2007-12 Closed Architecture CRs

CR Number: 5032

External Reference: SAFER CR 1716

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Add Target Indicator to the T0028 transaction

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

Description: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

[2007-07-26] Not voted on. Approved by FMCSA for SAFER 7.3.

[2007-05-18] Presented at 2007-05-17 CVISN ACCB meeting.

[2007-05-03] During the CVISN Deployment Workshop in March 2007, the stakeholders requested the addition of the PRISM Target Indicator to the T0028 transaction.

T0028 transaction currently extracts all data uploaded from the XML input files. Data uploaded via the PRISM Vehicle File (PVF) are currently not part of the T0028 transaction. Therefore, states implementing CVISN and PRISM may need to download two sets of vehicle registration files. This change would allow users to receive all key information via the T0028 transaction.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:13:07 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 5/3/2007 5:19:18 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/21/2007 8:13:07 AM

CR Number: 5031

External Reference: SAFER CR 1697

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/SAFETYNET/ASPEN

Synopsis: Modify T0018 Inspection Report Input Transaction to accept new values from Level VI inspections

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

Description: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

[2007-07-26] Not voted on since already approved for SAFER 7.3.

[2007-05-17] Presented and discussed at the 5/17/07 ACCB meeting. Post for review and vote on 6/21.

[2006-11-01] Current implementation of the Level VI inspection data capture and reporting is flawed. Enhancements will enable better data quality and easier recording. Effects Aspen, SAFETYNET, MCMIS, and the SAFER web services. Database changes will be required.
This enhancement is requested by the CVSA RAM Subcommittee and has the full support of the FMCSA HM Division.

[2007-05-03] Volpe reported that ASPEN and SAFETYNET users are impacted by this CR.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:09:05 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 5/3/2007 5:12:18 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/21/2007 8:09:05 AM

CR Number: 5030

External Reference: SAFER CR 1695

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/SAFETYNET/ASPEN

Synopsis: Modify T0018 Inspection Report Input Transaction to allow for PASA value

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

Description: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

[2007-07-26] Not voted on since already approved for SAFER 7.3.

[2007-05-17] Presented and discussed at the 5/17/07 ACCB meeting. Post for review and vote on 6/21.

[2007-05-03] Volpe reported that ASPEN and SAFETYNET users are impacted by this CR.

[2007-04-24] Modify the SAFER Inspection Upload XML Schema to allow for an indicator to show an inspection was conducted in conjunction with a Pre-Authority Safety Audit.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:07:33 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 5/3/2007 5:07:31 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/21/2007 8:07:33 AM

CR Number: 4988

External Reference: SAFER CR 1173

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/SAFETYNET/ASPEN

Synopsis: T0018 Inspection Report Input Transaction must be updated to support special characters.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: [2007-04-19] Closed. Deployed.

Description: Users are able to upload inspections without a properly formatted inspection report number.
Aspen needs to test to ensure that the report number is 12 Characters long.
The SAFER Inspection Web Service should reject inspections where the report number is not 12 characters long.

[2007-04-19] Presented and discussed at the 4/19/07 ACCB meeting.
More information is needed from Volpe as to whether there is impact on states.

[2007-05-03] Volpe reported that ASPEN and SAFETYNET users are impacted by this CR. It was implemented in SAFER 5.2 April 2007.

	[2007-05-17] Presented and discussed at the 5/17/07 ACCB meeting. Voting is NA since already implemented.
Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Salazar Sandra B
Modified Time:	5/17/2007 5:30:02 PM
Modified By:	Salazar Sandra B
Entered On:	4/6/2007 4:35:54 PM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	5/3/2007 4:49:55 PM

CR Number:	4987
External Reference:	SAFER CR 1172
Category:	SAFER XML
Component:	SAFER/SAFETYNET/ASPEN
Synopsis:	T0018 Inspection Report Input Transaction must be updated to check for valid Report Number.
Status:	Closed Fixed
Disposition:	[2007-04-19] Closed. Deployed.
Description:	The SAFER Inspection Web Service should reject inspection reports without a properly formatted inspection report number. The report number must be 12 characters long. This change will require versioning of the T0018 transaction. [2007-04-19] Presented and discussed at the 4/19/07 ACCB meeting. More information is needed from Volpe as to whether there is impact on states. [2007-05-03] Volpe reported that ASPEN and SAFETYNET users are impacted by this CR. It was implemented in SAFER 5.2 April 2007. [2007-05-17] Presented and discussed at the 5/17/07 ACCB meeting. Voting is NA since already implemented.
Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time:	5/17/2007 5:29:47 PM
Modified By:	Salazar Sandra B
Entered On:	4/6/2007 4:34:48 PM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	5/3/2007 4:50:20 PM

CR Number:	4966
External Reference:	
Category:	CVISN - National ITS Architecture
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	Add new architecture flow CVS-to-CVCS to report “commercial vehicle disable status”
Status:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	[2007-05-17] Closed. Incorporated into National ITS Architecture.
Description:	[2007-05-17] Closed. Incorporated into National ITS Architecture. [2007-05-17] Approved by FMCSA. [2007-04-19] Recommended for approval at the 4/19/07 ACCB meeting. [2007-03-16] Presented at the 3/15/07 ACCB meeting. This CR does not have an impact on CVISN states at this time. The CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architect’s list serv for 30-day review. [2007-03-12] There is an architecture flow named "commercial vehicle disable" that enables the Fleet and Freight Management Subsystem (FMS) to disable the Commercial Vehicle Subsystem (CVS) of a particular vehicle. Via a recent change request (CR 4778), the flow was added to the interface from the CVS to Commercial Vehicle Check Subsystem (CVCS). The motivation for adding the flow from CVS to CVCS was to alert the CVCS staff that the disable flag had been sent to the vehicle. The definition for the flow is "This flow safely disables a specific commercial vehicle," which looks odd going from the CVS to the CVCS. For this reason, we propose replacing “commercial vehicle disable” from CVS to CVCS with a new flow named "commercial vehicle disable status." The new flow would be defined as "This flow provides the status of the disable flag in the commercial vehicle." The “commercial vehicle disable” architecture flow would continue to be used as originally planned from the FMS to CVS.
Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified	9/21/2007 8:17:38 AM

Time:
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 3/12/2007 8:33:15 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Low
Priority: No
Type: Adaptive Change
Closed On: 9/21/2007 8:17:38 AM

CR Number: 4965
External Reference: SAFER CR 1612
Category: SAFER XML
Component: SAFER/CVISN
Synopsis: Develop a new transaction for ISS scores
Status: Closed Disapproved
Disposition: [2006-04-19] Closed deleted.
Description: CVISN users have requested a separate output transaction that would consist of at least the following data fields:

DOT Number
ISS Score
ISS update date

More data can be added to suit the user's need.

The ISS data is currently part of the MCMIS transaction (T0031). Each record consists of over 100 data elements. Having a transaction specific to ISS data will help to reduce the size of download and processing time.

The ISS transaction will be developed in a way that will help to improve the timeliness of the data to the end users.

[2007-03-16] Presented and discussed at the 3/15/07 ACCB meeting.
Chris Campbell said that this CR was written to help address the problem experienced by WA with delayed receipt of ISS scores. Chris suggested that SAFESTAT values be included in this transaction as well, if they are in sync with the ISS scores. Gary DeRusha noted that PRISM uses the “target indicator” and “MCSIP Step” instead of the ISS score to decide whom to inspect. He questioned why CVISN states do not use the target indicator. Bill Guiffre asked whether this new transaction was just a work-around for the download speed problem and whether it would be needed if the real problem was fixed. This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architect’s list serv for comment from other states, and the ISS issue will be addressed at the CVISN Deployment Workshop.

[2007-04-19] Presented and discussed at the 4/19/07 ACCB meeting.
This is a workaround for the ISS Score. It was created in February when the MCMIS transfer had significant delays. Since the focus is to get the data in a timely manner, if

SAFER CR 1613 to improve MCMIS processes is implemented, this would resolve the issue with ISS data. CR was withdrawn by WA.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 4/19/2007 5:03:48 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 3/8/2007 12:53:39 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 4/19/2007 5:03:48 PM

CR Number: 4948

External Reference: WA

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/CVISN Architecture

Synopsis: T0023 E-Screening Enrollment Transaction is Ineffective

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2006-04-12] Closed deleted.

Description: [2007-02-23] Bill Goforth, WA

The T0023 transaction does not work in a context where multiple states share e-screening administration responsibility for the same carrier. An example would be a carrier with a mid-west fleet and east coast fleet. The state that sends the T0023 transaction for the east coast fleet will override the T0023 transaction sent by a mid-west state for the mid-west fleet. It may also be necessary to control authorization on a vehicle by vehicle basis. This is not possible with the current design of the T0023 transaction.

In addition, authorization for screening within a specific state is the decision of that state not the jurisdiction that sends the T0023 transaction for a group of states. So it would seem that each state is the authoritative source for its screening authorization. But there is no way for individual states to submit a T0023 transaction for their state only for a carrier without deleting the authorizations for all other states for the carrier. (The SAFER ICD says “The authorizations in the transaction shall completely replace any existing authorizations previously established for that carrier”).

When Washington uploads T0023 transactions, we authorize all carriers to operate in all states. We have never had a carrier request authorization for specific states and not others. They have already found ways to disable their transponders when they travel through states where they don’t want to use their transponders.

For these reasons, we feel that the T0023 transaction is either unnecessary or needs to be redesigned. Washington would prefer to have this transaction done away with.

[2007-02-26] Chris Campbell, Iteris, supporting ID, SC, UT, WY, SD, OK, AK
We also agree with this CR. It is a useless transaction set for all of our clients.

[2007-03-16] Presented and discussed at the 3/15/07 ACCB meeting.
WA and SD support this CR. Chris Campbell asked what the impact would be on the T0029 delivery (would the T0029 sub-folder structure be eliminated?). This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architect's list serv for comment from other states and will be addressed at the CVISN Deployment Workshop.

[2007-04-12] Per discussion at the Workshop and AI #99 assigned there, CR 4948 "T0023 E-Screening Transaction is Ineffective" will be closed and WA will write a new CR for the preferred option regarding T0023.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 4/12/2007 12:30:18 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 2/26/2007 5:37:55 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 4/12/2007 12:30:18 PM

CR Number: 4795

External Reference: SAFER CR 1429

Category: XML subscription enhancement

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: States request a capability for a state to select to receive the most recent record or all records for a given VIN, via the subscription process.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

Description: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

[2007-07-26] Not voted on. Approved by FMCSA for SAFER 7.3.

Further discussion with the CVISN stakeholders has determined that the subscription page shall provide the following selections:

1. Filter to receive the most recent record determined by Last_Update_Date
2. Filter to receive the most recent registration record determined by the Registration_Start_Date.

With the combination of using the IRP_Status_Code filter, the user shall be able to select the most recent active registration data.

[2007-05-17] Update to SAFER 1429 analysis presented at 2007-05-17 CVISN ACCB meeting:
"There is an existing filter called "Duplicates" for the T0028V2 transaction. Selection of "Duplicates" will allow the state to receive all records. De-selecting this option means the state will only receive one registration record per VIN.

The SAFER development team will need to analyze whether the "Duplicates" filter can be enhanced to retrieve the latest registration record. If not, a new filter will be created to support the future business rule changes in the T0022 transaction."

[2007-02-12] Correction
The discussion at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting centered on the meaning of “most recent record”, "most recent registration record", and on how states would use this information.

Gary DeRusha noted that this CR was meant to grandfather the current behavior, i.e., provide that a state may choose to receive only one registration record for a given VIN and state. However, since the SAFER VIN table has been restructured (SAFER Release 5.1), records are not overwritten, and it is possible for more than one registration record to exist for a given VIN and state. This CR was intended to address multiple registration records for a given VIN within a state.

It was proposed that the REGISTRATION_START_DATE in the SAFER VIN table be the field that determines the “most recent registration record”. It was also proposed that a state be able to filter on any one of the following options:
a. Retrieve the most recent registration record for which STATUS = “Active”
b. Retrieve the most recent registration record regardless of STATUS value
c. Retrieve the most recent registration record for which STATUS = “Active”, but if no such record exists, then retrieve the most recent registration record for which STATUS = “Inactive”

Users did not agree on the definition of "most recent record". States were not in agreement what the rule should be if there are registrations from more than one jurisdiction. This discussion is still open.

[2007-01-18] Discussed at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting.
APL and Volpe will reword the CR and repost to the listserv for another 30-day comment period.

[2006-12-18] Discussed at the 12/14/06 ACCB meeting.
States on the call supported recommending for FMCSA approval. Will be posted to the listserv for 30-day review.

[2006-12-08]
Background:
The SAFER subscription capability allows states to filter on certain fields, thus restricting the data that they receive. Subscription service currently exists for T0028 V2 (IRP Registration (Cab Card) Output Transaction) and T0031 (MCMIS Safety & Census Update Output Transaction).

With the SAFER 5.1 Release, the SAFER VIN table has been restructured to prevent

data from being overwritten. This means the SAFER database may contain multiple records for the same VIN.

Change Request:
At the November 2006 ACCB meeting, states requested that a filter be implemented for all output transactions to give states the option of receiving only the most recent registration record for a given VIN or all registration records for a given VIN. This will support SAFER CRs 50 and 1386 (Architecture CRs 2562 “Request to review SAFER business rule regarding multiple VINs” and 4788 “Transfer of Vehicle License Plate”). (NOTE: Architecture CR 2562/SAFER CR 1386 was disapproved 2006-12.)

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:09:31 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 12/8/2006 1:31:11 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 9/21/2007 8:09:31 AM

CR Number: 4788

External Reference: SAFER CR 1386

Category: SAFER/PRISM

Component:

Synopsis: Transfer of Vehicle License Plate

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2006-12-18] Closed - disapproved.

Description: Summary:
The business case is that a registrant transfers a license plate from a vehicle (vehicle A) previously in their fleet to a vehicle (vehicle B) that was not in SAFER already. Currently, changes to the SAFER Vehicle Registration Table differ, depending on whether the change was submitted via the CVISN XML or the PRISM PVF method.

When the transfer is made via the XML T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) transaction, SAFER updates the registration record for that plate by replacing the vehicle A registration data with vehicle B data. Vehicle A's registration data is no longer in any record. Therefore, a query using state/license plate number will return the one updated vehicle registration record that shows vehicle B's data.

When the transfer is made via the PVF method, a new registration record for vehicle B

with the new license plate number is created. Thus, PRISM is able to access both vehicle registration records.

Proposal:
The CVISN/PRISM subcommittee of the ACCB recommends that SAFER be changed so that the processing for a license plate transfer via an XML transaction is the same as the processing for a transfer via PVF.

Rationale:
With the restructured SAFER tables and the anticipated capability of requesting subscriptions based on last update date, states will have the option of receiving both records or just the most recent record. (A new CR will be written to allow this selection via the subscription process. This would support SAFER CRs 50 and 1386.) Many states have said they want to see both records and let the roadside folks figure out which one is current, while other states say they only want to see the most recent.

[2006-12-18] Discussed at 12/14/06 ACCB meeting.
Volpe has determined that the current CVISN handling of vehicle license plate transfer is correct and PRISM will be changed. This CR is closed, disapproved.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 12/18/2006 8:48:58 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 11/21/2006 11:45:06 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Adaptive Change

Closed On: 12/18/2006 8:48:58 AM

CR Number: 4778

External Reference:

Category: CVISN - National ITS Architecture

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Update CVISN Architecture to better address Expanded CVISN capabilities.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2006-12-18] Approved by J. Secrist.

Description: As part of the CVISN program, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) defined an initial set of capabilities that could be deployed incrementally by a state and its motor carriers. Those “Core CVISN” capabilities focus on electronically exchanging safety and credentialing information, electronically processing interstate

registration and fuel tax credentials and filings, and implementing transponder-based roadside electronic screening at one fixed or mobile site. The Expanded CVISN initiative builds on Core CVISN to continue to enhance the safety, security and productivity of commercial vehicle operations and to improve access to and quality of information about commercial vehicle operations for authorized public and private sector users. Through extensive outreach in 2004, FMCSA engaged stakeholders to identify the capabilities necessary to achieve the goals of Expanded CVISN. This CR proposes changes to the CVISN Architecture and the National ITS Architecture to better support Expanded CVISN capabilities.

