

## Open Architecture CRs 2006-08-22

**CR Number:** 4727

**External Reference:** SAFER CR 960

**Category:**

**Component:** SAFER/Web Services

**Synopsis:** Add Intrastate SafeStat data to ISS carrier refresh

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2006-07-26]Recommended for FMCSA ECCB approval

**Description:** The ISS development team requested to include intrastate SafeStat data into ISS to support the single carrier refresh snapshot and monthly database refresh.

SAFER needs to be enhanced to receive the intrastate SafeStat score from A&I and store in newly added columns in SAFER database. The ISS snapshot Web services maintained by SAFER will be modified to include the intrastate SafeStat score. It was determined that the intrastate SafeStat score currently is stored in MCMIS work tables and is being updated after each regular SafeStat run.

ISS development team will need to modify the monthly database refresh routine to receive the intrastate SafeStat score.

The SAFER team will need to develop a script to extract data via database link to MCMIS and load into the SAFER database.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.

Intrastate ISS values are calculated monthly with the SafeStat runs, but are not currently posted in MCMIS production or to SAFER. Currently, these intrastate carriers have their ISS values listed in SAFER as "Insufficient Data" (when, in fact, they could have many inspections). This proposal would begin to populate the intrastate SafeStat and ISS values to SAFER and include an additional indicator to indicate that these values are based on the intrastate SafeStat results. This will involve a change to the T0031 MCMIS Census and Safety output transaction. The current proposed change will add the value "N" to the list of possible values for the Indicator field.

[2006-08-16] From SAFER Version of the CR

From Allen Day:

Here are the table names and logic to determine intra-state ISS and SafeStat values from work tables on MCMIS. These work tables are available after the SafeStat run has been validated until the next SafeStat run validation process begins.

Intra-State ISS

Table: iss\_work

safestat\_run\_ind = 'S' (intra state SafeStat) iss\_group 1-46 Safety Based ISS Values  
iss\_group 98-99 Insufficient Data ISS Values

Intra-State SafeStat

Table: SafeStat\_Information

safestat\_run\_ind = 'S' (intra state SafeStat) safestat\_category 'A',  
'B','C','D','E','F','G','H' (Safety Based/Sufficient Data) safestat\_category = 'I'  
(insufficient data/no safestat scores)

If you need more detailed information on SafeStat Indicators (RAI, EHI, AII,etc.) you can use the following join information to get the desired information:

```
FROM safestat_information a, ss_info_census b, ss_info_review c,  
ss_info_inspection d, ss_info_recordable_crash e, ss_info_enforcement f,  
ss_info_crash g  
WHERE a.safestat_information_id (+) = b.safestat_information_id and  
b.safestat_information_id = c.safestat_information_id (+) and  
b.safestat_information_id = d.safestat_information_id (+) and  
b.safestat_information_id = e.safestat_information_id (+) and  
b.safestat_information_id = f.safestat_information_id (+) and  
b.safestat_information_id = g.safestat_information_id (+) and  
a.safestat_score_date= 'safestat_run_date' and  
safestat_run_ind = 'safestat_run_indicator' ('M'onthly run, intra'S'tate SafeStat)
```

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
names:**

**Responsibility:** Salazar Sandra B.

**Modified Time:** 8/16/2006 1:39:02 PM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 7/19/2006 1:18:07 PM

**Entered By:** Roberts Onna Beth

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Enhancement

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 4674

**External  
Reference:** SAFER CR 797

**Category:**

**Component:** SAFER

**Synopsis:** Modification to data requirement for SAFETY\_CARRIER

**Status:** Open

**Disposition:** [2006-08-21] Open for discussion and comment

**Description:** \* PLEASE SEE [2006-08-14] ENTRY BELOW FOR UPDATED DESCRIPTION

PRISM stakeholder requested to re-visit the data requirement for safety\_carrier. After SAFER version 4.9, safety\_carrier becomes a conditional mandatory field in T0022 transaction. That requires CVISN/PRISM states to populate safety\_carrier data field for all vehicle uploaded to SAFER. This is not required for CVISN-only states. The proposed modification is when the IRP\_Weight\_Carried is under 6,000 lbs or to be

determined, the carrier responsible for safety of the vehicle doesn't required to have DOT number. Therefore, the safety\_carrier field does not need to be filled.

[2006-05-26] Presented and discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting. NE stated that there are two weight related issues with IRP\_WEIGHT\_CARRIED. The weight limit is 10,000 lbs. by FMCSA Rules. If the weight is under 10,000 lbs, a Carrier ID (Safety Carrier) is not required. This CR is asking to relax the constraint for CVISN/PRISM states regarding the mandatory data requirement to populate the Safety Carrier field. The Carrier ID is not required if under 10,000 lbs. CR 3094 concerns a check constraint on the IRP\_WEIGHT\_CARRIED field itself.

Volpe will post the CR to the listserv for comment.

[2006-06-20] Volpe posted the following modified description to the listserv on 6/19/06:  
PRISM stakeholder requested to re-visit the data requirement for safety\_carrier. After SAFER version 4.9, safety\_carrier becomes a conditional mandatory field in T0022 transaction. This requires CVISNstates participating in PRISM to populate safety\_carrier data field for all vehicle uploaded to SAFER. This is not required for CVISN only state.

The proposed modification is when the IRP\_weight\_Carried is under 6,000 lbs or a limit to be determined, the carrier responsible for the safety of the vehicle will not be required to have DOT number. The safety\_carrier field does not need to be filled.

The new requirement for SAFETY\_CARRIER will be as following:

1. Conditional mandatory for CVISN states participating in PRISM only if the IRP\_weight\_Carrier for the vehicle is over 6,000 lb or to be defined.
2. Optional for CVISN only states and carriers whose vehicle IRP weight carried in under 6,000 lb or to be defined

[2006-06-27] Discussed at the 6/22/06 ACCB meeting  
Volpe will rewrite the description of this CR for clarification and repost to the listserv.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.  
The Volpe SAFER team needs to discuss this with the PRISM team and then clarify the description of this CR. Volpe will repost this to the CVISN System Architects listserv for comment.

[2006-08-14] Volpe - updated SAFER CR 797 description as follows:

PRISM stakeholders were requested to re-visit the data requirement for the SAFETY\_CARRIER field. After SAFER version 4.9 was released in October 2005, the SAFETY\_CARRIER field became a conditional mandatory for PRISM states using the T0022 transaction. This requires CVISN states that participate in PRISM to populate the SAFETY\_CARRIER field for all vehicles uploaded to SAFER. This is not required for CVISN-only states.

The proposed modification to the edit check for the SAFETY\_CARRIER field is that SAFER will allow null for the SAFETY\_CARRIER field only if the GVW is provided in the T0022 transaction and the value is under 10,000 lbs and greater than 4,000 lbs. Regardless of the GVW, if the vehicle has three or more axles, the DOT number is required for the SAFETY\_CARRIER field. Other situations where the DOT number is required for PRISM are when vehicles of any size haul placardable

quantities of HM and when Limo's are subject to Federal insurance requirements that need to be defined.

Therefore the new requirement for the SAFETY\_CARRIER field should be as follows:

1. Mandatory for PRISM states and CVISN-PRISM states using the T0022 transaction.
2. Optional for CVISN-only states.
3. For CVISN-only states, "Null" is allowed as the value IF the GVW is greater than 4,000 lbs. but less than 10,000 lbs.
4. For PRISM and CVISN-PRISM states, "Null" is allowed as the value IF the GVW is greater than 4,000 lbs. but less than 10,000 lbs. AND the vehicle has less than 3 axles AND the vehicle does not haul placardable quantities of HM AND the vehicle is not a limousine subject to Federal insurance requirements.

