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**Item 1: 4876 Agency Contact Config**

Tucker Brown: The first issue is the agency contact config as part of alarms. What happens when you add a new device to the system, or that device has never produced alarms so it could be an RWIS or detector. Any alarm produced by those and you go to create an event out of it, EM is going to require that contact be made for that event. If the event is based on an alert that has a device, it will try to create that device as a contact. The problem is if the user that normally creates this event, like an operator doesn’t have permission to create contacts, it will fail.

One option here is to allow the system to add the contact as an administrator so that this will succeed and the user can continue to manage the event, even though they do not have permission to create contacts. The basis of the enhancement would be to allow the system to add the contact as an Administrator so that this will succeed and the user can continue to manage the event, even though they do not have permission to create contacts. I think it will make it seamless to that user and yes, they will be able to put another contact in that system, but they won’t be able to do it directly. It still gives you granular control of permission to create contacts, but it also allows them to do their job. The other option automatically adds that contact as soon as the device is created, but that might be overkill if you don’t necessarily use the alerts or anything like that.

Does anyone have any feedback on operators being able to create contacts on the back end without any permissions?

Dan Buidens: We are good in District Seven. We don’t have any negative feedback. We are good with the current situation.

District Three: We don’t see any negatives with this. No issues.

District Five: Same thing here.

Ray Mikol: We agree with the other Districts.

Mark Laird: Same here.

Tucker Brown: Sounds good, it doesn’t seem like there is a major need for this so we will move to the next item.

**Item 2: Updated VLC Libraries**

Tucker Brown: Currently we have an older version of VLC. Basically, we would like to update to the newest version of the VLC. There are some issues people have identified with the older version. The newer devices don’t like that version of VLC. The version of VLC is built into the map, so it is not like you have a separate install of VLC on there. Any objections to upgrading the version of VLC?

Dan Buidens: No objections, we are for it in District Seven.

District Three: We are for it in District Three.

Jason Summerfield: District Two is excited for it.

Ray Mikol: District One agrees with the other Districts.

**Item 3: BlueMAC Reporting Old Tags Causing SG Driver to Spike CPU Usage**

Tucker: In District Five there were some BlueMAC devices that started reporting old tags (multiple days old). Almost always this is outside of the tag horizon of whatever you are looking for so eventually these tags will be discarded. The problem here is the number of increases in the tags being reported on the servers. The current expiration of tags happens when you go to make matches. The reason for that is potentially you have detector A and a downstream detector B, and you want the tag horizon between those two (6 hours). Then you have detector A to detector C and that would be 4 hours. When the tag comes into the system on detector A, you’re not necessarily able to say if it is expired or not because potentially if it matches with detector B if it is not 6 hours old it is okay. If it matches with detector C it would have to be 4 hours old. Tags are expired based on a “tag horizon” value per link which means until a match occurs, we would know which horizon to use. This change would use the maximum horizon (from all links of a detector) to discard tags as soon as they come into the system. Intend to deploy at D5 to see if there is a noticeable impact but wanted to give the SSUG a heads up. We have this fix already in place to help with D5’s issue. I wanted to get feedback to see if anyone had any negatives. I want to discuss more about it because it is a change on how tags are handled. I want to make sure we understand why it is what we are doing but I wanted to have an open discussion if anyone has any comments on it.

Mark Laird: So, you make them time out or expire now, in the list but the issue is new ones that come in that are older than that time.

Tucker Brown: When the tag comes into the system, it can be put into a list of match able tags. Until it is matched with a downstream detector, you don’t know if it is beyond that tag horizon or not. We can put in additional checks to check against each one and actively expire them and that is what we are trying to do here. Until we are matching with one, you don’t know or care if that it needs to be discarded. We call it tag horizon and it is basically too old to match but that doesn’t happen until the tags are matched with a downstream detector now.

Mark Laird: Okay. So, what if tags are around and they never get matched for some reason, they can be there a long time right?

Tucker Brown: Correct me if I am wrong but there is a second configuration value that gets checked for how long a tag can be on a single detector.

AJ Skillern: That is correct, the tag horizon when matching tags there are two timestamps involved that the device reports when it reads the tag and when SunGuide receives the tag. When we are expiring tags, we expire based on when we receive the tag. The tag horizon applies to the read timestamp that was reported by the device. In this case, the tag horizon changes because the read timestamp coming from BlueMac is a week and a half old.

Tucker Brown: To answer that question, yes, there is a value that expires them eventually, but they can hang around for however long that is.

Mark Laird: If you only used the tag read time, would that clean this up?

Tucker Brown: Not necessarily, that would be a larger change that we would have to analyze what would happen for that algorithm to occur to help the D5 fix. And I don’t think there are negatives for doing this.

Mark Laird: It seems like it would leave some stuff around it but probably not.

Tucker Brown: Any tag that is in a single detector will expire based on configuration value or the other.