New Terminators:
* Driver Identification Card - This terminator represents the portable entity (e.g., a smart card) that enables the transfer of electronic identification information about a driver. This may include license information, biometrics, and other data to identify the driver.

New Architecture Flows:
*cv driver credention - Driver information (e.g., identity, biometrics, address, date of birth, endorsements, restrictions) stored on a driver's license or other official identification card used to identify a driver of commercial vehicles.
* cv repair status – Information about the completion of a repair to a commercial vehicle.
* cv driver record – Information typically maintained by a state driver licensing agency about a driver of a commercial vehicle including driver identification data, license data, permit data, and driving history details.
* cv driver record request - A request for information about a commercial vehicle driver.

Modified Subsystem description: Commercial Vehicle Check System (CVCS)

Modified Equipment Package (EP) Name: CV Safety and Security Administration

Modified EP descriptions: CV Information Exchange, CV Safety and Security Administration, Credentials and Taxes Administration, Fleet Administration, Manage CV Driver Identification, Citation and Accident Electronic Recording, Roadside Safety and Security Inspection

Added EP: In-Vehicle Signing System

Modified architecture flow descriptions:
* safety status information – Safety information such as safety ratings, security ratings or flags, inspection summaries, and violation summaries. A unique identifier is included. Corresponds to the safety and security portion of CVISN "snapshots." The status information may be provided as a response to a real-time query or as a result of a standing request for updated information (subscription). This may also include information about non-U.S. fleets for use by U.S. authorities, and information regarding U.S. fleets made available to Mexican and Canadian authorities. The query flow is not explicitly shown.
* credentials information – Response containing full vehicle fuel tax and registration credentials information. "Response" may be provided in reaction to a real-time query or a standing request for updated information. The query flow is not explicitly shown.

Flows added to the CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram:
accident report: CVAS to CVCS
accident report: CVAS to Other CVAS
accident report: Other CVAS to CVAS
alerts and advisories: Alerting and Advisory Systems to CVAS
alerts and advisories: Alerting and Advisory Systems to CVCS
citation: CVAS to CVCS

citation: CVAS to Other CVAS
citation: Other CVAS to CVAS
commercial vehicle disable: CVSAg(CVS) to CVCS
cv driver record: CVAS to CVCS
cv driver record: CVAS to CVOIR
cv driver record: CVAS to FMS
cv driver record: CVAS to Other CVAS
cv driver record: Other CVAS to CVAS
cv driver record request: CVCS to CVAS
cv driver record request: CVOIR to CVAS
cv driver record request: FMS to CVAS
cv driver record request: CVAS to Other CVAS
cv driver record request: Other CVAS to CVAS
cv driver credential: Driver ID Card to CVCS
cv driver credential: Driver ID Card to CVSAg(CVS)
cv driver credential: Driver ID Card to FMS
cv repair status: FMS to CVAS
expected driver identity characteristics: CVSAg(CVS) to CVCS
freight equipment information: CVSAg(CVS) to CVCS

These changes will be reflected in the CVISN Architecture document. In that document, the architecture flows will also be mapped between specific equipment packages (new Table 2).

[2006-10-19] Presented at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.
Attendees recommended that this be approved. The CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects' listserv for an additional 30-day comment period.

[2006-11-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval at the 11/16 ACCB meeting.

IMPACT SUMMARY:
ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram - delivered 1/5/07
2. CVISN Architecture Document - delivered 1/5/07

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 1/8/2007 12:23:01 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 10/12/2006 8:10:30 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Adaptive Change

Closed On: 1/8/2007 12:23:01 PM

CR Number: 4777

External Reference: WA; SAFER CR 1508

Category: Request for summary reports

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Request for summary data reports that can be used by states to do a quick check of their CVIEW data quality.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist.

Description: Summary data can be used by states to do a quick check of their CVIEW data quality. It also provides a way to track growth of the various types of data (vehicles, fleets, IFTA accounts, Carriers, etc.) in SAFER.

Following are suggested monthly reports, tabulated by state:

1. total carriers, carrier updates for month
2. total IRP accounts, active IRP accounts, IRP account updates for month
3. total fleets, active fleets, fleet updates for month
4. total vehicles, active vehicles, vehicles updates for month
5. total IFTA accounts, active IFTA accounts, IFTA account updates for month

If possible the states would like to be able to specify the time frame for the monthly summary report to allow synchronization of the report with our local processing cycle. If not, there should at least be an established cut off date each month so that states will be able to determine which of their transactions should or should not be included in the report. [WA 2006-10-20 comment]

[2006-10-19] Presented at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting

[2006-11-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval at the 11/16 ACCB meeting.

[2007-01-15] Volpe: The SAFER development team will need to further clarify the above requirements with the stakeholders. For example, when it says 'updates for the month', does that mean the total count of updates for that transaction SAFER received?

The suggested reports are doable and should be a good way for tracking the growth of the data.

Not sure about how that would that help the data quality checking unless other data elements are included in the report template.

[2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. More input will be solicited from the states at the CVISN Deployment Workshop.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 5/7/2007 4:50:21 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 10/12/2006 6:50:10 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 5/7/2007 4:50:21 PM

CR Number: 4776

External Reference: WA; SAFER CR 1507

Category: SAFER Upload Change Tracking

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: A SAFER Web page and/or Web service query capability is needed that will allow a state to retrieve all XML transaction data for a vehicle, fleet, or other uploaded entity that is uploaded by a state using a T0019, 20, 21, 22 or 24 transaction.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist.

Description: SAFER Upload Change Tracking: A SAFER Web page and/or Web service query capability is needed that will allow a state to retrieve all XML transaction data for a vehicle (VIN), fleet or other uploaded entity that is uploaded by a state using a T0019, 20, 21, 22 or 24 transaction.

This is a SAFER data integrity related enhancement. The primary purpose of this enhancement is to aid with troubleshooting of problems where a state is not receiving data from another state or a state's data is not appearing in SAFER.

The queried information needs to include the XML upload file name and time stamp for each XML file where matching data is found.

The process used to extract the XML data must use "relaxed" versions of the XSD's for the above transactions so that no fields are required. The intent here would be to capture as much data as possible from the incoming XML files so that that even XML transactions that are rejected by SAFER would be logged in the tracking database (as much is practical).

14 months worth of data should be kept so we can find the data for the last vehicle renewal for a vehicle.

The primary key fields for each transaction type would be the key fields used to perform a query. The only exceptions to this would be: 1) T0022 transaction – allow query by VIN or LICENSE_PLATE_NUMBER and 2) T0024 transaction – allow query by VIN or TRANSPONDER_ID.

[2006-10-19] Presented at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.
While several states supported implementation of this capability, others questioned why Volpe's monitoring is not adequate. Volpe noted that this capability would enable states to do their own analysis, as sometimes the reason for an upload failure is related to states' business rules. It was agreed that this CR would be posted to the CVISN System Architects listserv for further comment.

[2006-11-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval at the 11/16 ACCB meeting.

[2007-01-15] Volpe. To fulfill this request, a SAFER query function needs to be implemented and the information will be displayed via the SAFER web page. The preliminary requirements from the ACCB are listed below:
1. The record should contain the XML upload file name with corresponding upload date.
2. Use "relaxed" versions of the schemas that the input transactions are using
3. Track all input transaction file names including the ones that failed. This implies the processing status should be one of the data element as well.
4. Tracking scope consists of 14 months worth of data to cover the last renewal information for a vehicle.
5. The searching parameters for each transaction would be limited to the key fields in each transaction.
The SAFER team will need to clarify the above requirements further with the stakeholders before designing such capability.

[2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. More input will be solicited from the states at the CVISN Deployment Workshop.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 5/7/2007 4:50:10 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 10/12/2006 6:49:06 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 5/7/2007 4:50:10 PM

CR Number: 4764

External Reference:

Category: CVISN - National ITS Architecture

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Eliminate distinction between wireline and wireless lines on CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-01-08] Closed; document delivered.

Description: Different line types are used on the CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram to indicate Wireline (Fixed Point Communications), DSRC, Wide Area Wireless, and Other Transactions. The distinction between wireline and wireless communications is no longer

of value for CVO applications.

Fix: Use a single line type for both wireless and wireline communications.

[2006-09-22] Presented at the 9/21/06 ACCB meeting.
Attendees recommended that this be approved. The CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects' listserv for an additional 30-day comment period.

[2006-10-19] No dissenting comments. Recommended for FMCSA ECCB approval.

IMPACT SUMMARY:
ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram - delivered 1/5/07
2. CVISN Architecture Document (contains diagram) - delivered 1/5/07

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 1/8/2007 12:23:15 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/18/2006 9:29:52 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Adaptive Change

Closed On: 1/8/2007 12:21:30 PM

CR Number: 4763

External Reference:

Category: CVISN - National ITS Architecture

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Add source and destination equipment packages for CVISN architecture flows

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-01-08] Closed; document delivered.

Description: The National ITS Architecture shows source and destination equipment packages for each architecture flow that is exchanged between EPs in different subsystems. The CVISN Architecture document does not.

Fix: Add a table to show source and destination equipment packages for each flow.

[2006-09-22] Presented at the 9/21/06 ACCB meeting.
Attendees recommended that this be approved. The CR will be posted to the CVISN

System Architects' listserv for an additional 30-day comment period.

[2006-10-19] No dissenting comments. Recommended for FMCSA ECCB approval.

IMPACT SUMMARY:
ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture Document - delivered 1/5/07

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 1/8/2007 12:23:25 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/18/2006 9:28:01 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Adaptive Change

Closed On: 1/8/2007 12:21:15 PM

CR Number: 4762

External Reference:

Category: CVISN - National ITS Architecture

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Slightly expand scope of CVISN Architecture document

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-01-08] Closed; document delivered.

Description: The CVISN System Design Description document is no longer maintained. It contained several high-level diagrams and descriptions should be updated and made accessible to all states in a current document.

Fix: The only document that is being maintained is the CVISN Architecture. Expand the scope of the CVISN Architecture document to include selected high-level diagrams and descriptions. In particular:
• Move the brief description of Core CVISN capabilities into the CVISN Architecture document.
• Annotate the latest version of the sausage diagram (see CR 4758) to highlight CVO aspects and move it into the CVISN Architecture document.
• Add the table of standard identifiers to the CVISN Architecture document.
• Add the brief descriptions of the 41 Expanded CVISN Capabilities to the CVISN Architecture document. These were documented in APL document SSD-PL-05-0202, Expanded Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Summary

Report, June 2005.

[2006-09-22] Presented at the 9/21/06 ACCB meeting.
Discussion focused on the attachment, CR4762_CVISNArchScope_VB1.pdf. In figure A, page 2, the title should refer to "Core CVISN" instead of "CVISN Level 1". With regard to the Vehicle Plate ID standard identifier for vehicles figure C, page 6, Volpe suggested that the reference for country codes to the FHWA Code Directory should be replaced with a reference to ISO standard 3166, since that is what is now being used. On that same page, there was also confusion about the two standard identifiers for vehicle; the line between the Vehicle Identification Number and Vehicle Plate ID was in the wrong place. The attachment has been updated and renamed CR4762_CVISNArchScope_R1.pdf.

Attendees recommended that this be approved. The CR and revised attachment will be posted to the CVISN System Architects' listserv for an additional 30-day comment period.

[2006-10-19] No dissenting comments. Recommended for FMCSA ECCB approval.

IMPACT SUMMARY:
ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture Document - delivered 1/5/07

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: CR4762_CVISNArchScope_R4.ppt
CR4762_Identifiers.doc

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 1/8/2007 12:23:35 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/18/2006 9:21:48 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Adaptive Change

Closed On: 1/8/2007 12:20:55 PM

CR Number: 4760

External Reference:

Category: CVISN - National ITS Architecture

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Update CVISN Architecture to keep pace with changes to the National ITS Architecture (Versions 5.1 and 5.1.1).

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-01-08] Closed; document delivered.

Description: Description:
The CVISN Architecture document should be updated to align with changes made in Version 5.1.0 and 5.1.1 of the National ITS Architecture. The changes include:

1. Architecture flow trip identification number was replaced by trip identification number input from CV Driver to CVSAg(CVS). (Version 5.1)

2. Version 5.1 of the National ITS Architecture organized the functional requirements by Equipment Package (EP) and added them to the physical architecture database and hypertext. In connection with those changes, the descriptions for these Equipment Packages were revised: Credentials and Taxes Administration, CV Information Exchange, CV Safety Administration, International CV Administration, Citation and Accident Electronic Recording, International Border Crossing, Roadside Electronic Screening, Roadside HAZMAT Detection, Roadside Safety and Security Inspection, Roadside WIM, On-board Cargo Monitoring, On-board CV Electronic Data, On-board CV Safety and Security, On-board Driver Authentication, On-board Trip Monitoring, Vehicle Location Determination, Vehicle Mayday I/F (name modification as well), Vehicle Probe Support, Vehicle Toll/Parking Interface, Fleet Credentials and Taxes Management and Reporting, Fleet HAZMAT Management, Fleet Maintenance Management, Freight Administration and Management, and Manage CV Driver Identification. The revised EP descriptions clarify the functions assigned to each package.

3. Updated terminator description: Alerting and Advisory Systems

4. Updated ITS Standards Information (5.1.1) “The ITS standards area was updated to make it consistent with the new ITS Standards Program website. Many minor changes were made to the ITS standards information so that the two sites are completely consistent in the standards information that is presented. Changes were made to standards document numbers and standards titles and several standards were added/removed to match current ITS standards activities. The DSRC 915 Mhz standards group description was updated to reflect feedback from the CVO community.” Further analysis required to determine if these changes impact the CVISN architecture.

Fix: Update the CVISN Architecture document to match the new flow name, equipment package descriptions, and terminator description.

[2006-09-22] Presented at the 9/21/06 ACCB meeting.
Attendees recommended that this be approved. The CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects' listserv for an additional 30-day comment period.

[2006-10-19] No dissenting comments. Recommended for FMCSA ECCB approval.

IMPACT SUMMARY:
ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture Document - delivered 1/5/07

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 1/8/2007 12:23:45 PM

Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	9/15/2006 10:00:15 AM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Adaptive Change
Closed On:	1/8/2007 12:20:34 PM

CR Number:	4758
External Reference:	
Category:	CVISN - National ITS Architecture
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	Bring the CVO Subsystems Interconnect ("sausage") diagram into alignment with the corresponding National ITS Architecture diagram.
Status:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	[2007-04-09] Closed
Description:	The following changes need to be made to the CVO diagram to bring it into alignment with changes made to Version 5.0 of the National ITS Architecture: 1. Add Security Monitoring subsystem 2. Change Wireline Wide Area Communications to Fixed-Point to Fixed-Point Communications 3. Add "(Mobile)" to Wide Area Wireless Communications label 4. Change Personal Information Access to Wide Area Wireless (Mobile) Communications 5. Change Roadside label to Field The attached file shows the proposed changes. [2006-09-22] Presented at the 9/21/06 ACCB meeting. Attendees recommended that this be approved. The CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects' listserv for an additional 30-day comment period. [2006-10-19] No dissenting comments. Recommended for FMCSA ECCB approval. ---------- IMPACT SUMMARY: ACCB Items: 1. CVISN System Design Description (not currently maintained) 2. Introductory Guide to CVISN (not currently maintained)
Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	CR4758 Natl ITS Arch Sausage w CVO highlights.ppt
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	4/9/2007 9:25:12 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/14/2006 2:57:23 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Low

Priority: No

Type: Adaptive Change

Closed On: 4/9/2007 9:25:12 AM

CR Number: 4727

External Reference: SAFER CR 960

Category: Intrastate SafeStat data

Component: SAFER/Web Services

Synopsis: Synopsis: SAFER needs to be enhanced to handle Intrastate SafeStat data.

Summary: 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.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. Scheduled for SAFER 5.2.

