

2007-10 Open Architecture CRs

CR Number: 5348

External Reference: Bill Goforth, WA (360-705-7365)

Category: SAFER Upload

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: SAFER

This CR requests the capability to keep track of which jurisdictions are permitted to upload T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 registration data on behalf of other jurisdictions.

Status: Open

Disposition: [2007-10-22] Open.

Description: [2007-10-22] Discussed at 2007-10-18 ACCB meeting.

NE noted that there are privacy concerns with a state sending cab card information to SAFER without the state's permission. It was suggested that FMCSA should take the lead and send "data upload request" letters to all non-CVISN states on behalf of all certified CVISN states. It was also suggested that a non-authoritative source first send any registration data they wish to upload to SAFER to the base state for verification before uploading it to SAFER. WA stated that the point of the CR is to get more registration data into SAFER. Some states on the call felt that if states are receiving CVISN funds, they should be willing to have registration data uploaded to SAFER. APL took the action item to present this issue to FMCSA.

[2007-10-18] Initial posting

This CR requests the capability to keep track of which jurisdictions are permitted to upload T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 registration data on behalf of other jurisdictions.

States propose the creation of a new JURISDICTION_UPLOAD_STATUS table in SAFER and new upload data integrity checks for the T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 transactions.

The proposed JURISDICTION_UPLOAD_STATUS table will be used to keep track of which jurisdictions are permitted to upload T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 data on behalf of other jurisdictions.

This CR has no impact on a jurisdiction uploading their own T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 data.

The proposed JURISDICTION_UPLOAD_STATUS table would contain the following columns (design specifics are provided here for discussion purposes only – final physical design chosen by FMCSA developers may differ):

JURISDICTION varchar(4) -- Country/Jurisdiction

AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS varchar(255) (or could be a secondary table)

CAN_UPLOAD_FOR_OTHERS_FLAG char(1) – "1" or "0"

JURISDICTION - The table will contain one row for each jurisdiction.

AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS – This is a list of all of the jurisdictions (4 character jurisdiction codes separated by commas) that are authorized to upload T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 data for the authoritative source, JURISDICTION. The default value is "ANY". "ANY" indicates that any jurisdiction that has CAN_UPLOAD_FOR_OTHERS_FLAG = 1 can upload data on behalf of the specified JURISDICTION.

A jurisdiction will send a written request to the ACCB to specify the jurisdiction(s) that are authorized to upload T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 data on their behalf. By only specifying their own jurisdiction for AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS, the authoritative source

jurisdiction can prevent any other jurisdiction from uploading data on their behalf. The right to specify AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS can be revoked by the ACCB if it is found that a jurisdiction (or its delegate) is unable to upload their data and make corrections in a reasonable time frame (for example, where a current cab card does not agree with data uploaded to SAFER or a state loses its SAFER certification for an extended period of time). In this case, AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS will be reset to "ANY".

To insure that SAFER can reliably verify the upload source for a submitted XML file, each jurisdiction will be given their own secure upload subdirectory that restricts upload access to the associated jurisdiction's username.

CAN_UPLOAD_FOR_OTHERS_FLAG – "0" indicates that a jurisdiction may not upload data for other jurisdictions. "1" indicates that a jurisdiction is permitted to upload data for other jurisdictions. By default this column will be set to "0". A jurisdiction will request this column be set to "1" in a written request to the ACCB. This privilege can be revoked by the ACCB if it is found that a jurisdiction fails to correct errors in their uploaded data in a timely fashion or if a jurisdiction repeatedly uploads erroneous information.

New Upload data integrity checks–

A data integrity check will be added for each of the T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 transactions that will check whether a jurisdiction has permission to upload the updates contained in a submitted XML file.

To do this, the BASE_STATE of each update in the XML file will be compared to the submitting jurisdiction (as determined from the name of the submitting jurisdiction's upload subdirectory). If they are the same, the update will be permitted (assuming no other edit errors are found).

If the BASE_STATE of an update and submitting jurisdiction are different and the submitting jurisdiction has a "0" for CAN_UPLOAD_FOR_OTHERS_FLAG in the JURISDICTION_UPLOAD_STATUS table, then the update will be rejected with an appropriate error.

If the BASE_STATE of an update and submitting jurisdiction are different and AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS for the BASE_STATE does not include the submitting jurisdiction, then the update will be rejected with an appropriate error.

Even though updates are found in an XML file that fail the above checks, updates that pass this and other existing checks in the same XML file will be permitted.

Impact:

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility:
Modified Time: 10/22/2007 1:48:24 PM
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 10/18/2007 6:06:28 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No

Type: Defect
Closed On:

CR Number: 5234
External Reference: WA, SAFER CR 1782
Category: Data Quality
Component: SAFER web page; A&I web page
Synopsis: Published ISS-D scores should agree with scores sent via XML
Status: Approved
Disposition: [2007-08-24] Approved by FMCSA.
Description: [2007-08-24] Approved by FMCSA

[2007-08-24] Voted on at 23 August ACCB meeting. Recommended for approval – 19 approve, 2 abstain, 30 non-voters.