Mark Laird: Most of the times these things aren’t very far apart, right?

Tucker Brown: Yes, most of the time it is reporting immediate tags milli-seconds apart. Some of them are doing first transmission, but it should be on the order or milli-seconds to seconds and not days. Again, please discuss this with your teams and let me know if you have any issues with it. It is really being worked as a support issue because we are changing the way the tag algorithm works, we will need to give everyone a heads up.

Mark Laird: It is only changing the stale tag reads right?

Tucker Brown: Anything that would be reporting stale data immediately, yes.

Mark Laird: For the normal stuff that is good data, it doesn’t really change the algorithm.

Tucker Brown: Correct.

Mark Laird: Seems safe enough.

Tucker Brown: Yes, and the other intent of this is to not mess with the underlying algorithm but try to trim off some of the stuff we don’t need anymore. This is just a heads up and feel free to send me an email and let me know if you have any questions.

**Item 4: RCA ConOps**

Tucker Brown: The way the RCA ConOps was written is for the system to provide each operator with a log in, username, and password on the remote system. It would make them a user for every remote user but would also give them control over permissions and what devices they see. It is a more granular approach to it. We received comments back from several Districts and the main comment was that it sounded like a lot of work to ask for all those users to use a remote system but also to manage all of those users. The user management of this is a pain, because both systems have to be doing this all of the time. The comment was to change this to a single login. This is how TxDOT has it right now and we were going to have to make a change to make it a unique login for each user, so keeping it as a single login is easier. The question I have is will that meet the needs of Florida? We just wanted people’s opinions on if we change it to a single login would it be okay.

Mark Dunthorn: We can do something closer to the original ConOps, if people have a real use case that requires that level of granularity then we can continue looking at that. What we may do is move forward with something that looks a lot like TxDOT and that would take care of some known specific needs. And if we need to change it and that is what we hear from the SSUG we will continue to investigate a longer-term opinion which would give more granularity.

Mark Laird: We do have the situation where we have different level of operators for express lanes. It is not an immediate concern for D6. So, this is one remote login that every District that wants to login into your District would use? Is that correct? Would all entities use the same login or is there one for each dedicated connection?

Tucker Brown: it would be one for each dedicated connection.

Kevin Mehaffy: Just to be clear, we would have a single login for each location, but we wouldn’t know for sure who from that location logged in?

Tucker Brown: You would not know the remote user in the system, that is correct. Let’s say we have your DMS screen pulled up and it shows all of them in your District. If you want to control another system, you would go to the C2C DMS control window. The idea behind this is that the same screen that contains your system would have the remote DMS and your DMS. Since it is a direct interface and you make a change, it will send it directly to their system. To your users, it is a seamless integration between users. The one question is when you send a change to the other system, do you send it as a unique user or CFX sending it to District 5.

Dan Buidens: I follow you. I am trying to think it through and if we only had a batch of user ID’s that could be distributed to our shift supervisors, we only have a handful of shift supervisors and there is always one on the floor. So, it would be a sure thing that the designated point person or the person in charge is the one pushing that message to the other Districts. I fear finger pointing on who posted the message and it would help if we could track it.

Tucker Brown: Doing the amount of work to do a handful of users versus unlimited, it is the exact same. I will point out when using RCA permissions in general, you can lock out people from posting, like your normal operators. So, you could lock them out to control access. Even though you don’t have the ability to say which specific user has certain permissions, you can lock them out from sending messages when they are not supposed to be.

Daniel Buidens: Based on the statement you made about it being the same level of work to add everyone as it is for select users, I would then vote for everyone.

Mark Laird: From the SwRI side it is the same implementation, right?

Tucker Brown: What I am saying is whether you want five users or 100 the amount of work we would have to do is the exact same. What we are discussing here is single users versus multiple users. Which is a different amount of work. Right now, how Texas is set up to have as single user so if we want multiple users, we will have to modify it.

Mark Laird: The on-going work in the Districts to maintain users is higher.

Tucker Brown: It would also mean that users would have an independent login for SunGuide at the local side and they would have an independent login at the District side. Those would probably not be the same password depending on policy at the District level. If you are connecting to multiple Districts, each one would have a unique username and password.

Daniel Buidens: Based on that understanding, I would prefer for it to appear that if District One is my neighboring District that it would appear if District Seven made a change. The District One system would identify that District Seven made a change to the DMS. Which would be fine with me.

Tucker Brown: You would see the post and it should be descriptive enough to show what District posted the message and why. But you are right, the District that posted the message (remote District) you won’t know what user at the District made the change.

Mark Dunthorn: But the District will be able to look it up?

Tucker Brown: That might be available, we could probably put something in the logs, but you would have to catch it within your logging time which would probably be a week.

Aven Morgan: District Three has the same reservations with accountability. If something did happen, we wouldn’t know who did it.