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)

[2006-10-19] Status reported at 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.
Implementation was deferred from SAFER 5.1 but is on the list for FY07.

[2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. Scheduled for SAFER 5.2

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 5/7/2007 4:50:56 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

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

Entered By: Roberts Onna Beth

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 5/7/2007 4:50:56 PM

CR Number: 4640

External Reference: SAFER 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: Closed Fixed

Disposition: [2006-10-19] Closed. Fixed per SAFER 5.1.

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.

[2006-10-19] Status reported at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.
NE will report later this year as to whether this issue has been resolved by the implementation of the subscription capability (Architecture CR 2412 - SAFER CR 10) in

SAFER 5.1.

[2006-12-18] Discussed at the 12/14/06 ACCB meeting.
Nebraska has tested the subscription capability but will wait until early 2007 to implement it. They will report back in February as to whether the subscription capability relieves the processing problems.

[2007-03-27] John Casteel, NE.
Nebraska recently changed our SAFER T0031 download process to utilize the new SAFER T0031 subscription service. We have been using the subscription service for about a month now and last week was the first time we took the T0031 baseline files using this new feature. Shown below are the Nebraska download/database update times reported from the February regular T0031 baseline run compared to the processing times for the March subscription T0031 baseline run.

Regular T0031 (February 2007)
Download = 5 hours 12 minutes
DB Update = 7 hours 33 minutes
Total Processing Time = 12 hours 45 minutes

Subscription T0031 (March 2007)
Download = 1 hour 54 minutes
DB Update = 2 hours 38 minutes
Total Processing Time = 4 hours 32 minutes

In our case, we reduced total processing time for T0031 baseline files by about 75% (12 plus hours down to 4 plus hours). I expect other states that decide to use the SAFER T0031 subscription service would also see reduced processing times, but their percentage may differ from Nebraska. The variance would depend on what fields and how many fields the state identifies in their subscription service with SAFER.

Fix: New subscription capability implemented.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 3/29/2007 3:31:18 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 4/10/2006 5:24:21 PM

Entered By: Roberts Onna Beth

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 12/11/2006 8:28:09 AM

CR Number: 4626

External Reference:

Category: Add capability for multiple DBA names in SAFER

Component: SAFER/MCMIS

Synopsis: Modify MCMIS and SAFER to accommodate multiple DBA name fields.

Summary:
Currently, SAFER and MCMIS contain one DBA field. Several states have expressed a need for multiple DBA names, while several states are against multiple DBA names. Currently, some states concatenate multiple DBA names in the single DBA name field in MCMIS and state systems handle the multiple names. If this change were approved and implemented, both MCMIS and SAFER would need to be changed.

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2006-06-23] Disapproved

Description: [Barbara Hague, MO - 10-27-2005] requested information on how to handle multiple "Doing Business As" (DBA) names that are concatenated in the DBA field in the SAFER T0031 transaction. In Missouri, divisions of one legal entity use the same DOT # but have different DBA names. How do states use the DBA data? What is the purpose of having a string of multiple names in one data field? If the state cannot clearly assign legal responsibility, how can it assign responsibility for Safety?

[Doug Deckert, WA - 02-23-2006] Multiple DBA names may assist enforcement in identifying the carrier. It was noted that often a truck will have a name and USDOT on its side and the name is neither the legal name nor the registered DBA name. Also, a driver may give a carrier name that again does not match either of the search names in SAFER.

Since the DBA name originates in MCMIS, via completion of the MCS-150 form, any change in the number of DBA fields must be made in MCMIS. In turn this will affect SAFER and the CVIEWs.

This issue was posted to the CVISN system architect's listserv in February. Some of the comments include:

[MD DJ Waddell - 03-02-2006] As an example, a CV enforcement officer would use a browser-based interface to CVIEW to find the listed DBA names for a carrier whose vehicle is presently sitting on the static scale. If the name on the door doesn't match any in the list, then pull 'em in to show paper.

[NY Stephen Trudell - 03-03-2006] New York would like a limit of 3 DBAs. NY inspection people feel that this number of DBA entries would capture the vast majority of carriers with multiple DBAs. If a carrier utilizes more than 3 DBAs, then a red flag should go up.

[WA Doug Deckert - 03-03-2006] There may be times when a carrier will use a DBA name in one state and a different DBA name in another state. Often when an officer looks up the USDOT # they will see a legal name and a DBA name that doesn't match the DBA given by the trucker or on the side of the truck. Providing multiple DBA names (hopefully with a match) would help both the officers and the carriers (really the truck drivers) make things go more smoothly while the officer is inspecting paperwork or the commercial vehicle. Agree with the idea of three DBAs allowed and then raise a warning.

[MT Jodee Alm - 03-09-2006] Montana agrees that there should be a least 2 DBA's. But more than just the states' CVIEWs, SAFER, and MCMIS will be affected by this change. One has to remember what feeds into their CVIEWs. For Montana, we may also look at having to update our IRP, IFTA and Permitting Applications, plus any reports or forms

that are printed with this information.

[TX Tammy Duncan - 03-10-2006] Texas DPS strongly feels there should be only a single DBA allowed per carrier. If a carrier wants to operate under additional names, they should apply for different operating authority and/or US DOT numbers.

Texas deals with approximately 300,000 commercial vehicle inspections and 16,000 commercial vehicle crashes annually, and verifies the carrier information on every inspection and crash report. DPS believes very strongly that adding additional DBAs will make the process for creating and maintaining carrier profiles exceptionally more difficult.

If you allow multiple DBAs, where do you draw the line... Two, three, twenty? It is felt that the current limit of one DBA is more than sufficient to consistently ensure proper identification of a motor
carrier.

[FMCSA Sharon Owenson - 03-10-2006] Another aspect of changing the number of DBA names is the FMCSA regulations. 49 CFR 390.21(b)(1) states that the legal name or a single trade name of the motor carrier operating the self-propelled CMV, as listed on the motor carrier identification report (Form MCS-150) and submitted in accordance with Section 390.19. All FMCSA systems are set up to use only one DBA name. Using the legal name on the trucks and the trade name will allow you to use any trade name you want on the side of the truck as long as the officer can match the legal name and the USDOT number. In these instances where you have multiple DBA names, the DBA field would be left blank in MCMIS.

Example: JOHN DOE dba FARM & COUNTRY STORE USDOT XXXXXXX

Also, in response to the Texas suggestion that a company apply for other USDOT numbers and authority, it is important to remember that there can be only one USDOT number per company. You must set up a separate corporation to have another USDOT number. Hopefully that is what Texas
meant.

[2006-04-25] Presented at the 4/20/2006 ACCB meeting.
This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects listserv for a 30-day comment period and a vote.
Action: States are requested to respond by 2006-05-17 to these questions:
1. Does the state support modifications to MCMIS and SAFER to carry multiple DBA names?
2. If "yes", how many DBA names and how would the state use the multiple names?

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.
The text string comes from the FMCSA MCS150 entry form. The current usage is uncontrolled. Even if more DBA Name fields are provided, there are no edit checks to keep from continuing to concatenate the DBA Names in one or more fields. Some states felt that the amount of effort needed to implement this CR would be put to better use on more important CRs. The comments received on this CR will be tallied by APL and posted to the listserv.

[2006-06-23] This CR was disapproved at the 6/22/06 ACCB meeting.
After further discussion, the ACCB decided that the time and effort required to implement this CR would be better spent on more critical CRs. Participants agreed that this CR should be disapproved.

Fix:

Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Roberts Onna Beth
Modified Time:	1/2/2007 2:35:22 PM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	3/22/2006 4:15:49 PM
Entered By:	Roberts Onna Beth
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Enhancement
Closed On:	1/2/2007 2:35:22 PM

CR Number:	4529
External Reference:	SAFER CR 486, SAFER CR 799
Category:	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:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	[2006-09-18] Closed; incorporated into SAFER Release 5.1.
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 implemenation 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: 9/18/2006 7:09:51 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: 9/18/2006 7:09:51 AM

CR Number: 3958

External Reference: VOLPE CR 432

Category: SAFER Web services

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: SAFER Web service issues

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: [2005-09-22]Discussed at ACCB mtg. Should not have been an ARCH CR only SAFER CR for ACCB information. Closed.

Description: From Volpe CR 432:
JHUAPL reported four issues with the current SAFER Web services. The detailed information is contained in the attachment.

Basically, the issue has been identified in the following areas:

1. Transaction Authentication

It is found that a couple query transactions using Web services do not enforce authentication from the client system. As matter of fact, this issue was already fixed in the test system when the SAFER team was working with NDSU development team.

2. Error in globalTypes.xsd. Mexico shows up twice in the list of permissible jurisdictions.
This can be corrected along with the SAFER CR 306 in the October release. The Volpe center will distribute the updated globalTypes.xsd by September 16th.

3. Document element attributes. The XML namespace tags are correct for T0001 and T0032 but incorrect for T0031 and T0028.
This problem was fixed in T0032 when Wisconsin reported it. A similar fix can be applied to T0031 and T0028. Volpe should check with the Web service users before deploying the changes in the production version to avoid adverse impact.

4. The XML declaration is missing from the T0001 transaction.
Volpe has evaluated this and propose to fix it in the next deployment of the test service.

[2005-09-22] Disscussed at the ACCB meeting on 9/22/05.
It was determined that this CR should have been a SAFER CR for ACCB information only and not an Architecture CR. Closed

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: PSE-05-028.doc

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 10/4/2005 8:37:19 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/19/2005 8:10:39 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 10/3/2005 8:50:39 AM

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: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2006-09-18] Closed; incorporated into SAFER Release 5.1.

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 databe 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:	9/18/2006 7:09:36 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:	9/18/2006 7:09:36 AM

CR Number:	3671
External Reference:	SAFER CR 306
Category:	SAFER XML
Component:	SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis:	Add CANU to GlobalType.xsd
Status:	Closed Fixed
Disposition:	[2007-01-17] Closed - fix deployed 12/14/06.
Description:	[2005-06-21] SAFER CR 306 This change request is created to address Call # 80885 initiated by Cambridge Systematics. While processing data for the state of Connecticut, it was found the globalTypes.xsd file did not have one of the Canadian jurisdiction abbreviations: CANU for Nunavut. The globalTypes.xsd needs to be updated to reflect this change. [2005-06-29] Presented and discussed at the 6/23/05 ACCB meeting. This CR was submitted by CSI after the new Canadian jurisdiction code "CANU," for Nunavut, was found in data for Connecticut. 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. Volpe noted that this should be addressed at the enterprise-level and changed in all FMCSA systems. Changes need to be coordinated within FMCSA as well as with the states. It was requested that schema changes coincide with software release dates and that states receive adequate notice, at least 30 days. Volpe will discuss with FMCSA and get back to ACCB. [2005-08-19] Discussed at the 8/18/05 ACCB meeting This change can be made to SAFER independently from other enterprise applications. Volpe can make the change in the October 3 release. Volpe will send out the revised

schema by mid-September. This CR was recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2006-03-21]
Fixed in SAFER v4.9 October 2005

[2006-10-19] This change has not been implemented, but is expected to be deployed in the next few weeks.

Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States:

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 1/17/2007 3:28:38 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 6/21/2005 8:32:19 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 1/17/2007 3:28:38 PM

CR Number: 3670

External Reference: SAFER CR 143, SAFER CR 302, SAFER CR 348

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Develop a Business Use Case for E-screening Enrollment and Transponder ID Management/SAFER capability to support Transponder "Opt-Out" Process

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

Description: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

[2007-07-26] Not voted on. Approved by FMCSA for SAFER 7.3.

After a series of discussions on E-Screening business re-modeling, instead of implementing the Opt-In approach, the CVISN stakeholders proposed a Transponder "Opt-Out" Process for carriers that wish to decline E-Screening in specific states. The document created by Bill Goforth from WA is attached to this CR.

This new proposal requires SAFER to make the following changes:

1. SAFER shall allow any state to change any transponder data and its associated opt-out information via the new transaction T0024 v2.
2. SAFER shall have the capability to capture the changes for transponder, opt-out information, who made the changes, change date in the system and allow tracking via SAFER web query.
3. SAFER shall discontinue the T0023 transaction.
4. SAFER shall enhance the T0024 transaction to add the data elements for the opt-out information. The complete data elements in the T0024 V2 will contain the following:
-VIN (mandatory)
-transponder_number
-transponder_jurisdiction (mandatory)
-transponder_update_date (mandatory)
-opt_out_jurisdiction
-opt_out_state
-opt_out_country
-opt_out_change_date
-op_out_change_carrier
-safety_carrier (mandatory)
-activity_code (mandatory)
-last_update_date (mandatory)

5. SAFER shall send all above transponder information to all states via the T0029 transaction unless the states are on the opt-out state list.
6. SAFER shall generate T0029 for updated e-screening transactions and baseline generation.
7. SAFER shall place the T0029 data files in the T0029 FTP root directory. SAFER shall remove the states directory at a later time when all states are ready to switch to the T0029 root directory for download.

The proposed process requires CVISN states to perform the following:
1. Update XML schema to the new T0024 v2
2. Program CVIEW to add logic to the T0029 processing to ignore transponder for screening when their jurisdiction is on the opt_out_jurisdiction list for the transponder.
3. Program CVIEW to point to the T0029 FTP directory for T0029 download.
4. Responsible for making changes to the opt_out jurisdiction data for the transponder and submit the updates via a T0024 update file to replace all previous opt-out jurisdictions for the transponder with the new opt_out jurisdictios.

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 2006-11-16 ACCB meeting.
Volpe has not completed development of a Business Use Case for e-screening enrollment and transponder management, and it was requested that they participate in the E-Screening Focus Group.

[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.

[2006-05-17] Discussed at 2007-05-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. Volpe has rewritten SCR 302 to be the replacement for Architecture CR 4948 "T0023 E-Screening Enrollment Transaction is Ineffective" which was withdrawn at the 2007-04-19 ACCB meeting.

[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.

[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.

[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.

[2005-06-29] 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.

[2005-06-21] 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.

Impact on SAFER:
The proposed change required a new data value added to the activity_code to reflect the revocation of an authorization for a particular jurisdiction.

In addition, the T0029 transaction will need to be modified to send out an update file containing empty transponder information for the vehicles owned by that particular carrier.

Impact on States:

See list above. The state will need to use the new activity code =20 in T0023 transaction to indicate the revocation of the previously authorized jurisdiction.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:08:06 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

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

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 9/21/2007 8:08:06 AM

CR Number: 3115

External Reference: SAFER174; Arch CRs 2443,2637,2933,3039,3040,3830, 732

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Create T0031V2 transaction to send additional company information to CVISN states

Summary: This transaction will be versioned to add company data to the T0031 transaction.

Action: States are requested to comment as to whether there are additional MCMIS data

fields they would like to see added to the T0031v2 transaction not currently seen in the T0031 transaction.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2005-09-22] Closed Approved. In SAFER Release 4.8

Description: MMA has requested that Company OOS flag and OOS date be added to the T0031 transaction.

SAFER has received OOS date and OOS flag from MCMIS since January 2005. In order for SAFER to deliver new data elements, a new version of the T0031 transaction will be created. States interested in receiving the new data elements will be required to change their XML schema and the program to accept the new data from the new T0031 transaction. States not interested in receiving those data will continue to use the current version of T0031.

[2005-04-25] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2005-04-21.
This transaction will be versioned to add additional MCMIS data fields to the transaction (T0031v2). States will only have to make modifications to their systems if they want these fields. Volpe asked the states if there are other MCMIS 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.

[2005-05-34] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2005-05-19.
Volpe has additional data fields that could be added to this transaction. They will update the CR and post it to the CVISN Systems Architect list serv for comment by the states. Architecture CR 3040 (SAFER 152) - Add Carrier OOS data to the carrier snapshot, and Architecture 2933 (SAFER 124) - New values for REIVEW_REASON_NOT_RATED were recommended for FMCSA approval late last year as a versioned T0031. It was suggested that both of these CRs be closed and incorporated into Arch CR 3115.