[2006-08-21] Discussed at the 8/17/06 ACCB meeting

The PRISM team noted that this CR should be consistent with the PRISM Procedures Manual. In particular, the difference between GVW (gross vehicle weight – the weight the carrier declares at registration) and GVWR (gross vehicle weight rating – the weight that the manufacturer stamps on the inside of the power unit door) was discussed. The Volpe PRISM team agreed to reconcile the PRISM Procedures Manual with CVISN by using GVW rather than GVWR. They would also like the lower limit to be 0 rather than 4000 lbs.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment names:**

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 8/21/2006 6:49:21 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 5/15/2006 10:06:55 AM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Enhancement

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 4651

**External Reference:** CR3013, SAFER CR 705

**Category:** SAFER XML, SAFER ICD

**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Synopsis:** Implement VIN, IRP Account and IFTA Account validation for SAFER XML Service

input transaction.

**Status:** Open

**Disposition:** [2006-05-04] Open

**Description:** [2006-04-19]

CR 3013 was closed at the 3/23/06 ACCB meeting. Phase 2 of that CR is moved to this CR. The following are segments from the old CR that pertain.

"VIN validation was the topic of discussion for this CR. Jingfei Wu (Volpe) pointed out that only the data formatting rules will be enforced, and the IFTA/IRP/VIN validation will be in the following release of SAFER after receiving comments from stakeholders. Some states expressed an interest in getting a warning for invalid VINs instead of rejections. Validation is done at the jurisdiction site because of home-made VINs that the state considers valid. These VINs would fail the VIN validation routine at SAFER. It was suggested that states send their VIN patterns to Volpe so SAFER can check against those as well. Phase 1 of the implementation will be to enforce the edit checks for the formatting rules listed in the specification document. After a state is recertified, the rules will be enforced for that state. Phase 2 of this CR will enforce IFTA/IRP/VIN validation."

"The VIN/IRP account / IFTA account validation checks will be implemented in Phase 2. Iteris asked if the states will have to recertify again when Phase 2 is released. Volpe said yes. States asked if Phase 2 validation rules would cause SAFER to reject the records. Volpe said that would be up to the stakeholders. If the stakeholders only want a warning and not a rejection, then recertification wouldn't be necessary."

[2006-05-04] re discussion of CR 3013 at 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.

CR 3013 was closed, and the Phase 2 (VIN/IRP/IFTA) validation checks will be documented in Architecture CR 4651 (SAFER CR 705).

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment names:** 2005-12-19 CR3013-SAFER139\_data standardization\_Comments.xls 2006-01-25\_CR 139 Specification.doc

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 5/4/2006 12:54:01 PM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 4/19/2006 10:32:38 AM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Enhancement

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 4640

**External Reference:** CR 2555

**Category:** XML transaction processing time is too long-change the file size

**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Synopsis:** NE reports that it takes approximately 12-15 hours to process baseline XML transaction files due to XML tag overhead.

Summary: During discussion at the March ACCB meeting, states and Volpe suggested several alternatives for alleviating some of the transaction processing time problems.

Proposal: Recommend that FMCSA support further investigation by the developers into methods to alleviate the processing burden of exchanging data between SAFER and state CVIEWS.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2006-05-26] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

**Description:** During the March ACCB meeting, several comments were made as to the time it takes to process XML transactions. CR 2555 (Change the file size limit) was incorporated into this new CR.

State comments:

- XML tag overhead is hideous, carrying a lot of XML tags. Why not use on-demand on-call into the host system and not transport these files?

- Need a method of sending and receiving data so that files are not so big and rebaselining does not occur so frequently.

Volpe comments:

- SAFETYNET still uses flat files, but they will be phased out. FMCSA supports XML, not flat files.

- Suggest sending transactions as update instead of a refresh - only send fields that have changed instead of the whole record.

- Suggest that states filter out the records they don't want by using the subscription method.

[2006-04-25] Presented at the 4/20/2006 ACCB meeting.

The CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects listserv for 30-day review and comment period. The creation of this CR was an action item from the previous ACCB meeting discussion. CR 2555 was linked to this CR in StarTeam as one of the possible solutions to alleviate the processing burden for CVIEWS. One state brought up the fact that CR2555 was completely different from this CR and suggested that the two CRs should be posted separately. APL explained that they were linked together, not incorporated as one, because both had to do with processing transactions.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.

The ACCB approved the recommendation that FMCSA support further investigation by the developers into methods to alleviate the processing burden of exchanging data between SAFER and state CVIEWS.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
names:**

**Responsibility:** Salazar Sandra B.  
**Modified Time:** 5/31/2006 8:59:41 AM  
**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Entered On:** 4/10/2006 5:24:21 PM  
**Entered By:** Roberts Onna Beth  
**Severity:** Medium  
**Priority:** No  
**Type:** Suggestion  
**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 4529

**External Reference:** SAFER CR 486, SAFER CR 799

**Category:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Component:** SAFER Web services

**Synopsis:** Expand SAFER Web services to other XML transactions to support CVISN users. This includes the six input transactions and five other output transactions with which SAFER interacts with CVIEW.

**Status:** Approved

**Disposition:** [2006-05-04] Approved and scheduled for release in SAFER v5.1 (Aug 2006)

**Description:** This CR is an extension of CR 2444 (SAFER CR 21), which was in SAFER version 4.4. The SAFER Web services implemented in CR 2444 provides a query function for the CVIEW states to retrieve information directly from SAFER when data is not available in the local CVIEW system. This function is available for T0028, T0031 and T0032. This CR will apply Web services technology to all transactions. Because of the scope of the enhancement, implementation of Web services to the other five output transactions will occur in SAFER version 5.0 (Feb 2006). The implementation of Web services to the input transactions will be made in SAFER version 5.1 in August 2006.

[2006-01-25] Presented and discussed at the 1/19/06 ACCB meeting. Andrew Wilson explained the Web services approach to retrieving data from SAFER. CVIEW will be able to query SAFER for data via Web Services. Volpe is in the process of folding the Web services documentation into the ICD. The documentation will include a requirements document for this CR and individual specification documents for each transaction. There will be two phases to the implementation of this CR. The T0025, T0026, T0027, T0030, and possibly T0029 will be included in SAFER v5.0 (Feb 2006). All of the input transactions will be included in the v5.1 release (Aug 2006). There are no plans to discontinue the current FTP services.

[2006-05-04] Presented at the 4/20/06 ACCB meeting. The input transactions to be included are T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022. This CR will be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

[2006-05-15] SAFER CR 799 created in response to April ACCB meeting and

incorporated into this CR.

"This CR is an extension of CR 486 that has been implemented in SAFER version 5.0 for the output transactions. The SAFER web services implemented in SAFER CR 21 and SAFER CR 486 provide query function for the CVISN states to retrieve information directly from SAFER when data is not available in the local CVIEW system. This function is available for T0025, T0026, T0027, T0028, T0030, T0031 and T0032. This CR will apply web services technology to T0019, T0020, T0021, and T0022 input transactions. The implementation of web services to the input transactions will be made in SAFER version 5.1 in August 2006."

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.