[2007-07-26] Discussed at ACCB meeting. Vote on 23 August.

CVISN users request to see consistent ISS score from SAFER and from the T0031 download file. Currently the ISS score is refreshed monthly from SafeStat and MCMIS. The SafeStat online web site displays the ISS score that is refreshed monthly. However, SAFER computes the ISS score for carriers that have insufficient data and this is done weekly or daily when there are inspection count updates or daily updates from MCMIS. These carriers' ISS scores are more current in the T0031 file than on the SafeStat online web site. To resolve this issue, the SAFER web site will need to be enhanced to display the ISS score for all carriers stored in the SAFER database. This will allow CVISN users to see consistent data from the public web interface and the T0031 download.

[2007-06-04] Bill Goforth, WA

This CR addresses a problem reported in Heat problem ticket nos. 189346 (2/20/07) and 200657 (5/17/07). The problem is that public access to ISS-D scores is currently provided by an A&I system web page while ISS-D scores for roadside screening are provided via the SAFER T0031 XML transaction.

In some cases the ISS-D scores being displayed on the A&I web page are not the same as the ISS-D scores coming from SAFER. This occurs less than 5% of the time (estimated). But this is still over 70,000 carriers. This creates a significant public relations problem for states that are screening on ISS-D score.

This CR proposes changing where the public views ISS-D scores. Instead of going to the current A&I web page, this CR proposes changing to a SAFER web page to view ISS-D scores. The intent here is to make the ISS-D scores published for public viewing be the same in all cases as the ISS-D scores sent via SAFER to roadside screening systems (via T0031 transactions).

The primary reason for this CR is for ISS-D scores for carriers with “insufficient data” for an ISS-D score (Heat ticket 200657). Currently, these ISS scores are computed in both the A&I and the SAFER systems. Because the scores are computed at different times in each of these systems, the scores do not always agree with each other.

This CR also resolves inconsistent score problems for ISS-D scores on carriers that have sufficient

data for an ISS-D score. These scores are only computed by the A&I system. But there can be a time lag between when a new score is displayed on the A&I web page and when it appears in a SAFER T0031 download file. Again the public sees one score and is potentially screened on a different value.

By publishing ISS-D scores for public viewing from a SAFER web page, the scores viewed by the public will always agree with the scores being used for screening in CVISN states.

To avoid confusion, it is also recommended that the A&I support team disable the existing A&I ISS-D web page and change the link to point to the proposed SAFER ISS-D page instead.

Note – Because of timing problems, there is a potential that the SEA and SAFESTAT data displayed by the remaining A&I web pages will not agree with the ISS-D scores displayed on the proposed SAFER ISS-D web page. There needs to be either 1) a disclaimer on the A&I web pages that addresses the timing problems inherent between the 2 systems, or 2) all of the SEA, SAFESTAT and ISS-D data for carriers needs to be published for public viewing from SAFER web page(s). This latter option is desirable. But the primary focus of this CR is just with the public access to ISS-D scores.

Fix:

Comment:

**Attachment
names:**

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

**Modified
Time:** 9/10/2007 8:59:23 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 7/18/2007 5:00:41 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 5088

**External
Reference:** ARCH CR 4991

Category: Business Rules

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Business Rules to Support Data Quality Regarding USDOT Number

Status: Open

Disposition: [2007-08-24] Open. This CR captures a goal. It will not be voted on at this time.

Description: [2007-08-24] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2007-08-23. This CR captures a goal. It will not be voted on at this time.

[2007-03-21] At the CVISN Deployment Workshop, it was agreed that there should be basic requirements for states uploading data to SAFER as well as for SAFER sending data to states.

State Upload Rules for Registration Data:

- The state must capture the IRP licensee's USDOT number during vehicle registration and provide it at the carrier account level (IRP_CARRIER_ID_NUMBER field) in the T0020 IRP Account Input transaction.
- The state must capture the safety (carrier responsible for safety) USDOT number during vehicle registration and provide it in the SAFETY_CARRIER field of the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input transaction.

Impact Summary:

SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD)
SAFER
- Enforce these business rules.
State business processes
State CVIEW or CVIEW-equivalent systems

Fix:

Comment:

**Attachment
names:**

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

**Modified
Time:** 9/10/2007 2:53:20 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 5/31/2007 5:19:25 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 5087

**External
Reference:** ARCH CR 4991

Category: Business Rules

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Interim Business Rules to Support Data Quality Regarding USDOT Number

Status: Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-24] Approved by FMCSA.