[2005-05-27] Jingfei Wu (Volpe) posted the following updates to SAFER CR 174 (Arch CR 3115) to the list serv.
Since 01/04, the company snapshot has been modified a couple times to accept the new data elements from MCMIS. However T0031 has not been updated to reflect the new changes, although the CRs have been created for them. At the ACCB meeting of May 2005, the states suggested combining all related CRs into the current CR, which is SAFER CR174. All new data elements that SAFER is receiving from MCMIS will be included in the T0031v2 transaction.

Therefore, the following data elements will be added into the new version of the T0031 transaction called T0031v2:
OOS data
HM Safety Permit data
New Entrant Code
New values for Review_Type
New values for Review_Reason_Not_Rated

The following CRs will be closed and referenced to CR 3115 (SAFER CR 174) for future status updates: CR 3039 (SAFER CR144), CR 3040 (SAFER CR 152), CR 2933 (SAFER CR 124), CR 2443 (SAFER CR 12).

[2005-06-29] Discussed at the 6/23/05 ACCB meeting.
OK requested that the new MCS150 data elements be added to T0031V2 MCMIS Safety and Census Update Output Transaction. This would require MCMIS work and needs FMCSA approval. SAFER CR 109 addresses the MCS150 fields and remains open pending further discussion with the MCMIS team. Action Item: Terri Ungerman (OK) will compile a list of the new MCS150 elements that are not contained in the T0031v2

MCMIS Safety and Census Update Output Transaction and will send the list to Volpe.

OK also requested that T0031V2 contain a count of how many inspections, conducted within the last 24 months, included overweight enforcement. Volpe said that this could be accomplished during the weekly MCMIS load by adding it to the program that performs the counts. This would require additional MCMIS work.

[2005-07-25] Architecture CR 2637 (SAFER CR109) will be closed and referenced to CR 3115 for future updates.

[2005-07-25] Volpe replaced description for SAFER CR 174, new description follows. During the past year, the company snapshot (former carrier snapshot) has been modified a couple times to include the new data elements in the data transferring process coming from MCMIS to SAFER. These new data are displayed through the SAFER web site to the general public and enforcement users, however, these data are not available for the XML CVIEW states via the Carrier Safety and Census output transaction (T0031). In the past, some states have requested adding certain data to the T0031 transactions, and these requests have been documented in CR144 (Arch 3039), CR152 (Arch 3040), CR124 (Arch 2933), CR109 (Arch 2637), CR12 (Arch 2443).

In order to support the forthcoming new company snapshot changes and provide the CVIEW users new data that are consistent with those displayed on the SAFER web site, it was decided to consolidate all previous Change Requests that are related to the company snapshot/T0031 changes into this Change Request. Upon approval by FMCSA, a new version of the T0031 transaction will be implemented in SAFER to include all new data that SAFER receives and will receive from MCMIS but not yet in the current T0031 transaction. The following is the proposed list of the new data fields that will be added to the T0031V2 transaction in the SAFER 4.8 release in September:

* OOS data
* HM Safety Permit data
* New Entrant Code
* New values for Review_Type,
* New values for Review_Reason_Not_Rated
* MCS-150 new data elements [See notes below from CR 2637]
* Registrant carrier
* Tow away carrier
* cargo tank only carrier

States interested in receiving the new data elements through T0031V2 will need to change the CVIEW programs and use the new XML schema T0031v2. States not interested in receiving these data can continue to use the current version of T0031 without making any changes.

The Volpe Center is asking the CVIEW users to review the proposed data fields listed above to see if the CR has captured your data requests and if any there is any additional data you would like to add to the T0031V2 transaction.

****
MCS-150 New Values (from Arch CR 2637):
[2004-06-29] At the 6/23/05 ACCB meeting, Terri Ungerman (OK) to look into the data elements on the MCS150 form that don't appear to be in the T0031. The hope is that any missing items could be added to the T0031 when it is revised. The results are listed below.

1. Field 14 on the MCS150 form (Principal Contact Cellular Phone Number). This may be referred to by the LU User ID in the T0031, but it wasn't clear to me that it is

referencing the same data.

2. Field 21 on the MCS150 form includes options to circle E.Intrastate Shipper and F. Vehicle Registration Only. In the T0031 it appears that there is a field for Intrastate Shipper - HM, and a field for Hazmat status but I'm not sure how these correspond with item E on the MCS 150. There doesn't appear to be any field in the T0031 to accommodate F. Vehicle Registration Only.

3. Field 26 of the MCS150 is a table of values. In the T0031 it appears the totals for some of the columns are provided for, but not the individual table entries.

4. Field 27 of the MCS150 is also a table where the T0031 appears to provide the column totals but not individual values.

5. There doesn't appear to be places in the T0031 where the officer names are provided as shown on the MCS 150 form field 29.
****

[2005-08-02] Presented and discussed at the 7/28/05 ACCB meeting
The design document for T0031v2 will be sent to FMCSA for review next week. Volpe will consult the MCMIS team as to the feasibility of adding the count of how many inspections in the last 24 months had the OS/OW field checked and report at the next ACCB meeting. Recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2005-08-19] Discussed at the 8/18/05 ACCB meeting
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. Therefore, this item will be removed from CR 3115, and new Architecture and SAFER CRs will be created for it. CR 3115 will be included in the October 3 release.

[2005-09-22] Discussed as part of SAFER 4.8 Release. Incorporated CR 732 into this CR.

Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States: States interested in receiving the new data elements through T0031V2 will need to change the CVIEW programs and use the new XML schema T0031v2. States not interested in receiving those data can continue to use the current version of T0031 without making any changes.

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 10/3/2005 11:02:44 AM

Modified By: Roberts Onna Beth

Entered On: 4/15/2005 9:36:52 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 10/3/2005 11:02:03 AM

CR Number: 3114

External Reference: SAFER CR 173

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: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. Scheduled for SAFER 5.3.

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.

[2006-10-19] Status reported at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting. Volpe will discuss FY07 implementation of this capability with FMCSA. It will need coordination with L&I.

[2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. Scheduled for SAFER 5.3.

Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States:

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 5/7/2007 4:50:36 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

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

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 5/7/2007 4:50:36 PM

CR Number: 3094

External Reference: SAFER CR 164

Category: SAFER XML, EDI

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Add a check constraint to SAFER for the value of IRP_WEIGHT_CARRIED.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2006-09-18] Closed; incorporated into SAFER Release 5.1.

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:	1/23/2007 12:42:52 PM
Modified By:	Salazar Sandra B
Entered On:	2/14/2005 3:46:44 PM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Enhancement
Closed On:	9/18/2006 6:58:18 AM

CR Number:	3041
External Reference:	SAFER CR 149
Category:	SAFER XML
Component:	SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis:	Business rule check for T0024. Summary: Ensure that the Safety USDOT number in the vehicle registration table matches the carrier ID in the carrier authorization table.
Status:	Closed Disapproved
Disposition:	[2004-12-16] Closed - not an architecture CR
Description:	[2004-11-23] Implement a business rule in T0024 (vehicle transponder ID input transaction) to validate that the Safety USDOT number (CVIS_DEFAULT_CARIER) in the vehicle registration table (based on the VIN provided in the T0024) matches the USDOT number in the carrier authorization table (CARRIER_ID_NUMBER from the T0023 transaction, carrier escreening authorization input transaction). The current T0029 (vehicle transponder output transaction) requires that the Safety USDOT number in the vehicle registration table match the carrier ID number in the carrier authorization table, therefore failure to match will result in transponder data not being sent out. [2004-11-22] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2004-11-18. Volpe is continuing their analysis of this CR. [2004-12-16] It was decided this is not really an architecture CR so the architecture CR will be closed. The SAFER CR remains open. Impact on architecture: ----------
Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment	

names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	12/16/2004 3:06:52 PM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	11/16/2004 7:25:53 AM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Suggestion
Closed On:	12/16/2004 3:06:52 PM

CR Number:	3040
External Reference:	SAFER CR 152
Category:	SAFER carrier snapshot
Component:	SAFER/MCMIS
Synopsis:	Add carrier out-of-service data to the carrier snapshot Summary: New data elements related to OOS are available in MCMIS and could be added to the carrier snapshot T0031. It is not known whether CVISN stakeholders would like to receive this data via the snapshot. Action: States are requested to comment as to whether the T0031 should be versioned to include OOS data. Recommended for FMCSA approval as a versioned T0031.
Status:	Closed Is Duplicate
Disposition:	[2005-06-17] Closed - incorporated into CR 3115
Description:	[2004-11-16] from Volpe CR 152 FMCSA has requested that the carrier out-of-service data be added to the carrier snapshot. In order for that to happen, the snapshot will be revised to include the new data elements. MCMIS and SAFER will modify the loading program to support the changes. Once implemented, ISS, SAFETYNET and SAFER web will be receiving OOS data through SAFER. [2004-11-22] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2004-11-18. Volpe is preparing documentation on the OOS data elements that are available. APL will post the CR to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comments to see if the states want to receive this data. [2004-12-16] Presented at the ACCB meeting on 2004-12-16. Stakeholders expressed an interest in receiving the OOS data with the understanding that a new version of T0031 be developed and the current T0031 continue to be available. Recommended for FMCSA approval. [2005-06-17] Closed - incorporated into CR 3115

	Impact on architecture: ----------
Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	6/21/2005 9:21:56 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	11/16/2004 7:21:43 AM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Suggestion
Closed On:	6/17/2005 7:35:19 AM

CR Number:	3039
External Reference:	SAFER CR 144
Category:	SAFER ELQ
Component:	SAFER/MCMIS, CVIEW, PIQ
Synopsis:	Modify SAFER to accept New Entrant Code from MCMIS Summary: A new data element "New Entrant Code" is available in MCMIS and could be added to the carrier snapshot T0031. It is not known whether CVISN stakeholders would like to receive this data element via the snapshot. Action: States are requested to comment as to whether the T0031 should be versioned to include the New Entrant Code. Recommended for FMCSA approval as a versioned T0031.
Status:	Closed Is Duplicate
Disposition:	[2005-06-17] Closed - incorporated into CR 3115
Description:	[2004-11-16] from Volpe CR 144 A request to add the New Entrant Code data element to the SAFER database Company Snapshot has been approved by FMCSA. Modifications will need to be made on MCMIS and SAFER to incorporate the new code to the carrier snapshot. Once implemented, ISS, SAFETYNET, PIQ, and CVISN states will be able to receive the new entrant code data. The new data will be displayed on SAFER Web site as well. The detailed design and analysis are attached to this CR.

The estimated time on coding and testing is about 4 weeks.

[2004-11-22] Congress has required the FMCSA to establish minimum requirements for new motor carriers seeking federal interstate operating authority. These minimum requirements include having the carrier certify that it has systems in place to ensure compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations, and a safety audit conducted within the first 18 months of the carrier's interstate operation. Beginning January 1, 2003, all new motor carriers (private and for-hire) operating in interstate commerce must apply for registration (USDOT Number) as a "new entrant". After being issued a new entrant registration, the carrier will be subject to an 18-month safety-monitoring period. During this safety-monitoring period, the carrier will receive a safety audit and have their roadside crash and inspection information closely evaluated. The carrier will be required to demonstrate it has the necessary systems in place to ensure basic safety management controls. Failure to demonstrate basic safety management controls may result in the carrier having their new entrant registration revoked.

Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2004-11-18.
APL will post the CR with the New Entrant Code attachment to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comments to see if the states want to receive this data.

[2004-12-16] Presented at the ACCB meeting on 2004-12-16. Stakeholders expressed an interest in receiving the codes with the understanding that a new version of T0031 be developed and the current T0031 continue to be available. Recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2005-06-17] Incorporated into CR 3115.

Impact on architecture:

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: SAFER Company New Entrant Code.pdf

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 6/17/2005 7:34:09 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 11/16/2004 7:18:12 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 6/17/2005 7:34:09 AM

CR Number: 3013

External Reference: Arch CR 4651; SAFER CR 139, SAFER CR 164

Category: SAFER XML, SAFER ICD

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Standardization of data values in XML input transactions.

Summary: Data elements input to SAFER must be standardized to ensure data quality and integrity.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2006-03-30] Closed Approved

Description: [2004-10-18] During the 9/23 ACCB meeting Volpe led a discussion regarding left-justification of the CVIS_DEFAULT_CARRIER field. This is a data integrity issue that applies to many data elements, especially to those that could be interpreted as either character or numeric. Each XML transaction needs to be reviewed, but a general approach to addressing this issue is needed. Volpe will write one or more CRs to address this issue. The solution for the immediate problem with Nebraska registration data is that Nebraska will left-justify the values in the CVIS_DEFAULT_CARRIER field and re-baseline - this specific instance is addressed in Arch CR 2954 (SAFER CR 138). Arch CR 3013 (SAFER CR 139) addresses the general problem.

[2004-10-18] From SAFER CR 139
When searching data against the SAFER database, it has brought to our attention that some key data fields submitted from the XML input transactions are provided in an inconsistent manner.

A good example is that the IRP_ACCOUNT_NUMBER in T0020 can have leading zeros, leading space and etc. Another example is IRP_CARRIER_ID_NUMBER OR CVIS_DEFAULT_CARRIER in T0022 where leading zeros and null can be an issue to CVISN or PRISM states.

This CR is intended to address the need to standardize the input data fields as to how the data value should be provided to SAFER. The result of this effort shall improve the data integrity and data quality of the SAFER database.

The Volpe Center is conducting technical analysis on all XML input transactions and the SAFER database. Based on the analysis, a draft of SAFER data requirements will be developed and distributed to the stakeholders for review and discussion.

[2004-10-25] Presented and discussed at the 2004-10-21 ACCB meeting.
This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for review.

[2004-11-22] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2004-11-18.
Recommended for FMCSA approval. Volpe is continuing their analysis of this problem and will report back. Approved for Volpe to work on standards. When complete, a draft of SAFER data requirements will be distributed to the stakeholders for review and discussion.

[2005-03-01]
Contents of SAFER 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.
---------End SAFER CR 164

[2005-03-01] Architecture CR 3094 (SAFER CR 164) was 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.

[2005-03-21] SAFER CR 139 was presented and discussed at the 3/17/05 ACCB meeting.
Volpe took a first cut at standardizing data elements by looking at the key identifiers in transactions T0019, T0020, T0021, T0022 and T0024 and presented an Excel spreadsheet to the ACCB. The key identifiers potentially handle numbers in the input files with varchar2 as the data type in the database. Leading zeroes/spaces, trailing spaces and nulls are a common problem. It was mentioned that some states use leading zeroes as part of the number, such as, IRP_account_number. Others use special characters in the License_plate_number. States suggested taking the spreadsheet back to their IRP folks for review and then providing feedback to Volpe. The spreadsheet is attached.

[2005-04-25] Presented at the 4/21/05 ACCB meeting.
Volpe will compile the comments received and continue their analysis of the CR. States are encouraged to review the excel spreadsheet and send comments via the list serv.

[2005-08-02] Presented at the 7/28/05 ACCB meeting.
Seven states have commented on Volpe’s proposed solution, which was posted to the list serv after the June ACCB meeting. Volpe will post the updated spreadsheet to the CVISN System Architects list serv and solicit a final round of comments.

[2005-08-05] Jingfei Wu (Volpe) posted the following to the CVISN System Architects list serv:
"Enclosed is the latest spreadsheet containing the states' comments on the proposed standardization solution. Since this will be the final round of posting, states are recommended to submit any suggestions they might have to the Volpe Center."
The spreadsheet has been attached to this CR.

[2005-08-19] Discussed at the 8/18/05 ACCB meeting
The spreadsheet will be updated with additional comments received from Maryland and Texas. Volpe will post the updated spreadsheet to the CVISN System Architects list serv. There will be some consideration as to how existing standards can be incorporated into the spreadsheet.

[2005-09-22] Discussed at the 9/22/05 ACCB meeting
Andrew Wilson discussed a new Summary Spreadsheet that Volpe developed based on the spreadsheet containing all of the state’s comments. He proposed to consolidate today's discussion to include three main suggestions:
1. Take out leading and trailing spaces.
2. Allow leading zeroes in some fields.