SAFER CR 799 was spawned from SAFER CR 486 to include input transactions T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 and will be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
names:**

**Responsibility:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Modified Time:** 5/26/2006 9:39:20 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 1/20/2006 6:23:57 AM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Enhancement

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 3830

**External  
Reference:** SAFER CR 800, CR 3115, Volpe CR 431

**Category:** SAFER XML

**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Synopsis:** Add the following data to the Carrier Snapshot, which will be distributed via T0031 V2: (1) a count of the number of inspections in the last 24 months that had the OS/OW field checked, and (2) HazMat permit data.

**Status:** Approved

**Disposition:** [2006-03-30] Approved and scheduled for SAFER v5.1 release (Aug 2006)

**Description:** At the 6/23/05 ACCB meeting, OK requested that the T0031 contain a count of how many inspections in the last 24 months had the OS/OW field checked. This request was originally added to CR 3115.

[2005-08-22] During the 8/18/05 ACCB meeting it was decided that this portion of CR 3115 would be separated out into its own CR so the inclusion of CR 3115 could

proceed in the next SAFER update (Oct 3). Volpe checked with the MCMIS team concerning the request for the count of how many inspections in the last 24 months had the OS/OW field checked. There is no such field at this time, and it will require a new calculation.

[2005-09-22] Discussed at 9/22/05 ACCB meeting.

This CR was created because the data requested from MCMIS was not available to be incorporated into CR 3115 for the October 3rd Release of SAFER. Recommended for Approval.

FMCSA has requested that HazMat permit database added to the company snapshot in the future release. This CR has been approved by FMCSA to be implemented in FY 2006.

[2006-01-25] Presented and discussed at the 1/19/06 ACCB meeting.

This CR may be implemented in two phases. It is expected that the HazMat part of the CR will be included in SAFER v5.0 (Feb 2006). The OS/OW record count may not be ready by February and would then be included in SAFER v5.1 (Aug 2006).

[2006-03-21] Presented at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.

This was not released in SAFER 5.0 as planned. The SAFER side of the implementation is done, but the MCMIS side still needs to be completed. This CR will be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

[2006-05-04] Presented at the 2006-04-20 ACCB meeting.

The MCS-150 fields will also be added to this CR. This CR will be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

[2006-05-15]

SAFER CR 800 covers the MCS-150 fields (see above) as follows:

"This is continuation of CR 431. In summary, the follow data are requested to be included in the T0031v2 transaction. 1. Jamie Vasser requested to include domicile country code to be used by long haul mexican carrier insurance verification.in ASPEN, ISS, SAFETYNET. Louisiana has requested to add the reords count for the over size / over weight commercial vehicles inspected during the 24 months period to the T0031 transaction. 2. PRISM requested to include additional MCS 150 data fields. 3. FMCSA has requested to add HazMat permit data to the company snapshot. 4. Louisiana has requested to add the reords count for the over size / over weight commercial vehicles inspected during the 24 months period to the T0031 transaction. This will requires MCMIS to calculate the count and modify the materialized view to include the inspection count. Once MCMIS modifies the program. SAFER load will be changed accordingly. ACCB meeting has approved this CR for FMCSA consideration in 09/2005. This CR has been approved by FMCSA to be implemented in FY 2006. SAFER has implemented part of the changes during release 1. The rest will be implemented in release 2 in August 2006."

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.

Deadline for adding new data elements is mid June, 2006. Currently, the new data elements to be included in the T0031 v2 transaction for SAFER Release 5.1 in August are: domicile country code, additional MCS 150 fields, HazMat permit data and the count of how many inspections in the last 24 months had the OS/OW field checked.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
names:**

**Responsibility:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Modified Time:** 5/26/2006 9:41:02 AM  
**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Entered On:** 8/19/2005 7:22:57 AM  
**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Severity:** Medium  
**Priority:** No  
**Type:** Enhancement  
**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 3670

**External Reference:** SAFER CR 143, SAFER CR 302

**Category:** SAFER XML

**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Synopsis:** Develop a Business Use Case for E-screening Enrollment and Transponder ID Management

**Status:** Open

**Disposition:** [2006-07-26] Open pending further discussion.

**Description:** [2005-06-21] SAFER CR 302

This change request is created to address Call # 79695 initiated by Cambridge Systematics.

During recent development work on the Electronic Screening transaction for Connecticut, Cambridge Systematics described a business case scenario which SAFER does not handle in the current design of SAFER.

Transaction T0023 contains a list of states that the carrier authorizes SAFER to send its vehicles' transponder IDs to. If the state sends in another T0023 with one authorized state removed, does SAFER send out information to that state to remove those transponders?

It seems to suggest that when a carrier removes an authorized jurisdiction from the T0023 transaction SAFER needs a capability to inform the state and delete the transponder information associated with all vehicles owned by the particular carrier.

[2005-06-29] Presented and discussed at the 6/23/05 ACCB meeting.

It was suggested that resending the T0023 Carrier Authorization Input Transaction (E-Screening Enrollment) with a state removed would accomplish the goal of removing an authorized jurisdiction. Alana Gourneau (SD) offered to talk to CSI for further information/clarification of this CR. CR remains open pending further discussion.

[2005-08-02] Presented and discussed at the 7/28/05 ACCB meeting  
Cambridge Systems, Inc. (CSI), explained the reasoning behind the request for a delete function for the T0024 transaction.

- A T0023 transaction is sent to SAFER authorizing States A, C, and D to receive vehicle transponder data.
- A new T0023 transaction is sent to SAFER authorizing States E, C, and D to receive vehicle transponder data.
- Delete transponder numbers from State A's vehicles since they are no longer authorized to receive the data.

Volpe will look into the requirement for SAFER to send out a T0024 with blank transponder numbers to delete the transponder numbers from State A's vehicle records. Volpe also suggested sending out a T0024 that includes the transponder numbers when a State is added to the T0023 transaction. This CR will remain open pending further SAFER analysis.

[2005-11-28] Discussed at the 11/17/05 CVISN ACCB meeting.  
This CR and SAFER CR 143 (Modify the XML T0029 transaction not to include records that do not have transponder information) will be combined for further analysis and to develop a Business Use Case for e-screening enrollment and transponder ID management to enable states to see how it ties into their business processes. The Business Use Case will be presented to the ACCB for further discussion. The synopsis was changed to reflect this change.

[2006-05-04] SAFER CR 302 Presented at the 4/20/06 CVISN ACCB meeting.  
Transaction T0023 contains a list of states to which a carrier authorizes SAFER to send its vehicles' transponder IDs. If a carrier wants to remove an authorized jurisdiction, the state sends in another T0023 without the jurisdiction that is no longer authorized. SAFER needs a capability to inform the no-longer-authorized state and delete the transponder information associated with all vehicles owned by the particular carrier. There was some discussion regarding a similar capability for adding an authorized vehicle. The ACCB suggested that VOLPE update the CR to explain the process in more detail. Volpe needs to modify the CR to make sure the interpretation of the request is correct and resubmit to the ACCB.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.  
The ACCB agreed that this CR should be added to the list of e-screening issues and discussed further. Architecture CR 3670 asks Volpe to develop a Business Use Case for E-screening Enrollment and Transponder ID Management. The E-screening Use Case could be used as a mechanism to clarify the existing e-screening process for the stakeholders. This SAFER CR was incorporated into Arch CR 3670 (Synopsis: Develop a Business Use Case for E-screening Enrollment and Transponder ID Management), which will be discussed along with other issues in the E-screening Enrollment focus group.