Description: [2007-09-21] Approved by FMCSA

[2007-09-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval by vote of 13-0, with two conditions:

1. These upload rules are guidelines and are not mandatory. Records will NOT be rejected if these guidelines are not followed.

2. These guidelines represent CVISN goals. States should strive to adhere to these guidelines.

[2007-08-24] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2007-08-23. Update to change "registrant USDOT number" to "IRP licensee's USDOT number". Vote at ACCB meeting on 20 September 2007.

[2007-03-21] At the CVISN Deployment Workshop, it was agreed that there should be basic requirements for states uploading data to SAFER as well as for SAFER sending data to states.

State Upload Rules:

- The state should capture the IRP licensee's USDOT number during vehicle registration and provide it at the carrier account level (IRP_CARRIER_ID_NUMBER field) in the T0020 IRP Account Input transaction.
- The state should capture the safety (carrier responsible for safety) USDOT number during vehicle registration and provide it in the SAFETY_CARRIER field of the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input transaction.
- States that do not capture the safety USDOT number during vehicle registration should provide the IRP licensee's USDOT number (IRP_CARRIER_ID_NUMBER field from the T0020 transaction) if available in the SAFETY_CARRIER field of the T0022 transaction.

Impact Summary:

SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD)
SAFER
State CVIEW or CVIEW-equivalent systems

Fix:

Comment:

**Attachment
names:**

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

**Modified
Time:** 9/24/2007 6:45:47 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 5/31/2007 5:16:47 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 5086

**External
Reference:** ARCH CR 4991

Category: Business Rules

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Business Rules to Support Data Quality for Uploading IFTA Data

Status: Approved
Disposition: [2007-09-24] Approved by FMCSA.
Description: [2007-09-21] Approved by FMCSA.

[2007-09-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval by vote of 12-0, 1 abstaining.

[2007-08-24] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2007-08-23. Updated to add bullet that IFTA field in T0022 may be blank. Vote at ACCB meeting on 20 September 2007.

[2007-03-21] At the CVISN Deployment Workshop, it was agreed that there should be basic requirements for states uploading data to SAFER as well as for SAFER sending data to states.

State Upload Rules (related to uploading IFTA-related data):

- If a state is going to send a T0019 IFTA Input Transaction for a carrier, it should send the T0019 before sending a T0020 IRP Account Input Transaction.
- If the IFTA field (IFTA_LICENSE_NUMBER) in the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction is non-blank, it must be a valid IFTA account based in the same jurisdiction as the IRP base state and a corresponding T0019 with the same IFTA account number must be in place.
- The IFTA field (IFTA_LICENSE_NUMBER) in the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction may be blank, for those states that do not associate IFTA and IRP.

Impact Summary:

State CVIEW or CVIEW-equivalent systems – states agree to enforce these rules
SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD)

SAFER - Volpe/SAFER will enforce these rules and specifically these Processing Rules:

- Volpe needs to process files from a state in the order sent.

More specific information will be included in the analysis section of the corresponding SAFER CR.

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B
Modified Time: 9/24/2007 6:46:29 AM
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 5/31/2007 5:12:03 PM
Entered By: Salazar Sandra B
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On:

CR Number: 5007
External Reference: WA, Proactive Data Quality focus group, SCR 1841
Category: Proactive Data Quality Monitoring

Component: SAFER/MCMIS

Synopsis: T0031 Data Timeliness Monitoring

Status: Open

Disposition: [2007-07-26]. Open. Needs MCMIS team analysis.

Description: [2007-07-26] Discussed at ACCB meeting. IT Systems Change Request has been submitted. Telecon will be held in next two weeks.

[2007-05-18] At 2007-05-17 CVISN ACCB meeting, it was noted that this CR needs to go via FMCSA to MCMIS team for preliminary analysis and estimate.

[2007-04-19] submitted by Bill Goforth, WA, 360-705-7365, gofortb@wsdot.wa.gov discussed at CVISN ACCB meeting 2007-04-19

Greater visibility is needed to monitor data timeliness for the T0031 (carrier data) transactions.

There are on-going problems with timeliness of T0031 carrier updates from SAFER. Delays of 3 or more weeks have been seen in some cases. The extent of this issue is not clear and there appear to be a number of causes for T0031 data timeliness problems.

There are known problems with data timeliness in the following areas:

- receiving new carrier data
- MCS150 updates
- MCMIS status changes
- ISS scores and SAFERSTAT data changes
- MCSIP Level changes

The improvements proposed by this change request will greatly enhance visibility of the frequency and magnitude of T0031 (carrier) data quality and timeliness problems. They will also allow CVISN states to easily determine if their carrier data problems are a SAFER issue or a local CVIEW issue. This visibility will reduce support costs and help Volpe management and the CVISN states better manage their CVISN support resources.

This change request proposes the following improvements:

1. Establish performance objectives and create and monitoring processes to monitor the timeliness of T0031 data. Specifically this includes; clear performance objectives, measurement strategies, daily exception reports and monthly summary/trend reports to monitor processing delay times for MCSIP level, ISS score, MCMIS status, added carriers, and critical MCS150 changes required by PRISM (including carrier name and address changes).

The goal is to have processing delays be 24 hours or less on business days. With this goal in mind, measurement objectives and strategies are needed for each of the mentioned data elements that are realistic and reflect existing processing limitations. CVISN stakeholders need to agree on these measurement objectives. For example, a measurement objective for ISS score changes might be to have all A&I changes to be delivered in T0031 files within 6 business days (allowing for A&I data quality checking time) and all non-sufficient data ISS changes in SAFER delivered in T0031 files within 1 business day. The specifics regarding these objectives cannot be refined without practical input from the MCMIS and SAFER support teams.

A related secondary objective will be to log all incidents where a performance objective is not met so that it will be possible to track the frequency of a particular performance related problem.

2. Capture tracking data for all T0031 UD and BL download files and related subscription files. T0031 Tracking data will be stored in table form and consist of one row per update per carrier. Each row would contain the T0031 download file name and (at a minimum) the critical T0031 data elements consistent with item 3. below.

A web page will be provided to allow CVISN states to view the T0031 tracking data for a specific

USDOT number.

3. Create a MCMIS control file. This file will be a tab separated variable text file (TSV file or equivalent) and will contain one record per carrier. The proposed control file will be created daily. The control file will consist of the following MCMIS data elements (associated SAFER data element names are used here for sake of clarity):

CARRIER_ID_NUMBER
CARRIER_NAME
TAX_ID_NUMBER
DATE_ADDED
MCMIS_STATUS
MCMIS_STATUS_DATE
MCSIP_LEVEL
MCSIP_LEVEL_DATE
MCMIS_TRANSACTION_DATE
MCS150_UPDATE_DATE
ISS_SCORE
ISS_SCORE_DATE
SAFESTAT_CATEGORY
SAFESTAT_DATE
SAFETY_RATING
RATING_DATE

Because this control file will be used to measure the effectiveness of the MCMIS/SAFER interface, it must be created independently of the MCMIS/SAFER interface.

Tests where the above data elements are dumped to a text file from the CVIEW CARRIER table indicate that the proposed control file will be 39 to 40 MB after being zipped. In these tests, it took less than 5 minutes to create this file. But this may not be reflective of the time taken to do this in MCMIS if there are multiple tables that contain this information.

It is hoped that there will be a minimum impact to MCMIS to create this control file. Testing will need to be performed by the MCMIS support team to determine the impact of creating this file. The proposed MCMIS control file is key to the success of this change request. The data in this control file will be used to:

1. Allow more proactive T0031 data quality management - Volpe and CVISN states will be able to proactively monitor data quality and take corrective action when necessary. In other words, data timeliness problems could be identified and fixed without CVISN states having to report the problems to Volpe Technical Support. This will save considerable time for technicians at Volpe and for technicians in the CVISN states.
2. Quickly isolate timeliness and missing data issues as either Volpe or a CVISN state (CVIEW) issue - Using the control file and the T0031 tracking data (2. above), it will be possible for a CVISN state or Volpe to quickly determine the extent of a timeliness problem and whether the problem was at Volpe or on the CVISN state side. If the carrier data in question has been output to a T0031 file, it will be possible to easily identify which T0031 file it is contained in by looking at the T0031 tracking data.
3. Monitoring of T0031 Timeliness trends - Using the control file and the T0031 tracking data (2. above), it will be possible to write simple SQL scripts to determine how many carrier updates failed to meet the 24 hour timeliness objective. Timeliness analysis will be performed separately for each of the above mentioned data elements. This will be done on a monthly basis and used as a high level management tool to determine the priority and extent of carrier data timeliness issues.
4. Check CVIEW Carrier data accuracy and avoid unnecessary T0031 baseline downloads - The control file will allow CVISN states to verify the accuracy and completeness of their local CVIEW

carrier data and determine when it is necessary to perform a T0031 baseline download. This allows CVISN states to do a better job of keeping their carrier data in synch with SAFER and avoid unnecessary T0031 baseline downloads.

5. Emergency fixes - The control file can be used by a CVISN state as an interim emergency workaround to update critical CVIEW carrier data while T0031 timeliness issues are being addressed. This would help to prevent crisis situations for Volpe and CVISN states when critical T0031 data is missing. It is recognized that there would be inherent data synchronization problems in using this file as a data source. Whether the advantages outweighed the risks is a question that a CVISN state would need to carefully consider before using the control file in this way.

Impact Summary:
SAFER
MCMIS (minimal?)
States may choose to use or not

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility:
Modified Time: 9/10/2007 2:52:02 PM
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 4/19/2007 5:01:06 PM
Entered By: Salazar Sandra B
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On:

CR Number: 4991
External Reference: ARCH CRs 5086, 5087, 5088
Category: Business Rules
Component: SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis: Business Rules to Support Data Quality for Uploading IRP Data
Status: Approved
Disposition: [2007-09-24] Approved by FMCSA.
Description: [2007-09-21] Approved by FMCSA.
[2007-09-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval by vote of 13-0.
[2007-08-24] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2007-08-23. Vote at ACCB meeting on 20 September 2007.

[2007-07-26] Has been rewritten.

[2007-05-17] Discussed at the 5/17/07 ACCB meeting. It was decided to split the business rules into separate CRs for uploading IRP data, uploading IFTA data, interim rules regarding USDOT number, and goal-for-the-future rules regarding USDOT number. Thus the CRs could be voted on and implemented separately.

Rewritten version appears here:

State Upload Rules (related to uploading IRP-related data):

- If changing carrier data, a state only needs to send the T0020 IRP Account Input Transaction.
- If changing or adding fleet data, a state should send the T0021 IRP Fleet Input Transaction. A corresponding T0020 transaction must be in place.
- If changing or adding vehicle data, a state should send the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction. Corresponding T0021 and T0020 transactions must be in place.
- If a state is baselining, all three transactions (T0020, T0021, and T0022) must be sent.
- A state must send the T0020 before the T0021, the T0021 before the T0022, etc.
- If adding new carrier, fleet, and vehicles, a state should send the T0020, then T0021, then T0022s.
- Business rules will be developed to define how states that are exempt from IRP should use the "IRP" fields in the T0020, T0021, and T0022 when uploading registration data to SAFER.

[2007-04-19] Presented and discussed at the 4/19/07 ACCB meeting. Post for review and vote on 5/17.

[2007-03-21] At the CVISN Deployment Workshop, it was agreed that there should be basic requirements for states uploading data to SAFER as well as for SAFER sending data to states.

Impact Summary:

State CVIEW or CVIEW-equivalent systems – states agree to enforce these rules

SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD)

SAFER - Volpe/SAFER will enforce these rules and specifically these Processing Rules:

- Volpe needs to process files from a state in the order sent.
- Volpe will reject vehicle (T0022) records if the referenced fleet or carrier is not in SAFER.
- Volpe will reject the fleet (T0021) record if the referenced carrier is not in SAFER.

More specific information will be included in the analysis section of the corresponding SAFER CR.

OLD:

[2007-03-21] At the CVISN Deployment Workshop, it was agreed that there should be basic requirements for states uploading data to SAFER as well as for SAFER sending data to states.

State Upload Rules (related to uploading IRP-related data):

- If changing carrier data, a state only needs to send the T0020 IRP Account Input Transaction.
- If changing or adding fleet data, a state should send the T0021 IRP Fleet Input Transaction. A corresponding T0020 transaction must be in place.
- If changing or adding vehicle data, a state should send the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction. Corresponding T0021 and T0020 transactions must be in place.
- If a state is baselining, all three transactions (T0020, T0021, and T0022) must be sent.
- A state must complete sending the T0020 before the T0021, the T0021 before the T0022, etc.
- If adding new carrier, fleet, and vehicles, a state should send the T0020, then T0021, then T0022s.
- If the IFTA field in the T0022 is non-blank, it must be a valid IFTA account and a corresponding T0019 must be in place.
- For exempt states, rules about bogus values are needed (see action item below).
- If a state is going to send a T0019 IFTA Input Transaction for a carrier, it should send the T0019 before sending a T0020.

- The state must provide the USDOT number at the carrier IRP account level.
- If a CVISN state does not have the safety USDOT number for a vehicle, it must provide the IRP USDOT number in the "safety carrier" field. (Beware: the vehicle may be driving for a different carrier on a particular trip.)
- For PRISM states, the state should report the safety USDOT number in the "safety carrier" field.
- CVISN wants all states to start capturing safety USDOT number.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time: 9/24/2007 6:47:03 AM
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 4/12/2007 1:04:00 PM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On:

CR Number: 4990

External Reference:

Category: Business Rules

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Business Rules to Support Data Timeliness

Status: Approved

Disposition: [2007-05-18] Approved by Jeff Secrist.

Description: [2007-09-20] Discussed at ACCB meeting. Volpe said that no SAFER CR is needed, as they are currently meeting this goal, except in the case of SafeStat data stated below.

[2007-05-18] Approved by Jeff Secrist.

[2007-05-17] At the CVISN ACCB meeting on 2007-05-17, states voted 13-0 to recommend this CR for FMCSA approval.

[2007-05-03] Volpe clarified the interpretation of the "24-hour rule" for ISS and SafeStat data. There is a one-week lag between when SafeStat data is available in A&I and when it is made available in MCMIS, because there is a policy that A&I staff have one week to review the data. So in this case, there is a lag of one week until "the authoritative source deems the record to be valid." A policy change would be needed to improve this situation.

[2007-04-19] Presented and discussed at the 4/19/07 ACCB meeting. Post for review and vote on 5/17.

[2007-03-21] At the CVISN Deployment Workshop, it was agreed that there should be requirements that address how frequently data must be sent, both from states and to states.

24-Hour Rules

- Within 24 hours of the authoritative source deeming the record to be valid, the data should be transferred to SAFER.
- SAFER should transfer the data back within 24 hours.
- New data in MCMIS should be transferred to SAFER within 24 hours.
- "24 hours" applies to business days. Weekends and holidays do not count.

Impact Summary:

SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD)
Federal safety systems, including but not limited to SAFER and MCMIS
State CVIEW or CVIEW-equivalent systems

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:11:39 AM
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 4/12/2007 1:01:06 PM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Enhancement
Closed On:

CR Number: 4837
External Reference: CR 4836; SAFER CR 536, SCR 1613
Category: New XML Web Services Transaction
Component: SAFER/CVISN
Synopsis: Request for new XML transaction to provide near real-time OOSO changes to PRISM and CVISN users.
Status: Open
Disposition: [2007-09-20] Open. Included in the scope of SCR 1613, scheduled for SAFER 7.3.1 October 2007 release.
Description: [2007-08-23] Discussed at ACCB meeting. It was noted that SCR 536 "Improve timeliness of critical fields for PRISM business processes" is included in the scope of SCR 1613, scheduled for SAFER 7.3.1 October 2007 release.

[2007-07-26] Discussed at ACCB meeting. SCR 536 is on the list for SAFER 7.3, but may not be

needed if SCR 1613 is implemented.

[2007-05-17] Mentioned at 2007-05-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. Scheduled for SAFER 7.3.

[2007-01-19] Discussed at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting.

Gary DeRusha (Volpe) explained SAFER CR 536 and noted that the PRISM program is embracing Web services technology. It was noted that the corresponding ECCB RFC has been approved. The SAFER part is on a schedule for development this year, but a MCMIS commitment is still needed. Doug Deckert (WA) noted that this near real-time OOSO change information will be useful to CVISN roadside enforcement as well as to PRISM users.

[2007-01-17] Salazar (from SAFER CR 536)

Architecture CR 4836/SAFER CR 536 proposes changes to MCMIS and SAFER to make OOSO changes available to users via SAFER in near real-time. That proposal involves creating a new trigger in MCMIS that would notify SAFER when a change is made to the out of service status of a carrier by submitting a job into an asynchronous queue maintained within Oracle. The job would contain information that would be inserted into a new table within SAFER indicating that a change had been made in MCMIS since the last daily MCMIS to SAFER update routine.

To minimize the impact on SAFER, the carrier table in SAFER would not be updated as a result of the change in MCMIS. Instead, the job submitted by the MCMIS trigger would load the USDOT Number into a table created in SAFER that contains the USDOT number, MCSIP Step and a timestamp field. A trigger in SAFER would then retrieve the carrier's MCSIP Step from MCMIS and update the current timestamp.

This CR requests that this information be made available via a new SAFER Web Services transaction. That transaction would check to see if a change had been made to the out of service status of a carrier since the last daily MCMIS update to SAFER and, if so, it would use the resulting MCSIP Step value when returning carrier census data to the user. If a change had not been made, all field values would come from the SAFER carrier table.

While these changes were originally proposed to support PRISM users, this real-time information would also be useful to roadside enforcement.

Fix:

Comment:

**Attachment
names:**

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

**Modified
Time:** 9/21/2007 9:15:01 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 1/17/2007 10:33:53 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On:

CR Number: 4836
External Reference: SAFER CR 536, SCR 1613
Category: MCMIS Update of OOSO activity to SAFER in Near Real-Time
Component: SAFER/MCMIS
Synopsis: Request for OOSO change to be made available to SAFER in near real-time.
Status: Open
Disposition: [2007-09-20] Open. Included in the scope of SCR 1613, scheduled for SAFER 7.3.1 October 2007 release.
Description: [2007-08-23] Discussed at ACCB meeting. It was noted that SCR 536 "Improve timeliness of critical fields for PRISM business processes" is included in the scope of SCR 1613, scheduled for SAFER 7.3.1 October 2007 release.

[2007-07-26] Discussed at ACCB meeting. SCR 536 is on the list for SAFER 7.3, but may not be needed if SCR 1613 is implemented.

[2007-01-19] Discussed at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting.
Gary DeRusha (Volpe) explained SAFER CR 536 and noted that the PRISM program is embracing Web services technology. It was noted that the corresponding ECCB RFC has been approved. The SAFER part is on a schedule for development this year, but a MCMIS commitment is still needed. Doug Deckert (WA) noted that this near real-time OOSO change information will be useful to CVISN roadside enforcement as well as to PRISM users.

[2007-01-17] Salazar (from SAFER CR 536)

The FMCSA PRISM program utilizes the SAFER database to provide its users with MCMIS carrier census data necessary to comply with several PRISM program requirements. States maintain a local version of this data by processing a batch file after SAFER has been updated with a daily MCMIS activity transaction file. Due to timing delays inherent with these batch file updates, PRISM implementation procedures require that users verify the out of service status maintained in MCMIS if during processing the carrier disputes the value of the data maintained locally. Recently, PRISM has suggested that States utilize existing SAFER Web Services as an alternative to using their local systems to access the value of certain carrier census data. However, this approach only addresses the timing and logistical problems associated with getting the daily transaction batch files from SAFER to the State users. When necessary, on-line web browser access to MCMIS to validate data values is still required due to the timing differences between what is in SAFER and the actual value maintained in MCMIS.

To help resolve this problem, PRISM requests that a trigger be built in MCMIS to monitor the OOS_Carrier table that is updated whenever an out of service order is issued or rescinded. The only function of this trigger would be to notify SAFER in real time when a carrier has a change made to its Out of Service Status. The notification would be done by initiating a request to the Oracle Database Management System job queue that would in turn pass that USDOT Number to SAFER using an existing database link. A trigger in SAFER would then retrieve the carrier's MCSIP Step from MCMIS using an indexed key search through that same database link. Together these enhancements should go unnoticed by end users but they would allow subsequent inquiries using a new SAFER web services transaction to return the latest out of service status of the carrier in near real-time mode. The PRISM team will work with SAFER to specify the contents of this new transaction separately.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: RFC MCMIS Update of OOSO Activity to SAFERv4.doc

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 9:14:26 AM
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 1/17/2007 10:19:08 AM
Entered By: Salazar Sandra B
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Enhancement
Closed On:

CR Number: 4789
External Reference: SAFER CR TBD
Category: SAFER XML
Component: SAFER
Synopsis: Implement SAFER-CVIEW interface for Unified Carrier Registration (UCR) information
Status: Open
Disposition: [2007-10-18] Open. Discussed at ACCB meeting. Will be voted on 2007-11-29.
Description: [2007-10-22] Discussed at 2007-10-18 ACCB meeting.

Per the discussion at the ACCB meeting, this CR is hereby updated to request the capability for CVISN states to download the UCR data using the the XML / FTP Interface with which CVISN stakeholders are familiar.

The UCR data elements are:

- o UCR Registration Company US DOT Number
- o UCR Registration Company MC/MX Number
- o UCR Registration Company Freight Forwarder Number
- o UCR Registration Company MC/MX Tag
- o UCR Registration Intrastate Vehicles Indicator
- o UCR Registration Fee Payment Flag
- o UCR Registration Year
- o UCR Registration Update Date
- o UCR Registration Base State
- o UCR Registration Operating State

To upload UCR data, states will need to develop Web Service Client Software that invokes the FMCSA Upload Web Service. Indiana has developed a client and is currently testing with Volpe.

[2007-09-21] Discussed at 2007-09-20 ACCB meeting.
This architecture CR relates to new SAFER CR 1875:

The State of Indiana requested a UCR output transaction that will provide a carrier some of the MCS-150 data, broker information and UCR data.

Directed by the FMCSA, this output transaction will be developed as high priority in addition to the September release 2007 as a new phase of the UCR project.

To be consistent with the first and second phases, this output transaction will be developed using web services.

Once implemented, a daily output file will be created to capture the updates received by SAFER.

The data elements and schema will be provided by Volpe at a later date.

This has been approved by FMCSA and is being implemented, so will not be voted on by ACCB.

[2007-01-19] Discussed at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting.

Jingfei Wu (Volpe) noted that the implementation of the SAFER capability to upload UCR data from a state system is ahead of schedule and waiting for a Texas team to have a state system ready for beta testing. The draft high-level system specification has been posted to the ACCB Collaboration site for states to reference.

[2006-12-18] Discussed at the 12/14/06 ACCB meeting.

Volpe reported on a meeting that was held by FMCSA in the first week of December. An extension on deploying the UCR capability was not granted. Texas has volunteered to deploy a state UCR system that will be made available for other states to use. Eventually there will be one centralized system. Volpe is finalizing the requirements and beginning the design for changes to SAFER. There will be a two-phase implementation.

- Phase 1: By January, SAFER will have a component ready for testing with a state UCR system.

Volpe will publish the XML schema and interface documentation.

- Phase 2: By February-March timeframe, the Federal applications (Query Central, ISS, and MCMIS) will have the functionality to pull the UCR information from SAFER.

States are waiting for the UCR Board to tell them what the fees and the application are for UCR.

There will not be a UCR credential; the only way to check will be electronically.