3. Eliminate leading zeroes where the carrier_id_number is used.

[2005-12-20] Volpe's summary of the discussion and comments from the CVISN ACCB state participants:
"The common data problem in the XML input transactions are found to be leading zeroes, leading spaces, trailing spaces, zeroes and null. When the data for the same fields are inconsistently provided through different transactions containing this sort of data problem, users are not be able to perform query join to generate meaningful reports. The ACCB has suggested SAFER to programmatically remove them without changing the data provided by the states. The following is the list of requirement that SAFER needs to implement in order to address the data format issues:

1. Remove leading and trailing spaces for all key fields listed in the spreadsheet: CR3013-SAFER139_data standardization_102505.xls.
2. Allow leading zeroes in these fields such as IFTA_license_number, Fleet_number, IRP_account_number, VIN, and license_plate_number.
3. Eliminate leading zeroes where USDOT number is used such as carrier_id_number and SAFETY_carrier.

Data fields such as VIN and license plate number may have special characters as part of the data. SAFER will implement validation check against the existing standards. SAFER will also perform validation for USDOT number against the MCMIS data source which is the authoritative source for the carrier information. "
[end Volpe summary 12/20/05] See also 12/19/05 spreadsheet attachment

[2006-01-05] Presented and discussed at the 12/22/05 ACCB meeting.
The ACCB decided that states will be required to recertify based on the new data standards and re-baseline their data in order to improve data quality in SAFER. This CR will be implemented in SAFER Release 5.0 due out in late February 2006. The new data standards will be enforced for each state as they recertify. After recertification, SAFER will reject the records that do not conform to the new data standards.

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

Phase 1 will be implemented in the February 2006 release of SAFER v5.0. The SAFER CR 139 Specification has been added as an attachment to this CR.

[2006-03-23] Presented at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.
Phase 1 of this CR was released in SAFER 5.0. Edit checks are in place, and states need to recertify their CVIEWs by the end of the Calendar Year 2006. 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. This CR will be closed, and the Phase 2 changes will be documented in new Architecture and SAFER CRs.

[2006-04-19] CR 4651 created to cover Phase 2 changes

[2006-05-04] 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.
This CR was closed, and the Phase 2 (VIN/IRP/IFTA) validation checks will be documented in Architecture CR 4651 (SAFER CR 705) “Implement VIN, IRP Account and IFTA Account validation for SAFER XML Service input transaction”.

[2006-05-15] Volpe changed the wording of SAFER CR 164 to the following:
Synopsis: Add a check constrain to IRP_weight_carried
"This CR is created for an enhancement suggested by MDCVIEW & APLCVIEW. At the April 2006 ACCB discussion, stakeholders have provided detail information regarding the edit check for IRP_weight_carried. The previous description of the CR has been moved to the comments tab. The follow is the updated describtion of this CR. In the current SAFER system, IRP_weight_Carried is a mandatory field in T0022 transaction. However there is no specific requirement for the input value. The datatype of Vehicle_IRP_Juris.IRP_Weight_Carried is Varchar(2) which allows blank, null and zero to exist in SAFER. The stakeholders suggested to implement an edit check for IRP_weight_carried to improve the data quality in SAFER. The edits shall mandate the IRP_Weight_Carried is a number greater than 6,000 pounds. Blank, null and zero should not be allowed."

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: CR139_data standardization.xls
2004-05-20 CR3013-SAFER139_data standardization_Comments.xls
2004-05-21 CR3013-SAFER139_data standardization_Comments.xls
2005-12-19 CR3013-SAFER139_data standardization_Comments.xls
2006-01-25_CR 139 Specification.doc

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 5/15/2006 10:42:59 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 10/18/2004 2:19:57 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 3/30/2006 7:33:40 AM

CR Number: 3012

External Reference: SAFER CR 119

Category: Inspection reports

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Expand the inspection report storage in SAFER to 180 days

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2004-10-25] Closed; incorporated into SAFER release 4.6

Description: [2004-10-18] From SAFER CR 119
FMCSA requested the retention time for Inspection Reports be doubled from 90 days to 180 days.

The change was approved by Janet Curtis and Jeff Hall, 7/15/04.

It was incorporated into SAFER 4.6 and put in production as of 09/07 2004.

Impact on documentation: (note: none of these documents are maintained.)
ACCB Documents Affected:
Snapshot White Paper
COACH Part 1
COACH Part 3
COACH Part 5
Other Documents Affected:
CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange
SCOPE Workshop - Session 5

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 10/25/2004 1:37:55 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 10/18/2004 8:11:12 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 10/25/2004 1:37:55 PM

CR Number: 3011

External Reference: SAFER CR 112

Category: SAFER ELQ service

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Add third possible value "U" to post crash field

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2004-10-18] Incorporated in SAFER release 4.6

Description: [2004-10-18] from SAFER CR 112
In order to support Query Central and PIQ post crash processing:
1) Add the third value "U" for unknown
2) Change the code so that SAFER stores"Y", "N" or "U" instead of "0" or "1", in order to support Query Central. (this part of the CR has been subsumed by a new CR, #117)

Attached [to the SAFER CR] is the email from Gary Talpers requesting the change.

The estimated time to design, code and test this CR is about 60 hours.

FMCSA has determined how the post crash will be interpreted:
OOS violation existed prior to crash = counts in SafeStat
OOS violation resulted from crash = does not count in SafeStat
Inspector can't determine = does not count.

This CR has been approved [by Janet Curtis, FMCSA, 8/23/04] and will be implemented in SAFER 4.6 in September.

****[2004-11-11] Note - requested by the roadside system and is displayed in PIQ. Doesn't show up in CVISN transactions. There is some question whether or not this should be an Arch CR.

OBR-Closed. In Release 4.6

Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States:

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 3/21/2006 11:52:04 AM

Modified By: Roberts Onna Beth

Entered On: 10/18/2004 8:09:44 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 3/21/2006 11:52:04 AM

CR Number: 2954

External SAFER CR 131; ARC CR 2728; SAFER CR 138

Reference:

Category: Mandatory Data Elements for T0022 and T0028

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Volpe is reviewing the mandatory data elements in T0022 to see if there is a need to change some of the optional fields to mandatory so they provide meaningful information to the states.

Summary: The vehicle registration data currently in SAFER comes from three kinds of input: PRISM PVF file, CVISN EDI input, and XML T0022 transaction. Although the processing logic of XML, EDI and PVF data files are similar, the required data elements are different. Some of the mandatory fields are commonly required by all three data submissions, and others are only mandatory for one source but not for the other sources.

Proposal: Data elements in XML T0022 transaction will be made mandatory, conditional mandatory, or optional as indicated in the attached table.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2005-10] Closed - implemented in SAFER 4.8

Description: [2004-09-16] Volpe supplied SAFER CR 131 (description follows) in response to action item #4 of the 8/19 ACCB meeting.
The vehicle registration data currently in SAFER comes from three kinds of input: PRISM PVF file, CVISN EDI input, and XML T0022 transaction. Although the processing logic of XML, EDI and PVF data files are similar, the required data elements are different. Some of the mandatory fields are commonly required by all three data submissions, and others are only mandatory for one source but not for the other sources.

Volpe is reviewing the mandatory data elements in T0022 to see if there is a need to change some of the optional fields to mandatory so they provide meaningful information to the states. For example, if states provide values for REGISTRATION_START_DATE, states would be able to determine the current base state for an operating vehicle by looking at REGISTRATION_START_DATE and IRP_BASE_STATE. In other instances, potential data collisions would have been avoided if SAFER and PRISM both provided values for the same list of required fields. There is concern that authoritative data source and non-authoritative data source could overwrite each other's data.

The attached table (PDF file) is the proposed list of mandatory fields for XML T0022. The list was produced by merging the required fields being used by CVISN including E-Screening and PRISM. The Volpe Center recommends that CVISN states and PRISM states review the required field list to see whether or not the fields need to be converted and whether or not it is feasible to provide the data for those required fields.

The advantages of having all input transactions populating the common mandatory fields are listed below:
1. A single XML transaction would support both CVISN and PRISM program. Therefore there would be no need to develop a new variant transaction of T0022.
2. There would be no potential data collision since the updates from all data sources would provide the values for the same list of mandatory fields.
3. It would address concerns raised by Washington State in CR 2728 so that one would be able to determine the current base state of an operating vehicle.

[2004-09-27] Presented and discussed at the 2004-09-23 ACCB meeting.
Volpe is reviewing the mandatory data elements in T0022 to see if there is a need to change some of the optional fields to mandatory so they provide meaningful information to the states. The list was discussed and modified. One question discussed was whether there should be a "conditional mandatory", to handle cases such as Alaska and Hawaii

being exempt from IRP, certain fields be mandatory for PRISM only, etc. Sharon Holland, representing Alaska, proposed that fake data be submitted for IRP state/weight for Alaska. The updated list will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv.

[2004-10-18] At the 9/23 ACCB meeting Volpe led a discussion regarding left-justification of the CVIS_DEFAULT_CARRIER field. This is a data integrity issue that applies to many data elements, especially to those that could be interpreted as either character or numeric. The solution for the immediate problem with Nebraska registration data is that Nebraska will left-justify the values in the CVIS_DEFAULT_CARRIER field and re-baseline. Volpe created SAFER CR 138 to address this specific instance. SAFER CR 139 was created to address the problem in general.

[2004-10-25] Presented and discussed at the 2004-10-21 ACCB meeting.
I was decided that REGISTRATION_START_DATE should be mandatory because it is used by states to determine which registration is the most current. In addition, IRP_WEIGHT_EXPIRE_DATE will be mandatory. The T0022 mandatory/optional list will be updated to reflect this and will be reposted to the list serv. CR 2954 will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comments and will be voted on at the November ACCB.

[2004-11-22] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2004-11-18.
The use of IRP_Carrier_ID_Number and SAFETY_CARRIER was discussed. The IRP_CARRIER_ID_NUMBER indicates ownership and is the IRP applicant. However, list serv and meeting comments confirmed that not all states use this field, so it should remain optional. SAFETY_CARRIER (cvis_default_carrier) is the party responsible for safety, generally the operator. This field should be "conditional mandatory" because it is: optional for CVISN-only states, mandatory for e-screening, and mandatory for PRISM. Thus, no further changes were made to the T0022 Mandatory_Optional List, and CR 2954 is recommended for FMCSA approval.

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

Impact on SAFER:
1. The T0022 and T0028 schema files will need to be changed.

Impact on States:
1. XML States will need to update corresponding schema files for CVIEW.
2. XML States will need to re-certify for T0022 transaction.
3. No impact on EDI States

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

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: CR2954_T0022MO list.pdf
CR2954_T0022MO list_V04.pdf
CR2954_T0022MO list_V05.pdf
CR2954_T0022MO list_V06.pdf

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 10/5/2005 10:48:40 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/16/2004 12:17:51 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/5/2005 10:48:40 AM

CR Number: 2936

External Reference: SAFER CR 348; SAFER CR 302

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: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

Description: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

[2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. Scheduled for SAFER 7.3.

[2006-10-19] Status reported at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.
Implementation was deferred from SAFER 5.1 but is on the list for FY07. This CR is related to Architecture CR 3670 (SAFER CR 302). E-screening issues are being addressed by the E-Screening Enrollment Focus Group, which needs to document business rules and use cases and bring that material before the ACCB.

[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.

[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.

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

[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.

[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.

[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.

[2004-08-23] 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.

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: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:05:47 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 8/23/2004 12:22:08 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 9/21/2007 8:05:47 AM

CR Number: 2935

External Reference: SAFER CR 130

Category: SAFER XML interface

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Expand scope of capability to delete a record

Summary: This CR requests that the delete capability (reference CR 2563) be expanded to include additional transactions.

Proposal: The XML delete transactions will be implemented in accordance with the requirements expressed in this CR.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: [2005-07-07] Closed fixed

Description: [2004-08-18] Three States responded to question posted to CVISN System Architects list serv regarding expanding the delete capability requested in CR 2563.

Proposed Requirements

- The system shall ensure that a user can only modify data owned by that user.
- Each delete operation shall archive the deleted data, and output it in a corresponding SAFER output transaction to notify CVISN participants of the deletion.
- A restore operation shall be created for use by Volpe should it become necessary to restore data that was removed in a delete operation.

This shall apply to transactions:
T0019
T0020
T0021
T0022
T0023
T0024

[2004-09-27] Presented and discussed at the 2004-09-23 AVVB meeting.
This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comment and will be voted on at the October ACCB meeting.

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

[2005-07-07] Closed fixed

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

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Impact on States:
There is not impact if states chose not to use this capability.

Fix:

Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Salazar Sandra B
Modified Time:	7/7/2005 10:13:10 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	8/23/2004 11:01:21 AM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	7/7/2005 10:12:53 AM

CR Number:	2933
External Reference:	SAFER CR 124
Category:	Changes to SAFER-CVIEW interface for REVIEW_REASON_NOT_RATED
Component:	SAFER/MCMIS, SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis:	New values for REVIEW_REASON_NOT_RATED are in the carrier data received by SAFER from MCMIS. Summary: Since the FMCSA-sponsored CVIEW will not accept the new values, Volpe has implemented a workaround to change the values. Proposal: The CVISN states change their CVIEW to accept the new values so that the data in their CVIEW databases will be consistent with the data displayed on the SAFER web site. A schema change will be required; the transaction T0031 will be versioned to T0031V2 and will be available in the January 2005 release of SAFER.
Status:	Closed Is Duplicate
Disposition:	[2005-06-17] Closed - incorporated into CR 3115
Description:	Four new values (V, W, X, Y) were added to the REVIEW_REASON_NOT_RATED field. Changes have been made in the SAFER database to allow the new values to be loaded from MCMIS to SAFER. In order to support the current SAFER/CVIEW interface, a separate procedure has been modified to include a script that will convert the new values to 'Q' before scheduling the T0031 job. This extra step will be performed for every T0031 run until the XML CVIEWs are ready to accept the new values. In order for CVIEW to accept the new values, the T0031 schema file will need to be updated to include the new values to REVIEW_REASON_NOT_RATED. The Volpe Center will be responsible for providing the updated schema file to the CVISN states. In addition, if CVIEW uses a database constraint for the REVIEW_REASON_NOT_RATED field, it will need to be changed to allow the new values to be applied.

[2004-08-23] SAFER CR 124 presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2004-08-19.
This CR is related to architecture CR 2443 (SAFER CR 12) in that it involves new values for a data element being sent from MCMIS to SAFER. As with CR 2443, Volpe has developed a workaround to support the T0031 transaction, namely converting the new values to "Q". Volpe would like to implement a schema change at the same time that the schema change is made for CR 2443. States on the call were in agreement that both changes should be made at the same time. An architecture version of this CR will be written and will be posted to the list serv for comments. This change will be included in the beta-test T0031V2. As noted above, T0031V1 will remain available to states until 2005-01-01.

[2004-09-27] Presented and discussed at the 2004-09-23 ACCB meeting.
This CR is related to CR 2443. Because additional values are expected, implementation of this CR has been postponed until the January release of SAFER. Beta-testing with the states will begin in early October. This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv.

[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. Two states posted list serv comments in favor of relaxing constraint checking in these situations. Volpe will reconsider this if the situation arises in the future.

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

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Impact on States:
XML states would have to use the versioned schema. If they have a database constraint on the REVIEW_REASON_NOT_RATED field, or if they do any processing based on the value of that field, that processing may need to change.
Utah noted that changes could probably be done in one day.
There seems to be no impact on EDI states, as any unknown value of REVIEW_REASON_NOT_RATED is mapped to "Other".

[2005-06-17] Closed - incorporated into CR 3115

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 6/17/2005 7:36:21 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 8/23/2004 8:00:31 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 6/17/2005 7:36:21 AM

CR Number: 2805

External Reference: SAFER CR 105; WI-Tania Rossouw 608.267.2400

Category: SAFER Web services

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Add T0032 (Licensing and Insurance Output Transaction) to the SAFER Web services capabilities.

Summary: Implementation of a web service capability is in beta testing for several XML transactions. This capability is expected to be available in SAFER 4.6 due to be released in September, 2004.

Proposal: Add T0032 to the SAFER Web services capabilities.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: [2005-07-07] Closed - deployed in SAFER 4.7

Description: [7004-07-14] Submitted by Tania Rossouw of Wisconsin.
Add T0032 (Licensing and Insurance Output Transaction) to the SAFER Web services capabilities. We would like to be able to query SAFER for authority and insurance information.

[2004-07-19] Presented at the 7/15/04 ACCB meeting.
This CR will be posted to the CVISN Systems Architects list serv for review and will be discussed at the August ACCB meeting.

[2004-08-19] No disssenting votes, so recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2005-07-07] Closed - deployed in SAFER 4.7

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

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Impact on States:
There is not impact if states chose not to use the Web services capability.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 7/7/2005 10:09:54 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 7/14/2004 2:16:46 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 7/7/2005 10:09:54 AM

CR Number: 2798

External Reference: SAFER CR 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 mandatory field in the vehicle registration data.
6. The table will be posted in some form on the CVISN website.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

Description: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

A source other than the authoritative source, such as an escreening 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 escreening 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.

[2007-07-26] sbs

At the 2007-05-23 Escreening focus group meeting, the CVISN stakeholders agreed that SAFER shall be enhanced to track if the registration data in SAFER comes from the authoritative source or not.

Most of the CVISN states submit T0022 transactions via their own state CVIEW system. The irp_base_state in the registration data matches the state code in the T0022 data file name. States that do not have CVIEW but need to send the vehicle registration data to SAFER have to let states with a CVIEW send data for them. This SCR allows SAFER to track which state sends the data to SAFER and to indicate if the data is being verified by the authoritative source.

To support this request, the CVIEW states shall send and SAFER shall accept, store and send the following data elements:
1. Sending_State. The state who sends the T0022 transaction data for the authoritative state.
2. Verification_Source. The type of mechanism used to verify the registration data. The valid data value for this data element will be NLETS, Commercial Vehicle Officers and Transponder Administrators, and IRP.
3. Verification_Date. The date the registration data is verified by a authoritative source.

SAFER T0022 xml schema and T0028 XML schema will be modified to add the above three data elements.

States will be required to update the new schema files for the September 2007 SAFER 7.3 release.

HISTORY

[2007-05-17] Discussed at 2007-05-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. The requirements need to be finalized and reported to the CVISN ACCB. Scheduled for SAFER 5.3.

[2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. Scheduled for SAFER 5.2.

[2006-10-19] Status reported at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.
Item 5 in the proposal of the CR was corrected to “The REGISTRATION_START_DATE will be a mandatory field and REGISTRATION_EXPIRE_DATE will be a mandatory field in the vehicle registration data.” Volpe will discuss FY07 implementation of this capability with FMCSA.

[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.

[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.

[2006-03-30] 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.

[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.

[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."

[2004-08-23] 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 "Synoposis" section was developed and refined at those meetings. Corrected minutes from the 2004-08-16 meeting are attached to this CR.

[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.

[2004-07-19] 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.

[2004-07-12] 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

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:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	9/21/2007 8:07:04 AM
Modified By:	Salazar Sandra B
Entered On:	7/12/2004 8:59:22 AM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	9/21/2007 8:07:04 AM

CR Number:	2728
External Reference:	WA Bill Goforth - GofortB@wadot.wa.gov; Volpe CR 131
Category:	T0022 processing rules
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	LAST_UPDATE_DATE and REGISTRATION_EXPIRE_DATE are not enough to determine the current base state for a vehicle.
Status:	Closed Disapproved
Disposition:	[2004-09-27] Closed - superceded by CR 2954.
Description:	[2004-06-28] Submitted by Bill Goforth (WA) Vehicle VIN 1XKWDB9X6YR837650 is in our CVIEW database as NE vehicle, plate 56283 with a registration expiration date of 12/31/02. The vehicle changed ownership from NE carrier USDOT# 2605 to WA carrier USDOT# 236380 sometime in 2003. The latest WA transaction for the vehicle has a registration expiration date of 10/31/04. The problem is that the LAST_UPDATE_DATE for NE is 12/30/03 and the transaction date (LAST_UPDATE_DATE) for the latest WA transaction is 10/18/03. We are using LAST_UPDATE_DATE to determine the current base state for a vehicle. In this situation, we erroneously recognize NE as the current base state. We have approximately 500 vehicles that have this problem. We have considered trying to use both LAST_UPDATE_DATE and REGISTRATION_EXPIRE_DATE to determine the current base state. But this does not always work. OR vehicles register all of their vehicles through 12/31 of the current year. We have had vehicles that were registered in OR on 1/1/03, then are sold during 2003 to a carrier in WA and are registered from the point of purchase through the same time the following year (for example 8/1/03 through 8/1/04). OR vehicles are given a 3 month grace period to reregister in OR. This means that there is 3 month window (1/1/04 to 3/1/04) where we can't tell which state is the vehicle's base state. We would like to propose adding an IS_CURRENT_BASE_STATE indicator to the VEHICLE_REGISTRATION table and to the T0022 transaction. This indicator would be used by states that report the sale of a vehicle (or otherwise need to report an unknown ownership status) to indicate that the next transaction received (from a new base state)

that reports a valid vehicle registration can be distinguished as the current base state for the vehicle. So in this case NE would set IS_CURRENT_BASE_STATE = '0' and WA would set IS_CURRENT_BASE_STATE = '1'. This would allow states to more accurately determine the current base state.

This problem could obviously be solved in many different ways and the above solution is only intended as an alternative. Another alternative might be to have a TRANSACTION_CODE element that is required on the T0022. So there would be a transaction code for sale of a vehicle, deletion of a vehicle, etc. TRANSACTION_CODE could then be used to determine that a state is no longer the current base state or that ownership is unknown.

Further clarification from Bill Goforth...
Normally the problem occurs within a period of a few months. That is, the vehicle is sold prior to its expiration in the old base state, then purchased and registered in the new base state. The problem occurs when the "vehicle sold" transaction occurs in the old base state after the "new vehicle registration" transaction occurs in the new base state.

[2004-07-19] Presented and discussed at the 2004-07-15 ACCB meeting.
This CR will remain open pending further analysis. Volpe and Washington will discuss whether or not sufficient information already exists to determine the current base state.

[2004-08-23] Discussed at 2004-08-19 ACCB meeting, but Washington was not on the call.
Volpe has sent an email to WA in which they proposed that REGISTRATION_START_DATE be made mandatory in T0022 and T0028. Volpe will write a corresponding SAFER CR.

[2004-09-16] Volpe supplied SAFER CR 131 in response to action item #4 of the 8/19 ACCB meeting.
See corresponding architecture CR 2954.

[2004-09-27] Presented at the 2004-09-23 ACCB meeting.
Per discussion with Washington State, CR 2728 will be closed and the expanded issue of mandatory fields will be continued in CR 2954.

Impact on States:
XML states would have to use a versioned schema.
There would be no impact on EDI states.

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

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/27/2004 1:55:28 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 6/29/2004 6:07:19 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/27/2004 1:55:28 PM

CR Number: 2664

External Reference: Volpe CR 110

Category: SAFER database

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Archive inactive carrier and vehicle records

Status: Closed Deferred

Disposition: [2004-06-17] Closed - turned over to Volpe as SAFER CR.

Description: The SAFER database contains historical carrier and vehicle records that are no longer active. To improve the data quality of the SAFER, one of the efforts being considered is to develop procedures and tools to manage the SAFER data.

[2004-01-15] Presented and discussed at the 1/15/04 ACCB meeting.
States were in favor of archiving inactive carrier and vehicle data two years after the registration expiration date.

[2004-06-21] Discussed at the 6/17/04 ACCB meeting.
This is really a SAFER maintenance CR, the architecture CR will be closed and this CR will be turned over to Volpe.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 6/22/2004 6:09:05 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 6/3/2004 3:58:56 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 6/22/2004 6:09:05 PM

CR Number: 2639

External Reference: Volpe CR 104

Category: SAFER XML

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Provide L&I data to CVIEW users for carriers that do not have USDOT#.

Status: Closed Deferred

Disposition: [2004-06-16] Withdrawn

Description: SAFER CR 104:
"Wisconsin had proposed that SAFER receive all intrastate carrier data from L&I applications and this will benefit CVIEW states from enforcement and credential perspectives. The original email is attached to this CR.

Currently, the L&I application does not send carrier data to SAFER if the carrier has no USDOT number. As a result, SAFER does not have data for those intrastate carriers that have no USDOT numbers.

To support this business requirement, modification needs to be made in the L&I loading process, SAFER database table and T0032 transaction so that CVIEW users would receive intrastate carrier data from SAFER.

Further analysis at Volpe suggested that adding carriers without USDOT# to T0032 would increase the data volumn for download. Instead, SAFER will provide those carrier data to the states via the SAFER web service interface. This function will be implemented in conjuction with [Volpe]CR 105."

[2004-05-24] Presented and discussed at the 5/20/04 ACCB meeting.
There was much discussion of the situations in which MC numbers and US DOT numbers are issued, or not issued. Additional analysis of the business rules is required. Wisconsin will provide a more detailed description of the business rules to the community.

[2004-06-16] Wisconsin requested that this CR be withdrawn, as more investigation needs to be done on the business rules.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/16/2004 12:31:32 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 5/24/2004 8:27:02 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 6/16/2004 12:42:33 PM

CR Number: 2638

External Reference: Volpe CR 101

Category: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Component: SAFER/CVIEW, SAFER/PRISM

Synopsis: Enhance T0022 transaction to allow states to submit temporary authority vehicles to SAFER.

Summary: The SAFER XML service requires that the license plate/state be unique for vehicle records submitted via the T0022 input transaction. This CR requests that SAFER allow states to submit non-unique license plate/state and that SAFER would modify the data to produce a unique code (example: "TEMP + last 6 digits of VIN").

Proposal: States participating in recent ACCB meetings have recommended that this CR be disapproved. States should change their CVIEW or equivalent system so that the license plate/state submitted in a T0022 input transaction to SAFER is unique. SAFER should not modify data received by the state to create unique license plate/state.

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2004-07-19] Closed - disapproved.

Description: From SAFER CR 101:
The SAFER XML service as implemented currently requires the license plate/state be unique for vehicle records submitted via the T0022 input transaction. The Vehicle records submitted with a duplicate plate/state value (like TEMP/MA) are being rejected due to the existing business rule logic. As a result, the states are not able to send the temporary vehicle data to SAFER as the temporary license plate numbers issued by the states are often not unique.

In order to support this business function, changes need to be made during the T0022 data submitting and processing process so that a unique plate value will be assigned to the temporary vehicle. One of the suggestions is the states will use a common phrase (such as TEMP) for all temporary vehicles they are submitting in the T0022 transaction. SAFER will identify it as a temporary vehicle and automatically generate a numerical value to associate with the common phrase. The combination of both will make the License Plate field unique for the temporary vehicle of a given state.

If the request is approved and implemented, states will be able to submit vehicle records for all plate values issued to the temporary authority vehicles by providing SAFER the common phrases to be used in T0022 transaction."

[2004-05-24] Presented and discussed at the 5/20/04 ACCB meeting.
Volpe proposed a solution that would involve SAFER creating a unique key for vehicle records received with non-unique license plate values. Sharon Holland (UT) suggested that states should assign a unique number - e.g., TEMP + last 6 digits of VIN - so that such vehicles can be tracked. Bill Guiffre (CSI) was uncomfortable with SAFER altering records. This CR will be posted on the CVISN System Architects list serv and discussed at the June ACCB meeting.

[2004-06-03] During the recent meeting regarding PRISM/CVISN/SAFER programs, APL suggested that the data consistency between SAFER and CVIEW local database needs to be considered when evaluating the options.

[2004-06-21] Presented at the 6/17/04 ACCB meeting.

The CR will be posted to the list serv for states to review.

[2004-07-19]
Four states responded to the posting on the list serv. All endorsed the counter-proposal that states generate their own unique identifier rather than having SAFER create a unique identifier.

Presented and discussed at the 7/15/04 ACCB meeting. The CR was disapproved. It will be up to the states to ensure that plates are unique.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/16/2004 12:31:45 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 5/24/2004 8:21:40 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 7/19/2004 11:53:18 AM

CR Number: 2637

External Reference: SAFER CR 109; Terri Ungerman (LA)

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/PRISM/CVIEW

Synopsis: SAFER XML doesn't contain new elements of updated MCS150 form.

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: [2005-07-25] Closed - subsumed by CR 3115.

Description: [2004-05-19] from Terri Ungerman
"I am working with Louisiana to implement PRISM using CVIEW and SAFER. In a conference call yesterday we noted that the latest SAFER XML ICD doesn't contain the additional data elements that were added to the latest version of the MCS150 form, such as cell phone #, additional information on equipment, revoked USDOT, and company representatives. I was wondering if there was a plan to incorporate these data elements in the XML transaction sets going to CVIEW in the near future.

We are trying to make a decision tomorrow if we will use the SAFER transaction sets for the MCS150 form data or if we should use the PRISM MCS150 file. What we do depends on if/when SAFER will incorporate these additional data elements. If you could help us out, it would help us greatly in moving forward in our decision making process."

[2004-05-27] Presented and discussed at 5/20/04 ACCB meeting.

This CR is related to the issue of different data elements in CVISN and PRISM, which will be discussed in the June 3 CVISN/PRISM meeting.

[2004-06-17] Presented at the 6/17/ACCB meeting.
This CR was posted to the list serv last month; only one comment was received. The states were asked if there is interest in this CR; North Carolina and Nebraska indicated that they are interested. The requirements do not include the list of data elements yet, so this CR will need further analysis. It was noted that a new version of MCS 150 has been proposed; its adoption could impact this CR. More analysis is needed.

[2004-06-28] Feedback from Gary DeRusha (VOLPE-PRISM) 6/25/04
During the last meeting, Nebraska asked if the new elements of the Updated MCS150 form that were added to the XML Carrier Census transaction set would that allow them to use it instead of the PRISM MCS150 File to satisfy a PRISM requirement. I said that a reconciliation of the required fields would be necessary, but the intent would be that they could use the enhanced XML transaction set instead of downloading the PRISM file. I forgot to mention that in order to do so, states will have to make sure that they can access the latest MCS150_Update_Date field, which is not a field on the MCS150 form. My comment would be that the carrier's MCS150_Update_Date field should also be added to the transaction set if it is not already there.

[2004-06-29] At the 6/23/05 ACCB meeting, Terri Ungerman (OK) to look into the data elements on the MCS150 form that don't appear to be in the T0031. The hope is that any missing items could be added to the T0031 when it is revised. The results are listed below.

1. Field 14 on the MCS150 form (Principal Contact Cellular Phone Number). This may be referred to by the LU User ID in the T0031, but it wasn't clear to me that it is referencing the same data.

2. Field 21 on the MCS150 form includes options to circle E.Intrastate Shipper and F. Vehicle Registration Only. In the T0031 it appears that there is a field for Intrastate Shipper - HM, and a field for Hazmat status but I'm not sure how these correspond with item E on the MCS 150. There doesn't appear to be any field in the T0031 to accommodate F. Vehicle Registration Only.

3. Field 26 of the MCS150 is a table of values. In the T0031 it appears the totals for some of the columns are provided for, but not the individual table entries.

4. Field 27 of the MCS150 is also a table where the T0031 appears to provide the column totals but not individual values.

5. There doesn't appear to be places in the T0031 where the officer names are provided as shown on the MCS 150 form field 29.

[2005-07-25] This CR has been subsumed by Architecture CR3115 SAFER CR 174). Closed as duplicate.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified 7/25/2005 1:17:09 PM

Time:
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 5/19/2004 3:15:21 PM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On: 7/25/2005 1:17:09 PM

CR Number: 2578
External Reference: Volpe CR 29
Category: SAFER XML_in, SAFER ICD, SAFER SCIP
Component: SAFER/PRISM
Synopsis: Develop an XML input transaction for PRISM states to submit vehicle registration information to SAFER.
Status: Closed Disapproved
Disposition: [2006-03-21] Closed - disapproved.
Description: The PRISM team is exploring adding the capability of having the PRISM States with CVIEW or equivalent capabilities submit an XML vehicle registration input transaction to SAFER for all their vehicle records to help satisfy IRP requirement 12 in the PRISM Program Implementation Guide. That requirement mandates that PRISM States submit a full set of vehicle IRP records associated with carriers in the MCSIP program to SAFER. This information is combined with similar data from other States to support the generation of the PRISM Local Target File that is made available to PRISM States every day.