-----  
Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States:

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
names:**

**Responsibility:** Stuart Mary W.

**Modified Time:** 7/26/2006 9:44:11 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 6/21/2005 8:29:46 AM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Enhancement

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 3114

**External Reference:** SAFER CR 173

**Reference:**

**Category:** SAFER XML

**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Synopsis:** Enhance T0032 transaction to include additional company information.

Summary: This transaction will be versioned to add additional company information to the L&I transaction.

Action: States are requested to comment as to whether there are additional L&I data fields they would like to see added to the T0032v2 transaction not currently seen in the T0032 transaction.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2006-03-21] Approved and scheduled for SAFER v5.1 release (Aug 2006)

**Description:** Missouri has requested that the following data elements be added to the T0032 transaction:

---Add the carrier's business street, business city, business state, and business zip to the T0032 xml file. ---Add BOC3 yes or no indicator to the T0032 XML file.

---Add Blanket Company field to the T0032 XML file.

---Dependent upon the criteria of the statuses, we might need a status effective date for the Common\_Auth\_Status and Contract\_Auth\_Status fields if the status and the dates are not timed properly.

General statements from Missouri:

Missouri is implementing a new web-based system for a one-stop shop and would like to use federal data for filing requirements for the Single State Registration Program. If we have sufficient information, we can continue to monitor federal data and use the

data without additional filing requirements in our state. This would allow us to know immediately when the federal authority is inactive and can take the same action at the state level in conjunction with our credentials issued. In order to use this data, we believe that additional data elements for this program are needed as outlined below.

The T0032 file, which contains information about authority granted under the MC number, does not contain the business address. This address which is defined as the carrier's principle place of business where their headquarters are located, is needed within this file for use by states under the SSRS program because some reciprocity agreements waive fees based on principle place of business. I know that a physical address is in the T0031 file address, and although in most instances is the same address as what would be shown in the T0032 file, it has a different definition. That address is defined as where the safety records are maintained and can be made available. In Missouri's experience, for the most part, these two addresses are the same. We have found, however, that they can be, and in some cases are, different and must be respected as different. This makes it more important that we have the right address with the right definition. States can get into trouble if we either collect or fail to collect proper fees for other jurisdictions.

Also, in looking historically at the Licensing and Insurance file, we find that the status of the carrier shows ACTIVE and the BOC3 file shows "NO" quite often. This tells us that the BOC3 requirements are not being met and the carrier is in noncompliance even though the status is ACTIVE. What would be helpful to Missouri is to have that field in the T0032 file along with the Blanket Company field. We could then police that requirement and have the carrier file it when it is not on file. If we could rely on the data to be filed when it should be, we would not need this information.

[2005-04-25] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2005-04-21. This transaction will be versioned to add additional company information to the transaction (T0032v2). States will only have to make modifications to their systems if they want these fields. Volpe asked the states if there are other L&I data fields that should be included in the new transaction. This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comment and review.

[2005-05-04] Wisconsin posted the following request for additional data fields via the CVISN System Architects list serv.

From enforcement: Not sure what's there now, but we will need to have real-time access to operating authority information for ALL carriers. The FMCSA requires that we place carriers operating without authority or beyond the scope of their authority out-of-service at the roadside.

From Insurance/Authority/SSRS program: It would be nice if we had accurate information on true legal name, company officers, EIN number and when they are revoked what is the specific reason why.

[2005-05-24] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2005-05-19. Volpe will check on the availability of the additional fields requested by WI. The CR was recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2005-05-27] Volpe's response (via list serv) to additional fields requested by WI: After checking with the L&I team, it appears that ownership/company officers and EIN are stored in MCMIS. SAFER currently gets EIN from MCMIS via the MCMIS load program but not ownership/company officers. We need to add ownership/company officers to the company snapshot in order to get the data from MCMIS. SAFER also receives the legal name from MCMIS, not L&I, but they are the same legal name. If you could verify that this is the legal name you are asking for, that would be great.

Operating authority does not apply to "ALL carriers" but only to for-hire, which is a small subset. As far as L&I goes, they are only revoked because of insurance lapses.

[2005-06-29] Presented for informational purposes at 6/23/05 ACCB meeting. This CR was presented for informational purposes only since it was already recommended for FMCSA approval last month. Volpe responded to WI's request for additional fields in the T0032 Licensing and Insurance Update transaction. EIN and ownership/company officers are currently stored in MCMIS. SAFER currently gets EIN from MCMIS via the MCMIS load program but not ownership/company officers. Volpe would need to add ownership/company officers to the company snapshot in order to get the data from MCMIS. Volpe suggested that since the snapshots were being changed, the additional fields should be requested from MCMIS. These fields will be incorporated in the T0031V2 MCMIS Safety and Census Update Output Transaction under CR 3115.

[2006-03-21]  
This is an August release candidate for T0032 transaction.

[2006-05-04] Presented at 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.  
The enhancements will be incorporated in the T0032v2 transaction.

-----  
Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States:

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
names:**

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 5/4/2006 12:56:11 PM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 4/15/2005 9:32:35 AM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Suggestion

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 3094

**External Reference:** SAFER CR 164

**Reference:**

**Category:** SAFER XML, EDI

**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Synopsis:** Add a check constraint to SAFER for the value of IRP\_WEIGHT\_CARRIED.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2006-06-23] Recommended for ECCB approval

**Description:** [2005-02-14] contents from Volpe CR 164

This CR is created for a defect identified by MDCVIEW & APLCVIEW. Some vehicle data provided by SAFER has IRP\_Weight\_Carried with a null, blank or zero value. It is suggested that there should be a constraint for the value of IRP\_Weight\_Carried submitted from CVIEW.

If Vehicle\_IRP\_Juris.IRP\_Jurisdiction is not null, the Vehicle\_IRP\_Juris.IRP\_Weight\_Carried must be a number greater than 10,000. Blank, null and zero weights should not be allowed.

In the current design of SAFER, Vehicle\_IRP\_Juris.IRP\_Jurisdiction and Vehicle\_IRP\_Juris.IRP\_Weight\_Carried are both mandatory fields for XML input. However there is no specific requirement for the input value. The datatype of Vehicle\_IRP\_Juris.IRP\_Weight\_Carried is Varchar(8) which allows blank, null and zero values to exist in SAFER.

Volpe will perform technical analysis to determine whether the value checking shall be implemented during the input process or at the database level.

[2005-03-01] Presented and discussed at the 2/17/05 ACCB meeting.

Volpe pointed out that SAFER release 4.9 will already make this a mandatory field whenever a jurisdiction is provided, which meets a significant objective of the CR. The remaining significant issue is to block zero values. The ACCB decided that this CR could be incorporated into SAFER CR 139 (Arch CR 3013): Standardization of data values in XML input transactions and will be discussed at the next ACCB meeting.

This CR was therefore disapproved and closed

[2006-03-30] Presented at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.

No edit checks are done on this element, so that zero, null or blank weights are possible. This data element holds the "cab card weight" for each jurisdiction, and the value is used for e-screening. The original response to the CR included a lower bound of 10,000 pounds, but, after discussion, it was decided to simply require a numerical value greater than zero. The ACCB originally closed this CR in February, 2005, and included the contents in SAFER CR 139/Architecture CR 3013. Both CRs will be re-opened in their original state instead of including this problem in the new Phase 2 CR for 139/3013. This CR is a candidate for SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

[2006-05-04] Presented at the 2006-04-20 ACCB meeting.

Instead of deleting the IRP\_Weight\_Carried limit from the CR, the ACCB agreed on updating the CR to state that the IRP\_Weight\_Carried must be a number greater than

6,000 pounds. This CR is a candidate for SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.  
Volpe updated this CR to set the constraint at 6000 lbs. Some states use a lower threshold for IRP\_WEIGHT\_CARRIED. This CR will be reposted to the listserv requesting comments from the states regarding the lowest boundary allowed for the edit check on IRP\_WEIGHT\_CARRIED.

APL will re-post to the CVISN System Architects' listserv asking the states to comment on what they think the lowest threshold should be for the IRP\_WEIGHT\_CARRIED field.

[2006-06-23] Discussed at the 6/22/06 ACCB meeting.  
The ACCB decided to recommend this CR for FMCSA approval, setting a lower limit of 4000 pounds for IRP\_Weight\_Carried.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
names:**

**Responsibility:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Modified Time:** 6/27/2006 12:03:11 PM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 2/14/2005 3:46:44 PM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 2936

**External  
Reference:** SAFER CR 348

**Category:** New data element needed

**Component:** CVISN Architecture and Standards

**Synopsis:** A source, other than the authoritative source, may submit e-screening enrollment data to SAFER. States requested a data element to track the source of the transponder data.

Summary: Any state can update e-screening information (XML T0024). States do not object to an unauthorized state submitting transponder information for another state, as long as the vehicle registration data is not affected.

Proposal: Add a data element to track the source of the transponder data.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2006-03-21] Approved and scheduled for SAFER v5.1 release (Aug 2006)

**Description:** [2004-08-23] At the teleconference on 2004-08-16 to discuss CR 2798, it was noted that any state can update e-screening information (XML T0024). States did not object to an unauthorized state submitting transponder information for another state, as long as the vehicle registration data is not affected. Washington requested a data element to track the source of the transponder data.

This was also mentioned at the 2004-08-19 ACCB meeting.

[2004-09-27] Presented and discussed at the 2004-09-27 ACCB meeting.  
CR 2936 will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comments and will be voted on at the October ACCB.

[2004-10-25] Presented and discussed at the 2004-10-21 ACCB meeting.  
There were no dissenting votes so the CR was recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2005-08-02]  
This CR was recommended for FMCSA approval in October 2004, but a SAFER CR was not written. Volpe now has created SAFER CR 348 and will discuss it with FMCSA.

[2006-03-21]  
Pending in SAFER. This is to be implemented in August release of SAFER.

[2006-05-04] Presented and discussed at the 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.  
At the March 2006 ACCB meeting, states requested that Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122), which addresses management of update authority for vehicle registration data, be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1. Since Architecture CR 2936 addresses management of update authority for transponder data, states suggested that the scope of Architecture CR 2798 be expanded to include other transactions, including transponder data. Volpe pointed out that the testing requirements for implementing the CR would expand significantly. Volpe said that the implementation of Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122) will create audit tables only and will not involve sending output transactions. Volpe will re-write these CRs. APL suggested they be kept as separate CRs, but reflect this discussion about what the states really want.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.  
Architecture CRs 2936 (e-screening data) and 2798 (IRP registration data) deal with Authoritative Source. Volpe will check with FMCSA to see if both can be incorporated in SAFER Release 5.1. If not, then maybe CR 2936 can be included in 5.1 and CR 2798 in Release 5.2.

-----  
Impact on architecture:  
Change to CVIEW - SAFER XML interface at detailed level

Impact on documentation:  
SAFER ICD

Impact on states:  
If the information is just captured in a SAFER table, none.  
If XML transactions are versioned to accept/report this data element, then states exchanging escreening data would need to use the versioned schemas and may need to change processing.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment names:**  
**Responsibility:**  
**Modified Time:** 5/26/2006 9:44:13 AM  
**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Entered On:** 8/23/2004 12:22:08 PM  
**Entered By:** Salazar Sandra B.  
**Severity:** Medium  
**Priority:** No  
**Type:** Defect  
**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 2798  
**External Reference:** SAFER 122; DJ Waddell - MD - 240-228-5878  
**Category:** Business rules/process to clarify data source  
**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW  
**Synopsis:** Synopsis: Data integrity issues are resulting from a source other than the authoritative source submitting vehicle registration data to SAFER.

Summary: A source other than the authoritative source can submit vehicle registration data to SAFER. If the authoritative source later updates the information, the data already in SAFER may be overwritten. Business rules/process need to be established (a) to clarify the source of data and (b) to coordinate data entry/update by authoritative source and authorized but not 'authoritative' source.

Proposal: The proposal consists of several clauses.

1. A state (in most cases, a "non-participating" state) may authorize another state to send vehicle registration data to SAFER on its behalf; this must be documented by letter/email. Letter/email will also be required to withdraw the authorization.
2. A new table in SAFER will be created to keep track of which states are authorized to send vehicle registration data to SAFER for any given state. The default would be that only the IRP base state would be authorized to send vehicle registration data to SAFER.
3. Volpe will consider whether the new table is also the appropriate place to store contact information.
4. If a state that is not authorized according to the process attempts to send vehicle registration data (XML T0020, T0021, or T0022) for another state to SAFER, the XML transactions will be rejected and the IRP base state will be notified that an unauthorized state has attempted to send vehicle registration data on its behalf.
5. The REGISTRATION\_START\_DATE will be a mandatory field and REGISTRATION\_EXPIRE\_DATE will be a conditionally mandatory field in the vehicle registration data.
6. The table will be posted in some form on the CVISN website.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2006-05-26] Recommended for SAFER Release 5.1 or 5.2.

**Description:** A source other than the authoritative source, such as an e-screening enrollment system, can submit vehicle registration data to SAFER. If the authoritative source (e.g. IRP base state) later updates the information, the data already in SAFER, such as the e-screening enrollment information, may be overwritten. Business rules or a process need to be established (a) to clarify the source of data and (b) to coordinate data entry/update by authoritative source and authorized but not 'authoritative' source.

[2004-07-12] per DJ Waddell 7/8/04

Scenario: Vehicle operators want to enroll in Maryland's e-screening program, but their IRP base state has not provided registration data for the vehicle to SAFER.

Maryland's e-screening enrollment system collects data from the registrant, creates a vehicle registration record in CVIEW, and then enrolls the specified carrier and vehicle for the Maryland e-screening program. Data details are below. Maryland's e-screening enrollment program is operated by state agencies under the Maryland DOT, as is Maryland's IRP office.

Once the registration data is entered, the e-screening enrollment process may proceed, collecting the transponder number and the jurisdictions to enroll for. Technically, transponder number is part of the Vehicle\_VIN table, so it is registration data.

The registration data is sent to SAFER by MD CVIEW.

Analysis is needed on potential data collisions. If an authoritative source for vehicle registration data begins to contribute data to SAFER, and provides an update to one of the registration records entered by another source, the new data will probably overwrite the data already in SAFER. For example, if the IRP base state updates registration data entered by the MD e-screening program, this would probably un-enroll the vehicle from MD E-Screening, since transponder number and CVIS\_DEFAULT\_CARRIER USDOT number would probably not be provided by the IRP base state, and they would probably be replaced by NULL.