[Initial posting]

Summary:

Unified Carrier Registration (UCR) is being established to replace the Single State Registration System (SSRS). The FMCSA program office has committed to the UCR board to provide a capability to store the states' UCR registration fee into a centralized application and to display the UCR registration status to the roadside. The current recommendation is to leverage SAFER's architecture to store the UCR information and display to the roadside via Query Central and ISS. According to the requirement, SAFER needs to implement an input transaction using web service technology to process the UCR data uploaded from states and store it in the SAFER database.

Volpe will need to provide interface control documentation and to implement a certification process with states' UCR systems.

The next step will be for the staff to discuss requirements with the UCR board. This is expected to happen before the end of November 2006. It has not yet been determined whether this change would involve a change to an existing XML transaction or creation of a new transaction type.

Fix:

Comment:

**Attachment
names:**

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

**Modified
Time:** 10/22/2007 1:58:37 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 11/21/2006 11:46:17 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Adaptive Change
Closed On:

CR Number: 4674
External Reference: SAFER CR 797
Category: Data integrity
Component: SAFER
Synopsis: Modification to data requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER
Status: Approved
Disposition: [2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist.
Description: [2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist.

[2006-10-17] Discussion about the data requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER led to a simplified description as follows:
If the Gross Vehicle Weight for the vehicle is greater than 10,000 pounds, then SAFETY_CARRIER is a required field for states participating in PRISM, including CVISN/PRISM states.

[2006-10-03] Discussed at the 9/21/06 ACCB meeting
Discussion about the data requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER lead to a simplified description as follows: If the Gross Vehicle Weight for the vehicle is greater than 10,000 pounds, then SAFETY_CARRIER is a required field for states participating in PRISM, including CVISN/PRISM states.

[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.

[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.

[2006-07-26] 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.

[2006-06-27] Discussed at the 6/22/06 ACCB meeting

Volpe will rewrite the description of this CR for clarification and repost to the listserv.

[2006-06-20] 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

[2006-05-26] 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.

[2006-05-12] 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.

Fix:

Comment:

**Attachment
names:**

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time: 9/10/2007 2:50:18 PM
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: [2007-07-26] Open. Pending Volpe review of reqts. submitted by States.
Description: [2007-07-26] Discussed at ACCB meeting. Volpe will present update on consolidated requirements 2007-07-26 ACCB meeting.

[2007-05-17] Discussed at 2007-05-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. States' requirements were presented to CVISN in February, 2007. The requirements need to be harmonized/finalized by Volpe and reported to the CVISN. Scheduled for SAFER 5.3.

[2007-02-06] File with states' comments related to CVISN Architecture Change Request CR 4651 (SAFER CR 705) titled, "Implement VIN, IRP Account and IFTA Account number validation for SAFER XML Service transactions" presented to Volpe.

[2006-12-18] Discussed at the 12/14/06 ACCB meeting. Volpe needs more input from states on requirements.

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 11/16/06 ACCB meeting. This CR was originally part of CR 3013. Listserv comments to CR 3013 will be reviewed and this CR discussed at the December ACCB meeting.

[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 4651 (SAFER CR 705).

[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 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 current 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

VINs instead of rejections. Validation is done at the jurisdiction site because of home-made VINs that considers valid. These VINs would fail the VIN validation routine at SAFER. It was suggested that state their VIN patterns to Volpe so SAFER can check against those as well. Phase 1 of the implementation enforce the edit checks for the formatting rules listed in the specification document. After a state is rec 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 will have to recertify again when Phase 2 is released. Volpe said yes. States asked if Phase 2 validation would cause SAFER to reject the records. Volpe said that would be up to the stakeholders. If the stake only want a warning and not a rejection, then recertification wouldn't be necessary."

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: 2005-12-19 CR3013-SAFER139_data standardization_Comments.xls
2006-01-25_CR 139 Specification.doc
2007-05-11_SAFER Data Edit Requirements by State (r5).doc

Responsibility:

Modified Time: 9/7/2007 12:10:43 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: 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: [2006-11-27] Attachment from SD added.

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 11/16/06 ACCB meeting.
Several months ago, Terri Ungerman collected data requirements for hazmat permit snapshots. Some states have expressed an interest in OS/OW and other types of regional permit snapshots. Other states have said they are not interested in any type of permit snapshots for e-screening. It was suggested that this CR needs a State champion to develop the requirements.

[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.

[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)

[2006-07-26] 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 site to see the types of permits available for their state.

[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.

[2006-05-26] 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.

[2006-04-25] 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.

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

[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.

[2005-09-19 per sbs]

CR 733 Falls under the Expanded CVISN "better e-credentialing." Remains open pending further analysis.

[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.

[initial posting]

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.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: Hazmat Safety Permit Number.doc
CR0733_Data Elements for Permits.doc

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/10/2007 2:48:31 PM

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:

Total: 9