Since CVIEW transfers are transactional in nature, that requirement can be met if information for every vehicle with IRP maintenance activity from the State is sent to SAFER. Vehicle IRP data only needs to be transferred to SAFER when a change is made to it. This would ensure that current vehicle data is available so if a carrier becomes targeted in MCSIP at a later date, then all associated vehicle data is already there in the database and those vehicles will become appropriately targeted.

The proposed transaction set would be named T0022P, PRISM IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction where P in the transaction number stands for PRISM. The T0022P transaction is identical in format to the current T0022 transaction, the difference being that certain fields that are optional in the T0022 transaction are mandatory in the T0022P transaction and all IRP Cab Card Input transactions need to be submitted due to the way PRISM and SAFER process the data.

The rationale for requesting a new transaction set is that some States using CVIEW or equivalent capabilities to input IRP vehicle data to SAFER may not want to participate in the PRISM program and thus be forced to comply with the PRISM business rules. Therefore, the creation of a separate T0022P Transaction Set is being requested instead of proposing changes to the existing T0022. Since the use of only one IRP Cab Card Input Transaction Set will be allowed, if States choose to use the new T0022P transaction, it must satisfy all the PRISM and non-PRISM requirements that the State

may have.

The proposal for a new T0022P transaction was the result of an internal SAFER/PRISM meeting held earlier this year at the Volpe Center. At this meeting it was agreed that the new transaction T0022P would contain the same vehicle information contained in the PRISM Vehicle File submitted by PRISM Pilot Architecture States. It would use the same field sizes that SAFER uses now since SAFER uses larger size fields than PRISM does for the same data. The XML tag names would remain unchanged and would be mapped to specific field names referenced in the PRISM system specifications. PRISM program business rules mandate that all of the PRISM fields are required to contain data, the data be maintained to remain current and the selection set of records submitted must include all of the State's current IRP vehicles. By requesting a new T0022P transaction set, these business rules would only apply to PRISM States certified to use this method of transmitting targeted vehicle data to SAFER.

The following would be the mandatory fields in transaction T0022P. The rest of the optional fields in T0022 are not listed here but would be included in T0022P.

FIELD NAME SIZE TYPE PRESENCE RULE

Safety Carrier Number 12 string Mandatory Right justified blank space pad
VIN 30 string Mandatory Left justified
Plate Number 12 string Mandatory
Registration Jurisdiction 2 string Mandatory
Registration Date Effective yyyymmdd date Mandatory the date on the current registration
Registration Date Expiration yyyymmdd date Mandatory the date on the current registration
Make 10 string Mandatory Left justified
Model Year yyyy date Mandatory
Base Country 2 string Mandatory

Analysis by Volpe SAFER team (20040112):
The new transaction T0022P would impact XML states participating in both CVISN and PRISM programs. The SAFER XML certification testing procedure would be modified to include PRISM requirements into the certification process for PRISM states or CVISN states planning to be compliant with PRISM as well. The SAFER ICD would be modified to introduce the new T0022P interface for states in PRISM program. Upon approval, the XML schema definition file and a sample transaction file for T0022P would be published in the next version of the SAFER ICD.

The labor and cost analysis for this task is pending approval from FMCSA.

Analysis by Volpe PRISM team (20040112):
Issue #1: FMCSA will need to publish to XML states that intend on using the IRP cab card input transaction T0022P which vehicles need to be included in those transactions. At a minimum, all targeted vehicles must be.

Analysis by Volpe PRISM team (20040126):
It will require that CVIEW States that intend on using the T0022P, PRISM IRP Cab Card Input Transaction follow the rules of the PRISM program. To comply, they will be asked to submit ALL IRP transactions and keep them current. Fields that PRISM specifies as not being blank will be required and the PRISM Technical Support group will be involved in the certification process. Non-CVIEW States will be able to use the existing T0022 Input transaction set and a new variant; T0022P will be documented in the ICD for PRISM CVIEW States to use. If an existing CVIEW State decides to participate in

the PRISM program later on, they would have to be re-certified prior to coming on board.

[2004-04-16] Discussed at the 4/15/04 ACCB meeting.
Volpe is investigating the possibility of creating XML transactions for PRISM states. There are many ramifications to both PRISM and CVISN states that are being considered.

[2004-06-17] Presented at the 6/17/04 ACCB meeting.
This CR was also discussed during the CVISN/PRISM meeting and is undergoing analysis. The progress of this CR will be reviewed at the next ACCB meeting.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 3/21/2006 11:22:59 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 4/7/2004 8:21:04 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 3/21/2006 11:22:59 AM

CR Number: 2577

External Reference: SAFER CR 31

Category: PRISM XML_out, SAFER ICD

Component: SAFER/PRISM

Synopsis: Develop an XML output transaction for the vehicle component of the PRISM Local Target File.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2004-08-23] Approved by FMCSA PRISM Program

Description: The PRISM team at the Volpe Center is interested in having the capability to output the equivalent of the PRISM Local Target file for PRISM States with CVIEW or equivalent capabilities. PRISM State IRP and Enforcement groups need access to this data to comply with various PRISM program requirements; however, an XML approach to receiving this data does not currently exist.

The proposal is to create a new XML transaction set that explicitly contains only PRISM targeted vehicles as identified by the PRISM Central Site every evening. The data would come from the same source used to create the existing PRISM Local Target flat file used

by PRISM pilot architecture States and would be regenerated fresh each day. State IRP and Enforcement groups could be assured that by accessing this new transaction set they are getting the latest information available from the PRISM program on the status of targeted vehicles.

The PRISM Local Target file consists of both carrier and vehicle record types within the same file and duplicating this feature within an XML transaction set would not be necessary. Upon Volpe analysis, it was noted that only two fields had to be included from the carrier record of the PRISM Local Target file to satisfy PRISM requirements. Those fields where the MCSIP Step of the Carrier responsible for safety and the run date of the last MCMIS Carrier Census update to SAFER. By adding this information to each vehicle record of the new output transaction set, the result would simplify the XML processing. This proposed transaction set would be identified as T0028P (see later note - it will be T0041P), PRISM Targeted IRP Registration (Cab Card) Output Transaction.

As a result of the SAFER/PRISM meeting held at the Volpe Center earlier this year, it was decided that the new transaction T0041P would contain the same vehicle information included in the PRISM Local Target File. It would be formatted similar to the existing T0028 Transaction Set but would be comprised of only one type of transaction. Some elements of the IRP VIN and IRP Registration sections of the existing T0028 Transaction Set would be used but there would be no elements from the existing IRP Proration section. Also, new tag names would be created for the MCSIP Step and Census Update Date fields not included in T0028.

T0041P would use the same field sizes that SAFER uses now since SAFER uses larger field size than PRISM does for the same data. The XML tag names would remain unchanged and would be mapped to specific field names. The new output transaction T0028P would contain the following data elements:

FIELD NAME SIZE TYPE

VIN 30 string
Safety Carrier Number 12 string
MCSIP Step 2 string
Plate Number 12 string
Registration Jurisdiction 2 string
Registration Date Effective yyyymmdd date
Registration Date Expiration yyyymmdd date
Make 10 string
Model Year yyyy date
Last Census Update Date yyyymmdd date
Vehicle Last Update Date yyyymmdd date

If approved and implemented, the SAFER ICD would be modified to include the new T0041P interface for States in the PRISM program. The XML schema definition file and a sample transaction file for T0041P would be published in the next version of the SAFER ICD.

The labor and cost analysis for this task is pending for approval from FMCSA.

[2004-04-15] Discussed at the 4/15/04 ACCB meeting.
Volpe is investigating the possibility of creating XML transactions for PRISM states. There are many ramifications to both PRISM and CVISN states that are being considered.

[2004-06-21] Presented at the 6/17/04 ACCB meeting.

A CVISN/PRISM meeting was conducted on June 3, 2004 to coordinate issues in combining PRISM and CVISN systems. CR 2577 was discussed and a set of actions was established to resolve the issue. A follow-up meeting is scheduled for the end of June. In addition, Volpe is analyzing the CR. The progress of this CR will be reviewed at the next ACCB meeting.

[2004-08-23] Presented at the 8/19/04 ACCB meeting.
Volpe has developed XML transaction T0041P for XML PRISM output from SAFER. T0041P contains only PRISM targeted vehicles as identified by the PRISM Central Site every evening. The data would come from the same source used to create the existing PRISM Local Target flat file used by PRISM pilot architecture States and would be regenerated fresh each day. This is not a replacement for T0028. T0041P was tested with Nebraska which has a CVIEW equivalent that stores the PRISM data in a separate table from the CVISN registration data. This does not demonstrate the impact on CVIEWs that are designed based on the SAFER database schema, which would not have the separate PRISM table to store the data.

The T0041P transaction has been approved by FMCSA and will be made available to states that are configured to use it, but with the caution that states with conventional CVIEWs cannot use it without making modifications to their CVIEWs. This information will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv.

Impact on architecture:
None - this relates to PRISM architecture

Impact on documentation:
None

Impact on States:
No impact to CVISN states that are not PRISM states.
PRISM states may change from flat file to this format. This is no impact if they chose not to use this XML transaction.

Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	8/23/2004 1:11:19 PM
Modified By:	Salazar Sandra B
Entered On:	4/7/2004 8:19:29 AM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Suggestion
Closed On:	8/23/2004 11:44:59 AM

CR Number: 2572

External Reference: UT Sharon Holland (801) 944-5778; SAFER CR 107

Category: Database and XML schemas

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Add account balance information to the CARRIER_IFTA and CARRIER_IRP tables in the current CVIEW database.

Summary: Utah proposed a change to XML transactions T0019 and T0020 to add fields of interest only to Utah for data exchange among systems within the state. The discussion at the ACCB meeting led to the more general question of providing the capability in XML transactions to carry state-specific data. States indicated interest in this capability, as long as they don't have to change their processing if they are not using the feature.

Proposal: Volpe will pursue the idea of adding a section to an XML schema to allow state custom data to be optionally carried in an XML transaction; this section would be ignored by SAFER and not passed on to other States.

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2004-07-19] CR withdrawn - closed.

Description: Submitted by Sharon Holland for UT:

The Utah Ports of Entry collect delinquent IFTA and IRP balances from Utah-based carriers. To do this, they need information about the amounts owed. They access the CVIEW database for information about credential status. The CARRIER_IFTA and CARRIER_IRP tables in the current CVIEW database contain IFTA and IRP status codes and dates, but no account balance information.

To facilitate sharing account balance information through CVIEW, Utah would like to add account balance fields, as follows:-+
** CARRIER_IFTA table: Add IFTA_ACCOUNT_BALANCE
** T0019 IFTA XML transaction: Add IFTA_ACCOUNT_BALANCE
** CARRIER_IRP table: Add IRP_ACCOUNT_BALANCE
** T0020 IRP Account XML transaction: Add IRP_ACCOUNT_BALANCE

Account balance information does not need to be stored in SAFER and shared with other states, because other states would never collect a delinquent balance from a Utah-based carrier. But having the ability to transmit this information to the local CVIEW database through T0019 and T0020 transactions, and store it in the CARRIER_IFTA and CARRIER_IRP tables would be very helpful to Utah, and any other state that needs to share account balance information between state agencies.

Since Utah wants to keep their CVIEW database schema consistent with SAFER, the alternative to including account balances in the CARRIER_IFTA and CARRIER_IRP tables would be to build web services that allow CVIEW query windows to access IFTA_ACCOUNT_BALANCE and IRP_ACCOUNT_BALANCE in the local IFTA and IRP databases. This alternative is more complex, and more costly to implement, than the one requested above.

[4-16-04] Discussed at the 4/15/04 ACCB meeting.
While Utah proposed a change to T0019 and T0020 to add fields of interest only to Utah for data exchange among systems within the state, the discussion led to the more general question of providing the capability in XML transactions to carry state-specific data. States indicated interest in this capability, as long as they don't have to change their processing if they are not using the feature. Volpe will pursue the idea of adding a section to an XML schema to allow state custom data to be optionally carried in an XML transaction; this section would be ignored by SAFER and not passed on to other States.

[2004-07-19]
The posting to the list serv generated the following: 2 states disagreed with the request to provide the capability for state-specific data in XML transactions. The requestor, Utah, has withdrawn the CR.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 7/19/2004 12:35:32 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 4/1/2004 10:55:11 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 7/19/2004 12:35:32 PM

CR Number: 2563

External Reference: Volpe CR 51

Category: SAFER XML interface

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Add capability to delete a record

Summary: This CR requests that an XML Delete transaction be implemented. Currently, the state must call Volpe and ask them to manually delete a record.

Proposal: The XML delete transaction will be implemented in accordance with the requirements expressed in this CR.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2005-07-07] Closed - deployed SAFER 4.6

Description: At the 1/15/04 ACCB meeting the ability to delete a record was requested. The purpose of the delete transaction is to correct errors in certain attributes of XML-sourced T0022 data sent by a state.

In the event that a record is sent to SAFER and the key value is discovered by the state to be in error (e.g. VIN has one character incorrect), there is no way for the state to delete the record. If a correct record is sent, it will not overwrite the original record, because the keys are different. The current solution is calling Volpe and asking them to manually delete the record.

Volpe will perform analysis of the scope and required functionalities of the proposed transaction.

2004-04-16] Discussed at the 4/15/04 ACCB meeting.
Volpe is still analyzing the proposed delete transaction.

[2004-06-16] See attached overview.

Proposed Requirements

- The system shall ensure that a user can only modify data owned by that user. For IRP data, it is proposed that the IRP base state be considered the owner of the data, and that it be required for a user to be authenticated as that owner in order to delete records.
- Each delete operation shall archive the deleted data, and output it in a corresponding SAFER IRP Cab Card Delete Output transaction to notify CVISN participants of the deletion.
- A restore operation shall be created for use by Volpe should it become necessary to restore data that was removed in a delete operation.

[2004-06-21] Presented and discussed at 6/17/04 ACCB meeting.
Since this CR was discussed in April, Volpe has provided a set of requirements. This CR will be posted on the CVISN Systems Architects list serv for review. This CR does not address the issue that states can add data where the state is not the authoritative source (Maryland is an example).

Discussed the issue of data submitted on behalf of a state by another state or organization that is not the authoritative source. Maryland will create registration data for a vehicle that enrolls in screening that is from another state and there is no registration data available from that state. The current process for validating the registration data is to contact the IRP office. A separate notice is not provided from Maryland to SAFER in these cases; it is submitted with regular updates. We need to know if the registration was submitted by the base state or another state. Nebraska indicated that this is a concern. Another field is needed to indicate the source. Gary DeRusha noted that PRISM business rules do not allow this to happen. An architecture CR will be written by APL to address this issue.

[2004-07-19]
The posting to the list serv generated responses from 4 states. All agreed with providing the capability to delete a record. One state suggested that an archive capability not be implemented.

Presented and discussed at the 7/15/04 ACCB meeting. The CR was recommended for approval. This recommendation initially applies only to T0022.

Volpe will post the following question to the list serv: Do states wish to increase the scope of CR 2563 to include transactions other than T0022?

[2004-09-03] Update from Jingfei Wu
Volpe presented the technical analysis at the June's ACCB meeting. This CR does not address the issue that states can add data where the state is not the authoritative source.

This CR has been approved by the ACCB and FMCSA for implementation in the next SAFER release.
The deletion capability will be first available for T0022. Expansion of deletion function to other input transactions will be addressed in CR 130 and will be implemented at a later stage.

Until the authoritative source rules allowing other states to modify other state's data, the current implementation of the deletion transaction only allows deletions for the state whose state code matches the IRP_BASE_STATE.

The proposed required fields in T0022 deletion transaction will be VIN, License Plate Number and IRP Base State.