A process is needed to "close the loop" with non-participating states to inform them of data submitted listing them as the IRP Base State, and to request new expiration dates when license plates are renewed for enrolled vehicles. For example, MD would like to have in place ASAP an email list for the IRP offices for each jurisdiction. Then when a vehicle registration record is created or modified for e-screening enrollment, an email would be sent (possibly/someday automatically) to the corresponding jurisdiction's designated IRP office. MD proposes that the change go into CVIEW and SAFER with no action from the base jurisdiction, as it does now, with a plan/process in place so that it could be retracted if the base jurisdiction objects, with any eye to automating that process as well.

Vehicle Registration Data Fields:

Mandatory Fields:

VIN

License plate number

License plate state (= IRP base state)

Registration expiration date

IRP registered weight for the e-screening state

USDOT number of the carrier responsible for the safe operation of the vehicle

Transponder identifier

Optional Fields:

Title number  
Title jurisdiction  
Owner name  
Unit number  
Model year  
Make  
Type  
Fuel type  
GVW  
Unladen weight  
Number of axles (truck)  
Number of seats (bus)  
Registration start date

[2004-07-19] Presented and discussed at the 7/15/04 ACCB meeting.  
This CR will be posted to the CVISN Systems Architects list serv for discussion; no decision is being proposed at this time. A conference call will be scheduled for the week of August 16 if states are interested.

[2004-08-11] Andrew Wilson posted a document and a spreadsheet to the CVISN System Architect list serv. Both are available via the Attachments tab.

1. The attached Word document contains some background notes for the upcoming conference regarding CVISN Architecture CR 2798.
2. The attached spreadsheet contains the number of IRP records by IRP base state currently in the SAFER database. The relatively small number of records for some states are typically records that were entered to support E-Screening enrollment or PRISM vehicle targeting for another State.

[2004-08-23] This CR was discussed at the July and August ACCB meetings, and at a special teleconference on August 16, 2004. The proposal described in the "Synopsis" section was developed and refined at those meetings. Corrected minutes from the 2004-08-16 meeting are attached to this CR.

[2004-09-08] There is a correction to the minutes of the 19 Aug ACCB meeting. Item 3-5 should read: "5. The REGISTRATION\_START\_DATE and REGISTRATION\_EXPIRE\_DATE will be mandatory fields in the vehicle registration data."

[2004-09-27] Presented and discussed at the 2004-09-23 ACCB meeting.  
Item 3-5 was modified to read: "The REGISTRATION\_START\_DATE will be a mandatory field and REGISTRATION\_EXPIRE\_DATE will be a conditionally mandatory field in the vehicle registration data."

This CR was recommended for FMCSA approval. It will also be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for review.

[2006-03-30] Presented at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.  
Currently, State A can submit registration data for State B, and SAFER would not reject the transaction. A proposal was developed by a subcommittee of the ACCB and later approved and recommended for FMCSA approval in September 2004. SAFER CR 122 is pending and Volpe said that it was not a current candidate for the SAFER 5.1 release in August. States on the call felt strongly that the issue of management of update authority should be resolved as soon as possible and that the CR should be considered a high priority for the 5.1 release.

[2006-05-04] re discussion of CR 2936 at 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.  
At the March 2006 ACCB meeting, states requested that Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122), which addresses management of update authority for vehicle registration data, be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1. Since Architecture CR 2936 addresses management of update authority for transponder data, states suggested that the scope of Architecture CR 2798 be expanded to include other transactions, including transponder data. Volpe pointed out that the testing requirements for implementing the CR would expand significantly. Volpe said that the implementation of Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122) will create audit tables only and will not involve sending output transactions. Volpe will re-write these CRs. APL suggested they be kept as separate CRs, but reflect this discussion about what the states really want.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.  
Architecture CRs 2936 (e-screening data) and 2798 (IRP registration data) deal with Authoritative Source. Volpe will check with FMCSA to see if both can be incorporated in SAFER Release 5.1. If not, then maybe CR 2936 can be included in 5.1 and CR 2798 in Release 5.2.

-----  
Impact on architecture:  
None

Impact on documentation:  
SAFER ICD

Impact on States:  
States will need to implement the process described in the proposal.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment names:** CR2798 analysis\_V02.doc CR2798 IRPCounts.xls ACCB CR 2798 Minutes 2004-08-16\_v2.doc Minutes of CVISN ACCB Meeting August 19 2004 - Correction to CR 2798.rtf

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 5/26/2006 9:49:27 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 7/12/2004 8:59:22 AM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 2562

**External Reference:** SAFER CR # 50

**Category:** XML, EDI, ICD  
**Component:** CVISN Architecture and Standards  
**Synopsis:** Request to review SAFER business rule regarding multiple VINs  
**Status:** Open  
**Disposition:** [2005-03-01] Open pending further comment and analysis.  
**Description:** Submitted on Dec 16th, 2003  
Nebraska is requesting that the following SAFER business rule be reviewed.

The second business rule we would like reviewed is the requirement that the SAFER extract file does not allow more than one VIN entry within the same jurisdiction. It is my understanding that the file may contain duplicate VIN entries across jurisdictions but not within a jurisdiction. The same scenario that would create the situation where a vehicle appears in two jurisdictions could also happen, and does with some regularity, within a jurisdiction.

Vehicle A is registered under Carrier ABC Co. at the beginning of the registration year. Six months into the registration year, Vehicle A breaks lease with carrier ABC Co. and leases onto Carrier XYZ, Co. Carrier ABC Co. waits several weeks to file the appropriate paper work to transfer registration fees from Vehicle A to newly added vehicle B. During the interim, vehicle A is technically active in both carrier ABC Co. and XYZ Co. Carrier ABC Co. paid registration fees for vehicle A and until such time that they direct the Department to either refund or transfer those fees, the vehicle remains active in their fleet. Carrier XYZ Co. has also paid registration fees for the same vehicle, so the vehicle is also active (albeit with a different plate number) in that fleet. I understand that from an enforcement perspective this may seem confusing, but today, if a check by VIN, were conducted on the Nebraska system under the example above, both vehicles would appear active until specific carrier initiated action would require us to inactivate one.

[2004-03-11] Discussed at 2004-01-15 ACCB meeting.  
It was recommended that states not send a vehicle registration to SAFER when it is in a transitional state.

It is recommended that Volpe review this business rule as documented in the SAFER v4.2 ICD and as implemented in SAFER.

[2004-08-23] Discussed at 2004-08-19 ACCB meeting.  
This CR, related to the problem of multiple VINs, was submitted by Nebraska in December, 2003. Nebraska has developed a workaround (handling the situation via edit, so that duplicate records are not sent to SAFER). This CR will be closed. However, Volpe will consider this issue as it relates to PRISM and potential future merging of data requirements and business rules of the CVISN and PRISM programs.

[2005-02-08] Discussed at 2005-01-20 ACCB meeting (as Volpe CR 50)  
Volpe updates 2005-02-03 to CR 50:  
"At the request of the stakeholder, this CR is reopened since CR 50 was created primarily for a transitional data issue. There are other business scenarios where non-transitional data in the state IRP system need to be uploaded to SAFER but are currently rejected by SAFER due to the business rule violation. The data sent by the states may contain both active and inactive records for the same vehicle as states desire to have inactive statuses sent to SAFER in order to ensure that the most accurate data are kept there and sent to other jurisdictions. This would require SAFER to modify the business logic to allow one vehicle to have more than one record

accepted during data input processing. Additionally, states may have business practices where multiple license plates need to exist for one vehicle within the jurisdiction and this is not allowed by the existing SAFER business rule.