Daniel Buidens: I think that week allowance time on figuring out who posted it is adequate.

Mark Dunthorn: Is the username of the person who posted stored in the DMS message history table?

Tucker Brown: If we are going on a single user, the username will be that user. It is stored but it will be stored as District Seven.

Mark Dunthorn: I mean in the District Seven database, wouldn’t the user that posted on this sign be logged?

Tucker Brown: No because all of the logging for that sign is in the remote District, not the local.

Mark Dunthorn: Okay, then I think the status log approach will work.

Tucker Brown: We might have to look at it and tweak it slightly to show the remote user. Maybe District Seven: username or something along those lines. If we can get that granular then it would be logged in the database and tell you which user posted it. We have to go look at RCA and the way it is doing it.

Mark Laird: What’s the C2C user today?

Tucker Brown: Multiple users and you have to have your own login.

Daniel Buidens: Here is a hypothetical, so it is one username for a District Seven person to login, what if there were two of us trying to do it simultaneously? Would it work?

Tucker Brown: Think of it as RCA as the one signing into it. All the messages you are trying to send go to RCA with here is my username and password to make the changes. It would be concurrent, and it would be fine.

 Daniel Buidens: Tucker, do you want to investigate this, and we revisit it at the next SSUG?

Tucker Brown: If it was possible to show at least the username of the person at the database level, would that be enough? The username wouldn’t correspond to anything that is configured in your system because that username is from the other system but at least there would be some accountability. Would that be enough?

Daniel Buidens: In our opinion, yes.

Mark Laird: It sounds like it addresses the ability to trace down who did it.

Tucker Brown: Is the biggest issue with multiple users the issue of permissions and limiting the device to certain users or is it more of an issue of accountability?

Mark Laird: The latter is definitely a requirement.

Daniel Buidens: We lean towards accountability too.

Mark Laird: I would like to go back to Javier and Alejandro and discuss the remote-control stuff. In the meantime, we would just not make them available. We wouldn’t give the RCA user access.

Tucker Brown: I will get back to the group on logging the username at least at the database level. So, we will try that. If that settles the accountability part, then we can move forward with that the way it is. We will need an answer on it sooner rather than later because this is planned to be a voting item at the CMB.

Mark Dunthorn: It is. The worst case is to be prepared at the CMB. We would like something from you Tucker, if you could get something early as possible. The CMB is coming up in a couple of weeks.

Daniel Buidens: Since were on the subject of the CMB, a laundry list of voting items came out and assuming you prioritize the feedback. How many items will we end up voting on?

Mark Dunthorn: I don’t think it will be a full 20 but we will look to see which need to be voted on. This was just a starting point. We just received all responses yesterday, so we have not digested all of the responses yet. We will take the top 15 that make sense and represent what we are seeing. We will only take the items that require CMB attention, but we will discuss the full list at the CMB.

Mark Laird: We are still working on our list; I will get it back to you soon.

Daniel Buidens: That sounds good.

**Item 5: 511 Floodgate Recordings**

Tucker Brown: At the last meeting there was a question about if we were going to continue to record floodgates since they heard the IVR system is going away. Central Office did reach out to the FL511 team and they said that the Districts should continue to record floodgates until they receive notice from the FL511 team.

Jennifer Rich: I attended the FL511 Working Group meeting yesterday and Leadership has not blessed the sunset of the IVR. There is a meeting for TSM&O to meet with leadership in February, after that meeting, we will have better direction. As of now, do everything that you have been doing for floodgates and we will keep you posted on how to proceed in the future. There was a preliminary schedule shared at the FL511 Working Group with the TSM&O Engineers so they will have that information if you need it. It is a draft, but just keep recording as normal.

Tucker Brown: The next slide has to do with hotfixes, we sent hotfixes to the TERL for testing. The hotfixes contain about 50 issues. We are going to update it and it will likely include 55 issues. The hotfixes will come out for 7.1.2 and 7.2 multiple different releases to be on. If you aren’t on those versions, please consider upgrading soon as there are no more planned fixes for older versions. If you have any questions on the hotfixes or versions feel free to email the Central Office or myself.

Mark Dunthorn: That was all for today, does anyone have any open issues or questions they want to bring up?

Jason Summerfield: Are you testing the database again? Someone says that they keep getting request emailing to them every morning.

Mark Dunthorn: I think I heard about that a couple of weeks ago, but if it is happening again it shouldn’t be. We will check on it and I apologize if that is what is happening.

Tucker Brown: SwRI will confirm too but we don’t have any of our systems on a live SNTP right now.

Jacques Dupuy: At a SSUG back in October, Jira 3800 an application for HERE.

Mark Dunthorn: I know we are still looking at that and I know Kevin Mehaffy in District Three has some ideas so we will be talking about that at an upcoming SSUG. I agree Jacques, we do need a solution there. If there is nothing else, we will end the meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |