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**Item 1: 5065 – Add Support for Handling Active Directory Logins**

**Tucker Brown:** The first item is a discussion on how we want to handle active directory logins. Currently, all of the authentications are done locally so you put the user’s information in the system, you can edit and delete them. The enhancement is to do an active directory authentication so some of the adding and deleting is handled at an automatic level. The actual implementation for this has been done in Lonestar (TxDOT software) and I found out this morning it is also in the Tennessee software which is similar to SunGuide. The integration for this would be very minimal. This is the base used for the active directory to authenticate users and assign permissions. There have been discussions of other things we could do but for just this initial I was going to just do the active directory and be able to assign permissions. The questions I have are if the Districts are interested in using this and switching over to use this? We have previously discussed the need to keep the local users as we have now, would people want that? Would it be needed?

**Mark Laird:** District Six will definitely use active directory authentication and ideally, we would authenticate the user and that user would use permissions the way it is now.

**Jeremy Dilmore:** We would still use the local users because a lot of those folks are not on our domain that will use our SunGuide instance.

**Tucker Brown:** Would you like to maintain it specifically as local users?

**Jeremy Dilmore:** From our standpoint, we would end up in order to disable users the permissions would not be fully supported over, we would just use the local users. Which is what we have done for applications in the past.

**District Seven:** We support the active directory integration and I think there would still be some use here for local users in addition to the active directory ones.

**District Four:** I would like to use active directory and local users.

**Jason Summerfield:** Same with District Two, probably a mix of both.

**District Three**: Same for us, I think we would use a mix of both.

**Karla Smith:** Same for the Turnpike, we will probably have the use for both as well.

**Jason Summerfield:** Also District Two agrees with District Six that active directory should be used for primary authentication and permission should be set within SunGuide as well rather than having to create 300 active directory groups for stuff.

**Tucker Brown:** It sounds like we have everyone and there is broad support, we will move forward.

**Item 2: 1713 – EM Window Title Bar**

**Tucker Brown:** This next item is pretty simple it is changing the way the title bar is on the event dialog. Currently, we just have the event number in there. So, when you have a lot of them, and they are at the bottom of the screen all you see is the number. The proposed enhancement is to have the event number, event type, and location available in the title bar. This will be a very trivial enhancement, we are just making sure no one has objections to it. Hearing no objections, we will move forward with this enhancement.

**Item 3: 2493 – Icon Enhancement for Arterial DMS**

**Tucker Brown:** This has to do with a new potential icon for DMS. Right now, if you bring down the icon configuration and you look at what kind of the DMS there are you will see toll rate, toll status, truck parking, etc. There are a lot of categories for types of DMS that might be in the system. This is a request to add an additional layer for arterial DMS. Functionality would follow the same uses category “general” but would allow operators to hide the arterial DMS on the map. There is a much larger potential enhancement here which is to build in custom display filters. Meaning if you were to pick out sets of DMS, cameras, etc. it would let you pick out the exact set of icons you have. The filter would let you select what you want to see and hide everything else. To do this we would need to define the interaction between the icon configuration and the display filters. I am looking for feedback on if people like that idea or not. If we go with the custom filters are, they user preferences or does it apply to everyone at the installation?

**Jason Summerfield:** This is District Two, I think the initial part of this was looking at various forms way back when because arterial DMS’s would stack up again other things and we wanted to visually identify them and not filter them. We are in support of part one. Maybe in the future, there is some arterial logic that might come along later.

**Jay Williams:** Just for clarification, are the custom display filters just for DMS?

**Tucker Brown:** It would be for all devices. The way I picture it is you get to pick any combination of any devices and it would capture the view of what you have currently. Or it pairs it down to only see the certain devices on certain roadways.

**Shannon Waterson:** Can we set this up so that the higher-level users create the display filters? I don’t want an operator to decide what is displayed, I want that to come from a higher level and then the operator can enact that pre-determined filter.

**Tucker Brown:** I think that is where I was going with the global versus the user-specific. If we go with global use, think of the system use where it is defined for everybody. You can limit who actually creates those.

**Shannon Waterson:** We like that option.

**Item 4: 2025 Unpublishing Published Events**

**Tucker Brown:** The issue that came up in the course of working the event and an operator opens up an event and instead of unpublishing an event through the response plan, the event was manually unpublished. When that happens, the action is recorded as successful twice in the event chronology. The enhancement that was discussed here was to track the physical status of the item even if it is manually done. And to have the status of the item in the response plan so the correct time for unpublishing is the only time recorded.

I am not sure how many people are doing this and if you have any comments or thoughts.

**Mark Laird:** Sometimes we see this in District Six.

**Jason Summerfield:** I think the same thing happens when you try to get it removed from FLATIS. We unpublish it manually and we try a couple of times and it doesn’t work, then there are three or four unpublished messages in there. I am not sure that it is a problem.

**Tucker Brown:** I will ask a different question if you unpublish and the message comes back from FLATIS saying it was successful and the message doesn’t come down, should the chronology say yes that should have come down? I don’t know if we are tracking that but right now, we are tracking if FLATIS accepted the message. If we do not track it did the message come all the way? We do not have a way to track if the message came off the website.

**Mark Laird:** I would rather know that they attempted to take it down because what we are trying to do is analyze operator performance. Then we have a separate process to see if it did or not.

**Tucker Brown:** So, the timestamp is irrelevant, we want to know when the operator attempted and when FLATIS accepted it.

**Mark Laird:** Yes, that is what we want.

**Tucker Brown:** Does anyone else have any comments on this one? Hearing none.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Thank you, that was a quick set of issues. Thank you for the feedback. Does anyone have any other items they want to bring up? Hearing none, I will let everyone go. Have a great holiday and talk to you in the new year.

|  |  |
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