The current SAFER system implements the following business rules for vehicle registration transaction:

RULE 1: A VIN can only have one PLATE/STATE within a state at any given time.

RULE 2: A PLATE/STATE can only be assigned to one VIN within a state at any given time

Since modification of the business rules has great impact on the data exchanged between CVISN and SAFER, and potentially between CVISN/PRISM and SAFER, Volpe would like to re-evaluate the validity of the current business rules whether or not they support the current business practices and the future business requirements. Volpe would also like to solicit comments and feedback from the states whether there is sufficient interest in implementing the changes."

End Volpe 2005-02-03 updates.-----

[2005-03-01] Presented and discussed at the 2/17/05 ACCB meeting.

Comments from several states generally supported the idea that the proposed change would reflect business practices in their states. On the other hand, there were several states that currently follow the same business rules that SAFER has in place and opposed the idea. It was inconclusive at this point whether it was necessary or desirable (or neither) to modify the SAFER rules. Discussion was deferred until the March ACCB meeting. More input is needed from States.

IMPACT on architecture:

No impact on documentation (other than SAFER ICD)

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment names:**

**Responsibility:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Modified Time:** 3/1/2005 9:45:09 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 3/23/2004 10:13:12 AM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 2412

**External Reference:** Tania Rossouw, Wisconsin; SAFER CR 10

**Category:** SAFER XML in, SAFER XML out service, ICD  
**Component:** CVISN Architecture and Standards  
**Synopsis:** Implement SAFER XML subscription capability.  
**Status:** Recommended  
**Disposition:** [2006-03-29] Recommended for inclusion in SAFER Release 5.1  
**Description:** SAFER 4.2 XML support does not include an XML subscription capability, as was implemented for EDI transactions. Submitted by WI on 10/16/2003.

States cannot request XML snapshots for data from specific states or other criteria, as is available for EDI transactions. There is a concern that this may become a problem, due to the volume of data that is being transmitted and that needs to be processed.

[2003-10-17 ncm] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2003-10-16. Volpe has started to look into this problem.

During a TELECON on 12/17/03, WI indicated this to be their third highest priority for WI-submitted SAFER CR's 9, 10, 21. They also indicated they are doing some filtering on downloaded transactions but have concerns with the size of the transaction files and their associated transmissions costs (WI CVIEW is billed back at a per transaction rate).

[20040120] Volpe Analysis and proposed solutions:

While performing technical analysis on options to implement XML subscription capability, Volpe received a proposal from MMA, which is similar to one of the approaches being considered but which is more convenient for the state users. Further discussion of the approach in particular between the Volpe Center and MMA suggests it is a valid and feasible option. The major benefit of it would be less data volume for states to download from SAFER and thus would help to eliminate the XML overhead and processing problem states might have.

To implement this approach, SAFER would divide each output transaction file into files specific for each state and rename the files accordingly. In the T0025 output directory one might see the following files:

T0025\_ID\_20040102...\_ud.zip  
T0025\_MT\_20040102...\_ud.zip  
T0025\_UT\_20040102...\_ud.zip  
T0025\_NE\_20040102...\_ud.zip  
T0025\_MD\_20040102...\_ud.zip

In the T0025\_ID\_20040102...\_ud.zip file one would find IFTA information about carriers based only in Idaho. In the T0025\_UT\_20040102...\_ud.zip file one would find IFTA information about carriers based only in Utah. File T0025\_20040102...\_ud.zip containing IFTA information about all carriers will be generated as usual.

The same methodology could be applied to all transaction sets except the T0031 transaction set and possibly the T0032 transaction set, which Volpe does not envision changing.

Whether the subscription capability should be available for baseline file generation is pending for discussion.

During the interim, a new FTP directory could be created for each transaction, such as T0025sub for transaction T0025. The new directory T0025sub would be used to store

the output subscription files for T0025; example file names:  
T0025\_WI\_2004010101\_ud.zip  
T0025\_NE\_2004020202\_ud.zip  
T0025\_NE\_2004030303\_ud.zip

Two options could be supported by SAFER to the CVISN states to either download all the files for the specific transaction, or download subscription outputs from the subscription directory. States desiring to receive subscriptions would need to make source code changes in the CVIEW application to identify the state-specific files in the subscription directories. No change is required for the states not using subscriptions.

Please note this particular suggestion only provides the "Regional" function of the subscription. Other subscription capabilities will be implemented at later time.

[2004-03-11] Presented at the 2/26/04 ACCB meeting.

The suggested approach is essentially a self-subscribing process. States clarified their requirement for XML subscriptions: the output transaction file for State X should contain the data for vehicles/carriers authorized to operate in State X. Also, the issue of handling the data from PRISM states (targeted vehicles) was addressed. The file sent from PRISM states to SAFER does not contain the jurisdiction/weights data. It was suggested that all of the PRISM targeted vehicle information be written to one separate transaction file. Volpe took an action item to further analyze the proposed solution for the XML subscription capability.

[2004-06-16] See attached overview.

#### Proposed Requirements

- The subscription function shall support both baseline and update files. The time interval of the subscription output depends on the time interval that is configured for SAFER system and the availability of the update data.
- States shall define or modify their subscriptions using a web interface through SAFER web site.
- Access to the subscription link shall be limited to the privileged state users.
- After completion of the subscription request, an email shall be sent to the subscriber confirming the requested data sets or notifying of any subscription failure.
- The SAFER Subscription Service shall fulfill states' subscriptions based on the requests pre-defined by the states in the previous step. For each output transaction, SAFER shall generate the subscription data list by states, as well as a full set of snapshots as it currently does.
- Each subscribed state shall have a subscription folder created under each output transaction directory where the subscription output shall be stored. For example, for transaction T0025, the subscription folder for Wisconsin will be "SUBU\_WI", where U stands for update. Other values for the 4th character in the folder name include: B for baseline, P for PRISM subscription.

#### Notes:

- The XML subscription function will be first available though the FTP interface, and will be extended to use the SAFER web service in the future.

[2004-06-21] Presented and discussed at the 6/17/04 ACCB meeting. Since this CR was discussed in April, Volpe has provided analysis and requirements. Volpe will provide an estimate of cost and schedule to Janet Curtis. The states indicated that this CR is only of value if there is the capability of selecting the vehicles that operate in the state (versus only vehicles with base registration for the state). Volpe will add this as a requirement (output for vehicles that operate in state "x"). With this addition, Nebraska, Idaho, and Wisconsin agree that this CR should be implemented. The CR will be posted on the CVISN Systems Architects list serv for review.

[2004-07-19]

One state responded to the list serv posting and agreed with the request for an XML subscription capability.

Presented at the 7/15/04 ACCB meeting. This CR was recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2004-07-26] Clarification from Andrew Wilson 7/23/04

I would like to submit for discussion a clarification of the Requirement concerning filtering for the proposed XML subscription capability:

For the SAFER XML subscription service, the "Primary Filtering" shall filter records pertaining to vehicles or carriers and only include those records that are authorized to operate in the subscribing state.

Proposed algorithm for Primary Filtering for SAFER XML subscriptions. For vehicle records, the filtering will be based on whether there exists an IRP jurisdiction record for the vehicle and the state subscriber.

Based on the set of vehicles authorized to operate in the subscribing state, the XML subscription service shall compute a list of carriers that operate in the subscribing state.

For records that are indexed by DOT number, the filtering will be based on the computed list of carriers that operate in the subscribing state.

[2005-10-05] Implemented in SAFER v4.8 - closed.

[2006-03-29] Presented at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.

This was partially implemented (T0028 only) in October, 2005. It will be extended to T0031 and possibly other transactions. States should let Volpe know which other transactions are of interest. Both the architecture and SAFER versions will be reopened to include additional transactions. This is a candidate for SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

\*\*\*\*\*

Impact on architecture:  
Change to CVIEW - SAFER XML interface at detailed level

Impact on documentation:  
SAFER ICD

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment names:** CR2412 (SAFER CR 10) summary.doc  
**Responsibility:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Modified Time:** 6/22/2006 10:19:19 AM  
**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Entered On:** 10/14/2003 11:53:58 AM  
**Entered By:** Salazar Sandra B.  
**Severity:** Medium  
**Priority:** No  
**Type:** Defect  
**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 733  
**External Reference:** Tania Rossouw, WI - VOLPE CR 16  
**Category:** Need for permit snapshots  
**Component:** CVISN Architecture and Standards  
**Synopsis:** States requested that an XML permit transaction be included in a future version of SAFER.

Summary: This CR was originally proposed by WI in September, 2002. In order to share permit data through SAFER, states need to define what data is needed in the transaction. Long or short term permits? OS/OW permits? HazMat permits? Intrastate or interstate?

**Status:** Open  
**Disposition:** [2006-08-21] Open pending stakeholder comment.  
**Description:** At the Sept. 19, 2002 ACCB meeting, Tania Rossouw of Wisconsin requested that an XML permit transaction be included in a future version of SAFER.

[2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/02. States agreed that the capability for SAFER to handle permit data is needed. This feature will not be included in SAFER 4.2, but will be added to the list for future SAFER updates.

[2005-09-19 per sbs]  
CR 733 Falls under the Expanded CVISN "better e-credentialing." Remains open pending further analysis.

[2006-03-29] Presented again at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.  
This CR was originally proposed by WI in September, 2002. In order to share permit data through SAFER, we need to define what data is needed in the transaction. Long or short term permits? OS/OW permits? HazMat permits? Intrastate or interstate? NE issues short-term permits and views this as an intrastate concern. However, NV strongly supports the concept of permit transactions, as they issue annual permits and reciprocal permits with other states. Volpe was asked to report on what HazMat Safety Permit data fields are being sent to SAFER.

[2006-04-19] Fields being sent to SAFER in attachment.

[2006-04-25] This CR will be posted to the listserv for a 30-day comment period.  
Stakeholder action:

1. Review the attached document for Permit data already being sent to SAFER via MCMIS.
  2. In order to share permit data through SAFER, states need to define what data is needed in the transaction. Long or short term permits? OS/OW permits? HazMat permits? Intrastate or interstate?
- Respond to the listserv by 2005-05-17 with your answers to the questions above.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.  
WA asked for more time to comment on this CR. APL will repost to the CVISN System Architects' listserv.

[2006-06-27] Discussed at the 6/22/06 ACCB meeting.  
The ACCB agreed that this CR requires more participation from the stakeholders and additional research by Volpe/FMCSA. The CR will be reposted.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.  
Additional stakeholder input will be supplied to the CVISN System Architects listserv next week by Terri Ungerman. SD suggested getting onto their [www.SDTruckinfo.com](http://www.SDTruckinfo.com) site to see the types of permits available for their state.

[2006-08-07] Terri Ungerman, Oklahoma CVISN System Architect posted the following to the listserv:

SAFER fields - Recommendations  
as of August 4, 2006

Alliance for Uniform HazMat Procedures

Participating States

Illinois IL  
Michigan MI  
Minnesota MN  
Nevada NV  
Ohio OH  
Oklahoma OK  
West Virginia WV

Credential Unique Identifier - AAA-NNNNNNNN-AA

AAA =

UPM = Hazmat, including Hazardous Waste, in all states but OH and MN.

UPW = Hazmat, including Hazardous Waste in OH and MN & for NV Radioactive Waste after Part III Review

UPR = Intrastate Carrier only (without reciprocity into other states)

NNNNNNNN = 8 digit USDOT #

AA = Two digit Issuing State

Credential Expiration Date (Not Applicable for P status)

MM-DD-YYYY

Credential Status

P = Pending

A = Active  
E = Expired  
L = Letter of Filing (Temporary Credential)

[2006-08-21] Discussed at the 8/17 ACCB meeting  
Data element requirements for HazMat permits from the Alliance for Uniform HazMat Procedures, which includes 7 states, were posted to the listserv. Terri Ungerman also noted that since there will be other types of permits besides HazMat, a Permit Type data element should be added. Perhaps there should also be a way to indicate for which states a particular permit type is applicable. SD has identified about 30 different types of permits (www.SDTruckinfo.com ). The CR will remain open during this requirements gathering phase. Volpe will define each proposed data element. States are asked to continue to provide comments via the listserv.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment names:** Hazmat Safety Permit Number.doc

**Responsibility:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Modified Time:** 8/21/2006 6:49:50 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 9/18/2002 8:34:57 AM

**Entered By:** Goldfarb Robert H.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Suggestion

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 66

**External Reference:** CR 1082

**Category:** Diesel Emissions Data in Inspection Reports and Snapshots

**Component:** Snapshots

**Synopsis:** A group of states is seeking to include diesel emissions data in inspection reports and flags in snapshots for interstate enforcement of environmental regulations. Corresponding CRs should be issued for changes to ASPEN and/or other inspection support systems.

**Status:** Open

**Disposition:** [2006-07-26] Open pending further analysis.

**Description:** [2000-06-09] DJ Waddell  
A group of states is seeking to include diesel emissions data in inspection reports and flags in snapshots for interstate enforcement of environmental regulations. Corresponding CRs should be issued for changes to ASPEN and/or other inspection support systems. The original emails from Massachusetts and New Jersey are attached. Also attached are two presentations made originally at the Eastern States

CVISN Design Workshop that spell out the proposal.

[2000-10-27] DJ Waddell

Analysis is provided in the attached file Diesel Emissions.doc

[2006-03-29] Presented again at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.

This CR was originally proposed by MD in June, 2000. MD said that sharing this data is important for the northeastern states, subject to Department of the Environment regulations. It would be very helpful if ASPEN supported diesel emissions data. APL will contact east coast states to see if they are still interested. WA will check with state patrols.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.

APL will transfer CR 66 (Diesel Emissions Data in Inspection Reports and Snapshots) to the I-95 Corridor Coalition for further investigation.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.

Mary Stuart contacted Marygrace Parker from the I-95 Corridor Coalition. Marygrace recalled that analysis was conducted a few years ago by I-95 and thought that an ASPEN CR had been submitted. She will look for the documentation. Mary Stuart noted that requirements are needed and suggested keeping the CR open until further analysis is done.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment names:** Diesel Emissions I-95 Project.DOC Diesel Emissions WG.DOC Diesel Emissions.doc Joe Civaler Email.doc Multi-State Diesel Emissions.PPT NJ Diesel Emissions.PPT Original Message.doc

**Responsibility:** Salazar Sandra B.

**Modified Time:** 7/26/2006 9:50:00 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 12/17/2001 2:30:27 PM

**Entered By:** Greenwald Beverly E.

**Severity:** High

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**Total:** 15