specific implementation.

Derek Vollmer: Do you have an example?

Jeremy Dilmore: Not a particular one. I was thinking more from a process standpoint so there was a way to verify before we went too far. Or is it, wait until the issue comes up and then call Tucker and Christine to verify whether or not that NTCIP is actually supported or not. We can do that, too.

Derek Vollmer: I hear what you are saying, and I can give you an example. We don’t have standard specs for ramp meters at this time, so I don’t have a list of NTCIP objects that we’d want ramp meters to support. But ramp meter NTCIP stuff is supported in SunGuide. I don’t know which objects off the top of my head are being used in SunGuide for ramp meters. So, yes, it would be nice to have a list of those. Since I brought up ramp meters, we are actually working on a spec section for ramp meters and will create supplemental requirements for that for the NTCIP objects. So yes, if you think SunGuide supports some NTCIP objects for a device, then reach out to Christine or Tucker to see if they are, if it’s not something that we cover in the specs.

Jeremy Dilmore: Okay, so as we keep doing wacky stuff, we will give them a call. Thank you!

Christine Shafik: That was the last SunGuide Update slide, so we will now turn it over to Tucker for the enhancements.

**Enhancement #1: SG-6120 - Allow Saving Configuration of Items without Errors Despite Errors in Other Items of the Same Type**

Tucker Brown: This first one here is something that every single district, I believe, voted for. This has to do with the configuration of items and the validation errors that you get. The issue actually is that when you are configuring items, if you go into a dialog, if there are any issues with any row in that dialog, it prevents the user from saving it. Basically it forces you to correct all configurations for all the items in the dialog, and then it would allow you to save. The problem that is occurring is that someone may be trying to add a new device, but doesn’t feel like correcting everything else. Maybe the row they are adding isn’t affected by the other rows, and they just need to get something up and running. That is essentially what the user need was explained as.

The proposed enhancement is there would essentially be two levels of validation. The first one is, if I go to add, modify, or delete something, and that particular row does not have an error, then the system should allow me to save that particular row, and allow me to continue on.

The second level of validation is for the rest of the dialog. Are there other issues that are in error that need to be corrected and shown to the user? But they would not prevent saving of other rows that do not have an error. There is some danger to this in the sense that, the reason we put in validation errors is to make sure that people are actually fixing errors in configuration to make sure that those don’t lead to other problems in the system. This would allow you to essentially bypass that check and continue on with potential validation errors in other devices, not necessarily the one you are using. I do understand the user need of, “I need to get this fixed right now and I don’t have time to go and fix all of the other configurations.” So, along with this, if we are making changes to configuration dialogs that are going to have widespread impacts, the release will need to provide the ability for people to change that and not have to go item by item. So that is something that we are going to have to do anyway. Just as long as everyone is aware that if this does go through and everybody does this, that we still need to go back and fix larger configuration issues within the dialogs, and that we are making sure that the system is consistent.

Estimate $78k

This is fairly high because there are 80-90 configuration dialogs, and part of the problem with this one is that we are going to have to go one by one in the configuration dialogs. We will Implement the validation structure that I just mentioned in a more generic way that will apply to all the dialogs, and will have to walk dialog by dialog to make sure that the specifics of a row has specific validation to make sure that another row’s failure doesn’t affect the single row that you are about to save. Previously this wasn’t a problem because any validation error caused it to not save, but essentially we are going to have to put in specific rules for specific dialogs to make sure that the row you are trying to save is actually valid before you get to save that one row. More costly, but since everyone voted for it, I know it is a big problem for a lot of people.

John Hope: D5 has one question or clarification that even though we would like to have the fields saved that are valid, we still want the user to be notified that there are some errors. So, the notifications are still wanted.

Tucker Brown: When you say save a row that is not valid – this would not allow the row to be saved if it was not valid. The row has to be valid in order for it to be saved. And then once that is saved and everything is good, you would still see other validation errors in the same way. It just wouldn’t gray out the Save button because you potentially have a row that can’t be saved.

