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|  |  |
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Christine Shafik welcomed the attendees to the SSUG meeting and announced that the meeting will be recorded for the purpose of taking notes and would have announcements from previous SSUGs after role-call.

**1 Updates: Log4j**

Tucker Brown discussed the current Log4j issue. The Log4j vulnerability instance in SUNGuide is only in DMS process and no-where else. It is running inside the FDOT network so there is no public exposure and limits vulnerability with changes being made. The Log4j library is only used for DMS when it logs and doesn’t have access to status logger. Instead of working on the issue it will be remove. Should have a patch and removal going out Thursday or Friday for complete removal and will push out to the Districts for deployment immediately.

Both 8.1 and 8.0 versions are out so will have fixes for both and the fixes for older versions will be added.

The upcoming hotfix 6 for 8.0 and hotfix 1 for 8.1 will not over-ride DMS and can be applied over the top by the Districts or with help from SwRI either way. The E-mail with the fix will be sent out and the fix should be completed as soon as it is received.

**OTM Version 4.7**

Mark Laird discussed the new build of OTM Version 4.7. It was just sent out and requires an upgrade to existing systems. Existing systems will have to have the 4.6 upgrade to get the 4.7 version. Eliminates Log4j from code and upgrades libraries files. It uses a newer version that does not have the vulnerability. The OTM system is not exposed, does not have the vulnerability so there is no risk.

**JIRA Clearing Issue**

Christine Shafik discussed the Central Office trying to clear all pending JIRA sitting and found failures that have not been cleared. SwRI is responsible for handling resolution, but some remain waiting for District response. Need Districts to select correct issue. Critical failure is the category for ‘SunGuide is down’. If application or subsystem is failing, then categorize as failure. If it is a bug there is a category as a defect.

1st ask is to categorize correctly

2nd ask is central office instructed SWRI to monitor failure issues more closely and resolve asap.

Respond back to failure within 5 business. Even if not happened again respond to the JIRA explaining what is happening. Just responding that it is not happening again is responding.

Mark asked: If something is submitted and working on it, when would updates need to be sent if still working on it?

SwRI Responded: If SwRI is reviewing they are updating every 5 days. A response back is needed when sitting in ‘more information requested’ and still ping back every 5 days especially if failure and critical type issues. Will see more information and updates more frequently when critical. Other issue for more information requested ping monthly / 2 months get emails and ask on all. Failure and critical failure will get higher priority and will try to get out of the system as soon as possible. Don’t want to sit for weeks or months with no response. But if SwRI is reviewing District is not expected to respond. Christine responded that this is correct.

Turnpike asked if there is a JIRA filter that can be used to prevent issues from falling into the cracks?

SwRI question: Filter issues not updated in 5 days or filter for no updates after 5 days

Turnpike: Is there a way to run report to check or respond in the JIRA software

SwRI: There is a way to do that or may be able to create a dashboard. Can send out filtering criteria. Currently there are 3 failure issues and 0 critical failure issues and want to get it to zero.

Christine asked if there are any more questions.

Yesterday December 15th, is the new date for all issues that are non-responsive and thank you to all responding right away. They were able to close all except for 3 or 4 due to no information back, all non-response issues closed from District inquiries. Reminder to report major issues in a timely manner and get back with the system to see if there is a question of JIRA from SwRI and more info needed. We want to clear the backlog to serve you better.

**Topic 2: SG-6120 Allow Saving Configuration of Items without Errors, Despite Errors in Other Items of the Same Type**

Mark Laird from District 6 presented on Configuration dialogue showing all devices at one time and want to make configuration change. If any outstanding issue with any devices haven’t touched, can’t save changes made even though valid.

Would like to have ability to make configuration changes with one or more items, and if no issues with changes made, be able to save those changes. As Tucker pointed out, if don’t continue to perform validation on the other items of the form you potentially never know that you have other outstanding issues on configuration issues that might be creating issues in other areas. So desirable to perform validation on other items on the form.

Jason in District 2 responded that this is useful after an update especially if there is a dialogue change.

The intent on new updates, if large scale changes is to try and get as much as possible automatically. The intent is to try to do large scale automatically or give tool to fix. The ideal case is to have tools to do large scale configuration. If continue to get areas with large scale breaks in configuration, need to know to work around.

(?) Question: are you suggesting to push validation in the upgrade process or scripts?

(?) Answer: Intent is never leave in a bad state after upgrade. But if configuration problem before will still have problem but the upgrade should not create/cause problem.

John Hope - Quest: What is enhancement encompassing? Is it allowing certain configurations to pass through validation?

Answer: Two levels of validation:

1. Is row to be modified or added causing configuration problems and if not let pass
2. Do have validation problems opening up dialogue and are configuration currently bad. If fix one row and modified row is ok, then continue and fix individually. Report other issues as continue.

Will need to develop framework and apply. Not trivial enhancement.

Support: Districts FTE, 1, 3, 5, 7

**Topic 3: SG-6044 Exclude MOT Events from Performance Measures**

Dee McTague from District 4 presented the issue to exclude secondary MOT Events resulting from primary event in performance measures. The MOT response for long term closures mostly both on general use and Express and noticeably on Express lanes there is a definite negative impact on performance measures. Closure events on Express lanes impact multiple ingress and inaccurately inflates incident and roadway clearance performance measures.

Propose means to flag secondary MOT events to be excluded from performance measures.

(?) Question: Are those secondary linked events police activities or what type?

Answer: Usually emergency vehicles. And emergency vehicles and police activity are all included event types under performance measures. The only time this was circumvented if assisting activity off freeway if ramp closures on arterial roads identify it as it was and could still be accurate to call it as an interagency coordination event to get it out of performance measures but anything in express lanes that requires closure of multiple ingress creates multiple events.

Louis in District 1- uses primary and secondary incident to link events and secondary crashes. And have thought about separating and flagging to have different mechanism to link events. Have another mechanism to separate and exclude without additional work.

District -2 – wanted to add a flag in audit process for incidents that were not to be added to performance measures.

District 6 supports. District 2 is in support and Turnpike supports but once find a solution and start creating performance measures without long term MOT events, would there be any way to run PM for prior years for comparison?

Carla: There used to be a secondary MOT event type.

Dee: No, before when operating separately, event types weren’t limited on event types as they are now with 511 system.

Carla: Maybe a secondary MOT event type that is excluded from performance measures may be a solution?

Dee: Don’t know but with express lanes experiencing it more.

(?) Possibly use a polygon area to prevent creating multiple closures. No way to use in instance of closure of express lanes that also affected general purpose lanes. But use for closure of express lanes and ingress and egress.

(?) Could SwRI pose a solution?

SwRI: Possibly flag event as a non-performance event. Not difficult. Initially proposed as an audit flag but it would be an additional step that someone has to take post event to make sure it gets done. But risk it being set unintentionally or some events that actually do want it in performance measures could be missed. Internally have discussed evaluating reports to determine if people are flagging events that should be in the end report. Hesitancy to make sure the correct events are being flagged but easiest technical solution is to put a flag on the event to not be in performance measure report.

Dee: could you tie it into a linked event of a certain type with emergency vehicles and/or police activity or whatever Districts are using to record

SwRI: If tie to that type event may exclude valid events of that type

Dee: Still have to select flag but limit when flag was available.

SwRI: Would tie to specific permission for certain operators. May have other options

Christine: Something linked to performance measures and performance reports recommends running by ITS working group

Dee: Suggests ITS working group doesn’t recognize the issue and how PM are inflated based on these types of events. They have had bad performance measures as a result.

Christine: Can offer to explain the issue and impact and get input. Most ITS working group are TSM&O engineers and if not aware, need to be made aware.

Support: District 1, 7, 3, FTE, 2, 5

**Topic 4: SG-5456 “TMC Notified”**

Jason Evans, District 2 presented the notified time stamp being entered in current event. Chronology lists TMC notified and then lists responder. The TMC notified box is checked the time stamp chronology entry looks the same. So what is the intended use of the check box? When checked line item looks the same as when it is not checked. What does the check box do?

Tucker: Recalls responders that are TMC managed and checking allows to set time stamp. Do not believe there is an underlying distinction between having checked or time stamp versus not. Just a flag, a way to set time stamp.

Dee: If notified by FHP and entered notified by FHP the time stamp is entered. If going to notify FHP then select the box.

District 2: That is how D-2 used function. In chronology, no way to know if notified by TMC or agency notified by another means in chronology. Proposed enhancement would be is to have something in the chronology line item to have TMC notified when box is checked versus just notified when box is not checked to determine based off chronology report that there is notification or possibly use parenthesis next to responder when it was notified by TMC though OTM uses that column for their purposes. Maybe putting next to responder parenthesis when box is checked.

Alex D-6 Quest: Would it be helpful to discern between incoming and outgoing. That is what flag is for due to ‘TMC notified’ can be ambiguous. Maybe make type ‘notified’ then description would be agency

Question: Checked box selected TMC notified FHP. If not checked/selected then FHP notified TMC

Alex D-6: Look into something explicit to mark incoming and outgoing

D-7 supports if intent is checked box with description would read TMC notified agency and if not, then agency notified TMC.

Amy: added source to identify where reported information was coming from.

Support: District 4

Christine asked if Tucker had what he needed and he indicated he did if the meeting was being recorded.

**Topic 5: SG-5215 SAS Missing Merge with Travel Time Options**

John Hope from CFX presented the issue of scheduling DMS messages versus SAS function of scheduling DMS message “auto merge” option is not available under SAS.

Suggesting add “auto merge” checked box to SAS configuration. If schedule DMS message, expect it to be merged with travel time but doesn’t happen. Especially for scheduled actions where know scheduled message would pop up expecting to manually merge with travel times after the fact is troublesome.

(?) Comment: Desirable but when doing it on SAS dialogue, doing it for one or more signs and may potentially override sign default and apply to all the signs.

John: Not a problem because when scheduling should know what DMS is selecting and people working are not novice operators but administrators or supervisors.

Support: District 4, 7, 3, 6, FTE, 1, 5

**Announcements:**

Christine Shafik made the following announcements:

* District 6 concluded testing for 8.1. Found one pending issue and SwRI found source of issue. They will be releasing fix and is included in hotfix 1 for 8.1 which is coming out within a week or two. If have not deployed in testing environment, please do and recommend deploy hotfix 1 at same time. It will include all issues in hotfix 6 for 8.0 plus initial enhancements and botfixes for 8.1.
* The new meeting invites for 2022 would be coming because this was the last meeting for 2021.
* The next SSUG meeting is scheduled for January 13, 2022.
* There are a few issues to present but to send any District issues and they will be scheduled accordingly.
* Otherwise Merry Christmas and Happy New Year!