John Hope: Okay.

Tucker Brown: Any other questions or comments on this one?

Any DiRusso: If there are no questions, we are ready for the vote.

**Vote: 10 Yeses. 1 No preference. 0 No. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #2: SG-5456 - "TMC Notified" for all notified times regardless of whether notified box is checked**

Tucker Brown: This next one is about defining the behavior of the TMC Notified checkbox. When you have the screen that’s on the right side of the event dialog, there are two options here. One is you can just insert the timestamp in the Notified timestamp field. There is also a checkbox there that says Notified by TMC. Essentially this is a clarification of what it means to check the box and add a timestamp, or just have the timestamp.

When you actually set those, you get a message in the chronology that, I don’t remember the exact phrasing, but essentially the entry needs to read if the box is checked, “TMC notified the Agency that’s there”. But if it is just the timestamp and you don’t check it, it is going to say, “Agency notified TMC”. So this is clarifying basically which direction the communication is going, and making sure that the chronology reads out correctly so you’re going to know what actually happened in the event

Estimate $3k

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: A question came through the chat: What about adding contacts to the left side?

Tucker Brown: That wasn’t part of this enhancement. Can you clarify what you are looking for there?

Richard Heming: What I’m looking for there, underneath on the left side where you can manually add names and phone numbers. Is it going to say that TMC notified such-and-such on that side, too?

Tucker Brown: Are you talking about in the chronology, or in this dialog?

Richard Heming: I’m talking about in the chronology.

Tucker Brown: Are you asking it to say that a particular person is notified in the chronology?

Richard Heming: You can add a contact in on the left side underneath the top part (I can’t see it right now), but when you add it in, it says “TMC notified”.

Tucker Brown: When you say left, are you talking about to the right of the Event Details in the Contacts area?

Richard Heming: Yes, in the Event Details area.

Tucker Brown: So, that one is just for contacts of the event. It does have a timestamp of when you actually enter that information, but doesn’t really relate directly to this. There was another enhancement that was put in recently to address that, but it has not made it to the SSUG yet.

Richard Heming: Okay. Alright. Will do.

Amy DiRusso: Is everyone okay with voting on this issue as is, or do you want to expand it?

Richard Heming: If there is already a Jira ticket in for what I’m talking about, I’m good with this as is.

Amy DiRusso: Okay, thanks, Richard. Any other comments? Okay, we are ready for the vote.

**Vote: All Yeses. This item passes.**

Tucker Brown: Richard, if you want to look at it, SG-6193 is the contact one. Take a look at that and see if that captures what you are looking for. Or if not, you may be able to add something to that to enhance that one, as well.

**Enhancement #3: SG-6072 - Vehicle Alert dialog does not pop up when minimized**

Tucker Brown: This is about the vehicle alert popping up when it is minimized. The vehicle alert dialog - the name of it changed - it used to be the wrong way driving dialog. But we’ve actually added over-height vehicle alerts to it, as well, so the name has changed to vehicle alert. So, when it pops up, if you handle the alert, and close the dialog and another one pops up, it opens up in front of everything so you can see it immediately. But if you were to handle the alert and not close it, and you minimize it or hide it behind other windows, you can get an alert and it not immediately recapture focus. That was intentional behavior to start with, but the behavior should be that it wants to go to the front.

So, the proposed enhancement here is to refocus that dialog no matter how the alert comes in. We discussed other pop-ups at the SSUG, but for this particular one we are going to keep it focused on this one dialog because it might need to be on a dialog-by-dialog basis of whether we want that to capture focus or not. But for this one it was decided that it would refocus no matter what happens.

Estimate $2k

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: I don’t hear any questions or comments, or see anything in the chat, so we are ready for the vote.

**Vote: All Yeses. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #4: SG-6036 - EM selects predefined group of event attributes   
based on event type**

Tucker Brown: In R8.0 we changed the concept of EM to include attributes. Attributes can be system-specified or custom ones. Both are supported and there is a checkbox that says this event type has these attributes. It was a way to help reporting purposes for specific attributes. Things like wrong way driving, or vehicle versus pedestrian, or work zones, or things like that.

So, for the enhancement here it was requested that when you select certain event types, when the event is created that it would select certain attributes automatically and have them set in the event; it wouldn’t make the operator do it. Wrong way driving was one of these examples. Currently, programmatically, it is set to that anyway because that was one of the things we set up as part of that enhancement. Bur this would basically change this to a configuration along with others.

The initial configuration would probably have wrong way driving set up to where if you have a wrong way driving event, the wrong way driving attribute automatically gets set. The reason that is important is because if you change it to a crash event, or if you change it to something else, that wrong way driving attribute holds. And so no matter what your event type is, that wrong way driving attribute would be reportable, so it would pick up all of your wrong way driving events whether they are actually that event type or something else.

There may be others that need to be configured here, so if you have different event types, the installation would get to set it for whenever I have this particular event type, I always set that. Once it is set the operator does have the ability to remove it or do whatever they need to. They are not locked in; it’s just automatically set once the event is created.

Estimate $16k.

That does include the ability to set up configuration dialogs for setting those up and maintaining those long term, as well as actually getting them set.

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: I don’t see any questions or comments; we can proceed to voting.

**Vote: 10 Yeses. 1 No preference. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #5: SG-5806 - SG-5810 - Copy a SAS Plan**

Tucker Brown: Right now if you want to make a new schedule with the same type of items as an old schedule, you would basically have to recreate everything from scratch.

There are two changes here. One would allow you to make a copy of a plan item. So, if you have a plan item in a schedule, you can click a button and get an exact copy of that with the same items. So, maybe it’s a DMS group that you already have set up that you like and you just want to change the message slightly, or maybe the timing or something like that. You can click a button and it will give you a new plan item with all of the exact same set-up. The only difference would be that it has to give it a unique name. So, it would do that for you, but you could then change it if you want.

The other items here is to make a copy of a SAS schedule. So, in that case you are copying both the schedule and the schedule items within it. And so you could get a full copy of the schedule. Again, the names would be changed for uniqueness, and you could go in and change those to what you’d like for them to be. It may be as simple as adding a 1or 2 to them or something like that. The names would change but everything else would remain exactly the same in terms of configuration. There would basically be two additional ribbon buttons that you would click on and you would get a new item with that.

Estimate $5k

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: Hearing none, we can proceed to the vote.

**Vote: All Yeses. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #6: SG-5215 - SAS Missing Merge with Travel Time Option**

Tucker Brown: Right now in a DMS, on the left side when you have a standard DMS Send Message, you get the option to auto-merge it with travel times. That option doesn’t exist in SAS, and that is something people have requested. So essentially we are going to add that behavior to be able to auto-merge it into the SAS items that are being sent, as well, to allow those items to be auto-merged. This (next slide) shows the textual description of that.

Estimate $2k

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: Hearing none, we can proceed to the vote.

**Vote: All Yeses. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #7: SG-6142 - Add a "Submit Crash Report" option for Operator Map Failures**

Tucker Brown: This next one is kind of interesting; it’s not something we usually see as an enhancement. Right now if a map were to crash. And by crash, I mean it gets to the point where it completely goes away - the user didn’t close it or anything like that, it just disappears. The users will generally just restart the map, log back in and continue on. And then maybe they send an email to the administrator, or maybe they don’t. They may send it later which means we don’t capture the timestamp. It’s sometimes difficult to gather the information about what happened, where it happened, how can we get more information to help so it doesn’t happen again. So, gathering the information for the specifics is sometimes difficult to capture, especially when basically someone has to report that to an administrator before that stuff can start being collected.

So, the enhancement here is that we are going to add a “Repot Crash” behavior. This is actually going to be transparent to the users. But essentially as something is crashing, we would capture the operator, so the user name; the time; and the specific comment from the user if there is anything they can add to it.

And then a request was made – we may be able to also put a crash dump in, as well, and store that on the local machine. If that is possible, if we can do that, then this would be part of that. Potentially that would not be possible because you might have to have administrator rights to actually create that file. If that’s the case, we won’t be able to put that in because having administrator access for local users is not something that anyone would be able to grant, at least from what I know. So, potentially that could be there, if possible, but if not it would just be the specific information.

And then, once it gathers all of this, the idea is that we are going to set up a separate Jira repository that if you want access to, by all means you can. But instead of giving that to an administrator or something like that, we are going to send it directly to that Jira system, and it is going to log that and allow us to immediately catch any crash at any district at any time, and be able to look over those and figure out what is happening to basically prevent them from happening. The idea behind this is that if we fix every one of them that comes in, or if we have a number of them coming in, and just keeping the overall stability of the system very high. And making sure we are not seeing any outright crashing behaviors period.

Estimate $50k.

This includes developing the backend to actually be able to generate all of that, and setting up the Jira project. And then there are hours built in here as well to do some initial testing against it to make sure that when we release this that it doesn’t immediately flood the Jira system. We don’t think that is going to happen. But it could be one small issue, but it could get multiplied out over 60 users, or 100 users or however many there are across the state at any given time. So, basically we don’t want to overwhelm the Jira system with a single error. So, the idea would be to release it with no known ones, and then make sure that anything caught on the backend gets logged and gets fixed immediately.

Any questions or comments?.

Amy DiRusso: Hearing none, we can proceed to the vote.

**Vote: All Yeses. 1 No preference. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #8: SG-5592 - SG-6073 - Make SunGuide usernames case insensitive**

Tucker Brown: Traditionally in SunGuide, all usernames have been case sensitive, meaning that you’d have to have the right casing with your username. With the last release and the addition of Active Directory, we could not require that for the Active Directory users because they allow it either way. Right now the SunGuide-only users are still case sensitive.

This request is to make the SunGuide-only users, the non-Active Directory ones, case insensitive, as well. We would have to write a tool to make sure that you don’t have any users that violate that. That’s a pretty low probability; the system generally checks for that. Unless something weird happens you shouldn’t have that case. This would make all users case-insensitive whether they are Active Directory or SunGuide-only users.

Estimate $6k

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: Hearing none, we can proceed to the vote.

**Vote: All Yeses. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #9: SG-6039 - Temporary "Allowed Word" option for authorized users**

Tucker Brown: When you are sending DMS messages and you have an unapproved word in it, for instance something like a license plate number. The first time you approve it, especially when it gets to the top of the queue and it is going out to a sign, it requires someone to say Yes, I approve this and want it to go out to the sign. The problem is if you have a sign where a higher priority message comes up and it drops on the queue, when it comes back up you have to approve that word again.

The proposed enhancement here is to approve the word for the lifetime of the message. So as long as that message stays on the queue, no matter where it is on the queue, it is approved. When it comes back up to the top it doesn’t require re-approval. If the message were to leave the sign, like if someone were to blank the queue or something like that, that would require that that one be approved again. But for the lifetime of that message on that sign, you’d never have to re-approve that particular word. So, license plate number or something like that.

The other side of this enhancement is to start archiving the user who approves these messages. This would apply to all approvals, and start archiving that in general so if you were to ever have a situation where a word went up on a sign that wasn’t supposed to go up there and you were trying to figure out who did that. Right now we don’t have any way to do that. But we would start archiving to be able to report on that type of activity.

Estimate $16k, including the archiving.

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: Hearing none, please proceed to voting.

**Vote: All Yeses. This item passes.**

.

**Enhancement #10: SG-6015 - TPAS prompt for verifying available spaces for CO reporting**

Tucker Brown: Right now the TPAS system essentially runs independently of operations. So, it is up to operations to go out and look at cameras and manually verify them. It’s kind of an operational procedure that’s set up for them to actually do that, and if they miss it there is no way to check it. It is a very manual process.

The proposed enhancement here would be a way to streamline the process, but also report on who did it and when, what counts they are actually reporting. The overall goal is to make sure that the TPAS sites are reporting accurate counts, and making sure that those counts are being verified.

The idea here is that at a configurable interval, you’d essentially get what amounts to an IDS alert, so the system alert box. You’d get it and it would appear to the users with permission to be able to handle these TPAS alerts. Then you’d be able to bring up each TPAS site and its associated cameras and verify the count. The idea here is that the dialog would come up, you’d get the site and verify the count of the spaces. If it’s wrong you’d have a spot there to go and change it, and that would propagate back to the TPAS side to make sure that got changed.

The operators need to verify the count versus the count on 511 and verify that Yes, I did that and it is correct. So there would be a checkbox there to let everyone know that Yes, I did that. As part of resolving that facility count, the system is going to log who made the check, when it was, the facility, what the number of spaces was, what they said it was, was the count accurate, was there any offset. Essentially all the things you need to gather as part of that check. If there are other fields needed we can gather that at the design review, to make sure that we are covering all of the districts and all the needs you have for operators verifying those.

It was requested too, that if a site was out of service or under construction, or maybe it’s just getting put in place, or whatever the case may be, that you can mark it as out of service and it would log it and move to the next one. Just a way of getting around it if you don’t have access or it is down, that you can move on to the next one without interrupting the counts.

One other request that was there was to add a Sleep or Snooze to the dialog. So if it pops up and you may be doing something else at that particular point, and you want to say, “Come back in 5 minutes” or “Come back in 3 minutes”, or whatever you want to do. But the idea is that you would be able to get rid of it and bring it back at a certain point. We would be able to tell who does that and when, as well, to make sure that they are not constantly snoozing those.

There was a request for the scheduled times that this dialog would actually appear to run the counts needs to be configurable by time of day and day of week. So, by time of day you may run more checks during peak hours. And then day of week, you may not run those on the weekends. So, timing by time of day and day of week would be supported in this, as well, to change the interval at which this pos up. Maybe you’re running them every 30 minutes in slow times and every 15 minutes when it’s peak times, something like that. It would be schedulable by deployment when you want those to run.

Additionally we would have some reports we’d need to generate. There would be some new fields that we’d have to put into the reporting system, and generate additional Crystal reports to come up with information on essentially what were the operators doing, what did it look like, and what information did they input. And be able to report that out in a Crystal report that administration could look at and go, Yes, they actually did this and it’s right.

One other request that was there, as well, was that the TPAS counts be manually triggered to run. This whole behavior we’re talking about right now is about it being scheduled. But if someone is training somebody or they just want to run a quick count to make sure it’s right, they would be able to do that whenever they want to on demand.

Estimate: $50k

Any questions or comments? None

Amy DiRusso: We can proceed to voting.

**Vote: 9 Yeses. 2 No preference. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #11: SG-5386 - RPG Email Contains Incompatible Line Returns**

Tucker Brown: Right now there are templates for the emails. They allow information to go out, but depending on the client that you are using and how it supports particular line returns, maybe it ends up like the one on the left (graphic on slide) where it gets all crushed together. Or it may end up like the one on the right (graphic on slide) where the line and character returns are correct, but it’s essentially a text based email. Nothing particularly special about it.

The request here is to make them essentially look a little bit better. The email template would be modified to use HTML to be able to do more editing styles similar to the Executive Notifications. So, text sizing, italics, bold, underline, justifications. The example on the right (graphic on slide) shows a grid format. The content is still going to be based on you getting the fields from Event Management and putting them into the right spots in there, but the structure is largely going to be dependent on HTML, which should render for everyone a whole lot better in terms of line returns and things like that. But would also give you a lot more flexible options on how to present that information to people. It would still be a standard template. You would still have the default template for emails. You’d still get to do individual emails per event type. So the template format and what you can set the template on is not changing, just how you’re making the template look is really all that is changing here. And then sending them out, you’d see an updated format for those.

Estimate: $29k

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: Hearing none, we can proceed to vote.

**Vote: 9 Yeses. 1 No. 1 No preference. This item passes.**

**Enhancement #12: SG-4941 - Emails for Device Issues**

Tucker Brown: The intent here is to allow the system to detect large-scale device outages, depending on what you actually want to define as large. The idea here is users can define a device group, and it can be any type of devices, DMS, CCTV, however you want to assign that group together. Essentially anything with a device status – failed, active, error, out of service, that type of stuff. Anything with that type of status you’d be able to group together in terms of defining this group.

And then you would set a percentage threshold to say that if x number or x percentage of these devices enter a failed state at any given time, that would cause it to be in an alert state. Options for this - you’d get an option to add an alarm for that condition, so something that pops up for the operators. But you could also potentially assign it to an email group. We have email groups in Event Management. Or single contacts, or however you want to set that up. So, essentially set it up as email groups, or set it up to go to operators, or both. And when that condition occurs, you’re going to get an email or a notification about that.

There was also a request that if you create this group and then decide that for some x amount of time you don’t want to see alerts, that you would be able to turn off notifications for that group, so you would not see them any time they met that threshold; it just wouldn’t alert. You can set it up, turn them on, or if you have problems, turn individual groups off and not be able to send on those.

This one does get a little more interesting because we are now monitoring device status over multiple subsystems, so they’ve kind of got to be grouped together. It’s kind of a newer concept for this system, but could lead to some good behaviors, as well.

Estimate: $50k

Any questions or comments?

Eric Gordin: What I was wondering about, and maybe it’s already been fleshed out in SSUG, is I know a lot of our agencies already monitor the network itself, and probably already receive emails when a switch has an issue, or something like that. So we are now going to receive more emails for an outage. I just want to make sure everyone knows what we might be dealing with. And have we talked about at which device levels we want to use this at?

Tucker Brown: I can’t answer the first one, but we did discuss device levels. Are you talking about the types of devices we would monitor?

Eric Gordin: Yes.

Tucker Brown: We talked about it that any device type could be put in the group as long as it has a status. And they could be mixed and matched together. So, I don’t know if those would be set up any particular way – maybe it’s area-specific rather than device-specific, or however you want to set those up. It was supposed to be flexible to allow any case you wanted. I’ll let someone else chime in on other monitoring tools they may have. As far as I remember, I don’t recall that coming up at the SSUG. But I’ll throw that out to everyone, as well.

Eric Gordin: Follow-up question. This is for if a device or a group of devices loses connectivity to SunGuide. That’s really the issue, right?

Tucker Brown: Correct, we are only monitoring poll cycles, or if we have a direct connect to a device, we’re monitoring it. It’s if SunGuide no longer has access to communications with that device.

Eric Gordin: Okay. I’ll let others chime in. Thank you.

John Hope: Eric, network outages may be one cause of multiple devices going down, but there could also be network disconnections, that may not be monitored or be alerted upon, especially if you have multiple networks talking to each other. Like in District 5 there are a lot of local agencies that connect and share their devices with the District 5 system, and occasionally we may have a disconnection from one to the other which may or may not actually be captured by our monitoring tools.

Eric Gordin: Thanks, John. Yes, I just wanted to get a bigger picture understanding of what this was about. Thank you.

Amy DiRusso: If there are no more questions, we can proceed to vote.

**Vote: 6 Yeses. 5 No preference.**

John Hope: Do you know if we need a certain percentage of yeses, or is it just a majority?

Carla Holmes: It just requires a majority.

**John Hope: Okay, so Item #12 passes.**

**Enhancement #13: SG-5849 - New Report – Cameras that haven’t been used (Tabled from last CMB)**

Tucker Brown: This is from the last CMB. This one has to deal with cameras that people should be touching, but may or may not be. So we will walk through this one. Just to remind you, there are two components of this. There is a real-time check and a database historical check to this. It was identified that we need to track the operation of the cameras, are they being PTZ’ed. So each camera would have a flag here that would indicate the system should monitor it, and then on a configurable interval, these would be checked to make sure that someone PTZ’ed the camera within that interval. So if it were set as every hour, then some time in that hour, someone should have PTZ’ed the camera at some point.

The change is to have the interval set up on a time of day basis, and also day of week. The period may change based on peak hours, based on weekends. So, again, a schedule that you can configure daily, but also day of week. The actions being monitored here, they would only count if they were from a user. So if SAS or some other system did something to a camera, those would not count towards actions being done that period. So, it would pop up as this camera hasn’t been used.

The things in red on the slide is what has been changed. So, essentially, when that interval kicks off and it says let me check all the cameras, if there were cameras that needed to be PTZ’ed a popup would appear to users. It would be permissions based, so not all users would have to see it, only the ones you really want to. It would send a list of cameras to the users and allow them to view what they did wrong, and they would be able to PTZ those for the next period.

From a report standpoint, we would generate a Crystal report. The report would have to contain an interval, meaning I want to see cameras that got moved between 8 am and 9 am, and here is the group of cameras to check. So, camera groups would also have to be implemented. So, those would be the parameters for the reports. And again, the actions of the SAS system or other systems that would be automatically doing something to cameras wouldn’t be counted. So, essentially it would go through and check all of those and give you a report of what went on during this period, of cameras that had not been PTZ’ed. So there is a real-time check and an historical check.

The biggest changes from the last time were time of day and day of week type stuff and applying that to them. And then camera groups, specifically for historical reporting, but also for the real time check, for which cameras to check would also be done. So, those are the major changes. We did not vote on this last time, so we do need to vote this time.

Estimate: $36k

Any questions or comments?

Amy DiRusso: Hearing none, we can proceed to voting.

**Vote: 7 Yeses. 4 No preference.**

(This concludes the voting items.)

**FYI: SG-5143 - Make Chronology report be able to be generated entirely or only in sections of interest.**Tucker Brown: We actually did vote on this and it did pass. I’ll go through the enhancement. When a user does a Chronology Report, it basically does everything that’s in the chronology, but the request for the enhancements was to filter down to only a particular set of items, Like if you only want to see DMS items or whatever chronology type you are interested in. They wanted to add that functionality to the RISC Chronology Report, as well. So essentially, the ability to filter down.

There was also a request for a white list, so essentially give me all the types and I will tell you what I don’t want.(I don’t want the DMS items, but I want everything else.) So the updated estimate I believe was $13k and went to $15k. So, not a big change. That was approved at the last one, but does have an updated estimate.

Any questions or comments? None.

Again, that was not a voting item, so I’ll turn it over to Amy.

**Review of Action items**

Amy DiRusso: The first action is for me to send out the CMB attendees. I will send that out to make sure everyone is on that. I noticed that there are more people at the meeting than are on the Change Management Board email list. if you want people added or not included, please let me know, or else I will keep it the same. Did anyone else have any action items from this meeting?

Carla Holmes I didn’t capture any additional action items, Amy.

Amy DiRusso: Thank you, Carla. I’ll turn it over to Tucker or Christine to close us out officially.

Christine Shafik: Thank you, Amy. Does anyone have any announcements or open discussion about SunGuide?

If there is nothing to add we will be scheduling the next CMB 3 months from now, maybe in May. Amy and John will be sending this out.

You will be receiving an email from me this week to request your Top 20 enhancements you’d like to see this year. We have a very long list of CMB Approved enhancements and we cannot accommodate all of them in one big release or in one year. So we’d like to see your priorities; which ones you want to see this year. We will be sending this this week, and requesting to have it back next week so we can start the development of requirements and put things together.

Amy, there is a comment regarding the District 7 voting member in the Chat.

Amy DiRusso: I see it. Thank you. I will be reaching out. I have Megan as secondary and nobody as primary. I will reach out to Megan and look into that and I’ll get that updated. Thank you, Romona.

**The meeting was adjourned.**