[2005-07-07] Closed - deployed in SAFER 4.6

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

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Impact on States:
There is not impact if states chose not to use this capability.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: CR2563 (SAFER CR 51) summary.doc

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 7/7/2005 10:03:56 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 3/25/2004 10:39:26 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 7/7/2005 10:03:56 AM

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: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

Description: [2007-09-21] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 7.3.

[2007-07-26] sbs SCR 50 has been updated by Volpe and has been approved for SAFER 5.3

Based on a series of discussions among the stakeholders about the current SAFER business rule implementation and the CVISN/PRISM business needs, this SCR 50 has been updated to reflect the following requirements for the vehicle registration business process. The summary document of the proposed rules and applicable business scenarios is attached to this SCR.

1. SAFER shall allow one vehicle to have multiple registrations in the same jurisdiction if the license plate and/or carrier will be different. Please note that this is different than the current business rule #1 that states that one vehicle shall only have one plate in the same jurisdiction at any given time. This new rule requires SAFER to support the following scenario.
- SAFER shall update the existing registration record when the same vehicle is getting a new plate or a new carrier.

- SAFER shall create a new registration record when the same vehicle is sold to a new carrier with a new license plate. Please note SAFER currently does an "update" in this scenario and this needs to be corrected.
- SAFER shall create a new registration record when the same vehicle is registered in more than one state. Please note that SAFER currently supports this scenario.

2. SAFER shall only allow one license plate assigned to one vehicle at given time in the same jurisdiction. This rule stays the same as the current business rule #2. However, SAFER will need to be modified to support the following scenario.
- SAFER shall update the existing registration record when an existing license plate is used by another vehicle regardless if the carrier is changed. SAFER will need to be modified to support it as the current logic would create a new record when the VIN is different.
- SAFER shall create a new registration record when the same plate number is used by vehicles registered in different states and or with different carriers. SAFER currently supports this scenario.

Please note the CVISN/PRISM stakeholders recommend that states shall be responsible to maintain the data quality of the IRP_STATUS_CODE changes in CVIEW and submit to SAFER in the update files in a timely fashion. This data rule has no impact on SAFER processing.

HISTORY

[2007-07-25] Volpe analysis of SCR 50 attached - "Include in CR 50 analysis.doc"

[2007-05-17] Discussed at 2007-05-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. The analysis in SCR 50 needs to be updated to reflect discussion at the 2007-05-08 PRISM/CVISN Business Rules telecon. Scheduled for SAFER 7.3.

[2007-01-23] Approved by J. Secrist. Scheduled for SAFER 5.2.

[2007-01-18] Recommended for FMCSA Approval.

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 11/16/06 ACCB meeting.
The CVISN/PRISM subcommittee of the ACCB recommends that this CR be approved to allow more than one registration record per VIN within the same jurisdiction. Recent changes to the SAFER database structure would accommodate this change. Volpe also noted that there should be a CR written to implement a capability for a state to select to receive the most recent record or all records via the subscription process. This would support SAFER CRs 50 and 1386.

[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.

[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.----------

[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.

[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.

[2003-12-16] 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.

IMPACT on architecture:
No impact on documentation (other than SAFER ICD)

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: Include in CR 50 analysis.doc

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:06:24 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 3/23/2004 11:13:12 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/21/2007 8:06:24 AM

CR Number: 2561

External Reference: Volpe CR 49

Category: SAFER XML service

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Review business rule for T0019 input transaction

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed with release of SAFER 4.4

Description: The SAFER/CVIEW interface as currently implemented does not allow one USDOT number to be associated with more than one IFTA license numbers if the records are in separate input transaction files. One USDOT number can be associated with multiple IFTA license numbers if the records are in the same input transaction file. For non-existing USDOT number, it allows for records in the same input file as well as in separate input files.

MMA, Inc. is requesting that the business rule be reviewed and the SAFER XML service be corrected to allow one USDOT number to exist with multiple IFTA license numbers for the same jurisdiction. The same business rule shall be implemented to the records in the same transaction file as well as in separate transaction files.

The fix for this CR will be available in SAFER version 4.4 in April.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time:	4/6/2004 8:27:06 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	3/23/2004 8:50:02 AM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	4/6/2004 8:27:06 AM

CR Number:	2555
External Reference:	WA Bill Goforth GofortB@wsdot.wa.gov - SAFER CR 108, CR 4640
Category:	Change the file size limit
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	The maximum transaction size should be reduced from 5000 records to 2000 records for the T0028 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Output Transaction and the T0031 MCMIS Safety and Census Output Transaction.
Status:	Closed Disapproved
Disposition:	[2006-05-26]Closed - disapproved.
Description:	The maximum transaction size should be reduced from 5,000 records to 2,000 records for the T0028 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Output Transaction and the T0031 MCMIS Safety and Census Output Transaction. Allowing the higher limit may result in files with size 50Mb or larger, which are difficult to manage and process. [2004-05-07] Volpe will address in June 2004 release of SAFER. [2006-03-27]Presented at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting. This CR, originally requested by WA, was recommended for FMCSA approval in March, 2004, but not scheduled for implementation. The states were asked if this change was still desired. Volpe said that a benefit of having a smaller file size would be faster aggregate processing time. WA suggested limiting the .zip file size to a megabyte. NE said they would prefer to receive fewer, larger files. Further discussion is needed, linked to the general issue of data volume (CR4640) [2006-05-26] Discussed at 5/18/06 ACCB meeting. The ACCB decided that this CR could be accomplished through CR4640 and recommended closing this CR. Impact: Update SAFER ICD to reflect this business rule.
Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	NE's T0028 files -- Maybe we need IRP Weight Groups.doc
Responsibility:	Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time:	5/31/2006 9:07:54 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	3/19/2004 12:44:28 PM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	5/26/2006 9:51:36 AM

CR Number:	2539
External Reference:	Volpe CR # 26
Category:	XML, EDI, ICD
Component:	SAFER
Synopsis:	Request to review SAFER business rule regarding USDOT # and IRP account #
Status:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	Closed with release of SAFER 4.4
Description:	Submitted on Dec 16th, 2003 Nebraska is requesting that the following SAFER business rule be reviewed. It is my understanding that the SAFER extract file requires that US DOT number be unique to a carrier. In the Nebraska system, it is possible to tie a US DOT number to more than one carrier provided they are under one Master account (i.e. They are using the same TIN.) One example in our system is tied to US DOT number 154318. On the SAFER web site, a search by this DOT number shows a legal name of: Ready Mix Concrete Co Central Sand & Gravel Company and a DBA name of: Lyman-Richey Sand & Gravel Company. In the Nebraska system, DOT number 154318 is tied to 3 separate carriers: Lyman-Richey Corporation DBA Lyman-Richey Sand & Gravel Company Lyman-Richey Corporation DBA Ready Mix Concrete Co Lyman-Richey Corporation DBA Central Sand & Gravel Company These carriers have unique NE assigned IRP carrier numbers and are located at different addresses. We are continuing to analyze our data while we proceed with our SAFER extract implementation and hope that other duplicate DOT number scenarios can be straightened out in our system. However, this example above needs to be addressed. Clearly the manner in which this carrier is displayed on the SAFER site is confusing. The parent company of all three carriers is Lyman-Richey Corporation and they have chosen to establish three separate yet related DBA entities. Nebraska hopes that this business rule can be reviewed and that perhaps rather than requiring a unique DOT number for each carrier, the requirement would be to have a unique DOT number for each corresponding TIN. (This would also conform to PRISM rules that tie a DOT number to a TIN.) [3-11-04] Discussed at 1/15/04 ACCB meeting.

Business rule regarding USDOT # and IRP account #
According to the SAFER v4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD), the SAFER-CVIEW XML interface allows one US DOT number to be associated with multiple IRP account numbers.

However, the SAFER-CVIEW XML interface as currently implemented does not allow one US DOT number to be associated with multiple IRP accounts numbers if the transactions are in separate input files. It does allow one US DOT number to be associated with multiple IRP account numbers if the transactions are in the same input file and the US DOT number does not already exist in the IRP account database.

States are requesting that the business rules be reviewed and that the SAFER-CVIEW XML interface be corrected to support the following:
1. Allow the same US DOT number to exist in multiple IRP records for a jurisdiction.
2. Make sure records within the same transaction file have the same business rules applied to them as transactions in different input files.

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

IMPACT on architecture:
No impact on documentation (other than SAFER ICD)

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 4/6/2004 8:43:21 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 3/11/2004 8:45:52 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 4/6/2004 8:43:21 AM

CR Number: 2538

External Reference: Volpe CR #10

Category: SAFER XML in, SAFER XML out service, ICD

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Anticipate need for XML subscription capability

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: [2004-05-19] Closed - duplicate of 2412.

Description: Submitted by WI on 10/16/2003. SAFER 4.2 XML support does not include a subscription capability as was implemented for EDI transactions. 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. Do not yet have experienced base to tell whether this will be a problem.

During a TELECON on 12/17/03, WI indicated this to be their third highest priority for WI-submitted 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).

Analysis (01202004):
While performing technical analysis on options to implement XML subscription capability, we received a proposal from MMA, which has the similar idea as one of the approaches we are considering 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 will 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 we do 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 will be created for each transaction, such as T0025sub for transaction T0025. The new directory T0025sub will 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 will 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 will 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.

[2004-05-19 ncm] This is a duplicate of CR 2412. All info herein has been moved to 2412.

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

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 5/19/2004 12:25:55 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 3/11/2004 8:37:27 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 5/19/2004 12:25:55 PM

CR Number: 2537

External Reference: Volpe CR #9

Category: SAFER XML_in service, ICD

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Need for XML inspection report transaction

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: [2004-05-19] Closed - duplicate of 2132

Description: Submitted by WI on 10/16/2003. Non-ASPEN states that will be using the XML capabilities of SAFER 4.2 would like to be able to send inspection reports from CVIEW to SAFER via XML. The application file format (AFF) used by ASPEN states could also

be used by non-ASPEN states if documentation were provided. During a TELCON on 12/17/2003, WI indicated this to be their second highest priority for WI-submitted CR's #9, #10 and #21.

[2002-01-19] Volpe Analysis:
A new input transaction T0018 will be created to support states uploading inspection reports in XML. The Volpe Center will jointly work with FMCSA FST at Colorado to define the XML schema file for the transaction T0018. The proposed XML schema file will be used by SAFER, CVIEW, SAFETYNET2000, ASPEN or equivalent systems and possibly MCMIS.

The data items in T0018, both required and optional, shall at least be consistent with those in the Inspection Report uploaded in AFF format. The framework of the current XML input transactions will be used when implementing T0018.

Once implemented, the CVISN states will be able to use T0018 to upload the inspection reports from CVIEW to SAFER in XML format. These inspection reports will subsequently be processed by the SAFER XML_in service.

For roadside inspectors, the inspection reports will be uploaded in XML from ASPEN or an equivalent system through HTTP protocol and processed subsequently by SAFER web service.

The SAFER web service will be an enhancement to the SAFER system to support real time query and uploads. The details of this enhancement are documented in SAFER CR#21, which has been approved by FMCSA.

[2004-03-11] presented at the 2/26/04 ACCB meeting.
Recommended for FMCSA approval. If approved, this change will be targeted for the July, 2004 release of SAFER. It will be implemented via the existing FTP method.

Regarding the statement "For roadside inspectors, the inspection reports will be uploaded in XML from ASPEN or an equivalent system through HTTP protocol and processed subsequently by SAFER web service", this would be a future capability; there is no current plan.

[2004-04-16] presented at the 4/15/04 ACCB meeting.
The solution to the XML inspection report transaction will be implemented as a web service. Iowa will test the transaction. This feature will be available in a special release in May. This change will also be implemented via the FTP method; that capability will be available in the July quarterly release of SAFER.

Impact on architecture:
ASPEN - SAFER XML

[2004-05-19 ncm] This is a duplicate of CR 2132. All info herein has been moved to 2132.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 5/19/2004 12:27:24 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 3/11/2004 8:34:19 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 5/19/2004 12:27:24 PM

CR Number: 2535

External Reference:

Category: CVISN - National ITS Architecture

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Add equipment package descriptions to CVISN Architecture document

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed following publication of document

Description: Baseline V1.0 of the CVISN Architecture document does not include descriptions of the equipment packages shown on the CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram. To make the architecture document more complete, descriptions should be added.

[2004-03-19] Presented at the 3/18/04 ACCB meeting. This CR has already been approved by FMCSA. Open pending publication of the document.

IMPACT SUMMARY:
ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture document

Fix: Extracted the definitions from the National ITS Architecture and included as Table 4 of the document.
ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture document

CVISN Architecture: published and delivered via PL-04-0133 (POR-02-7364), 1 April 2004.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 4/5/2004 3:44:57 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 3/4/2004 1:53:58 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 4/5/2004 3:44:39 PM

CR Number: 2446

External Reference:

Category: Communication of Changes

Component: CVIEW

Synopsis: Notification of User Authorization System changes indicated need for improvement in communicating changes to affected users.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed per ACCB meeting 2004-01-15.

Description: Maryland's CVIEW system administrator was surprised in January 2004 to receive an email referring to changes pending since October 2003 regarding FMCSA's change to user authorization methods. It isn't clear who in Maryland may have been notified of the impending changes in October 2003. Neither the MD system architect (me) nor the MD CVISN program manager (then Joe Foster) were on the notification list. An effort should be undertaken to review and update notification lists for impending changes to SAFER and related systems that may affect the interfaced systems. Because personnel changes are common, a process for maintaining the contact list should be implemented, probably including state CVISN program managers

The documentation intended to support users through the change-over to UAS seems to be inconsistent with emails and telephone advice provided. Specifically, the "UAS User Guide" says "There are currently no plans to implement UAS for system-to-system connections (i.e., CVIEW-to-SAFER or PRISM-to-SAFER)." But the Maryland CVIEW-SAFER connection was disabled, and subsequent dialogue indicated some uncertainty as to what connections were or should have been affected.

[2004-01-16 sbs] Discussed at 1/15/04 ACCB meeting. Volpe explained that turning on UAS was not supposed to affect SAFER-CVIEW connections, which was why the CVISN distribution was not notified. An unexpected problem with the firewall rules occurred during the transition. Volpe maintains a technical support list and those users were notified of the change. Any CVISN users are welcome to be added to that list, but only about 10% of the messages are related to CVISN. Users may also view announcements at the FMCSA Technical Support website http://fmcsa-ts.dot.gov/ (userid and password required).

Whenever a change is planned that affects the CVIEW-SAFER interface, the ACCB System Architect / CVISN Program Manager email list will be sent a message.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Waddell Richard L

Modified Time: 3/11/2004 11:45:17 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 1/12/2004 12:43:29 PM

Entered By: Waddell Richard L

Severity: Medium

Priority: Yes

Type: Defect

Closed On: 1/16/2004 11:24:24 AM

CR Number: 2444

External Reference: SAFER CR 21; Wisconsin

Category: Need query capability for carrier snapshot to support XML CVIEWS

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: States using XML CVIEWS do not have the query capability that is available for EDI users.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed with release of SAFER 4.4

Description: The roadside inspectors need to be able to retrieve carrier snapshots from SAFER when the requested carrier information does not exist in the state's CVIEW database. The Carrier snapshot queries shall be performed by connecting to SAFER via CVIEW.

SAFER CR 21 was discussed at the 2003-12-18 ACCB meeting. Volpe will investigate the options to providing the capability to states implementing XML CVIEW systems.

Volpe Analysis:(01222004)
Another Change Request (CR 10) we are analyzing recommends the implementation of date "subscriptions" similar to the EDI functionality, primarily to reduce the amount of data downloaded and stored locally at the CVIEW sites. This CR supports that concept, as it will allow sites to obtain query results from SAFER in near real-time when the data is not found locally.
A feasibility test was performed locally and demonstrated that web services is a feasible approach to meet the user's requirements. We recommend using existing XML output transaction source code to deliver the data through web services. Therefore, there is no need to develop new transactions in the XML format.

We recommend the web services functionality be developed using existing standards WSDL and SOAP. Oracle JDeveloper can be used as the development environment to automate the creation of WSDL and SOAP. We also recommend providing an example SAFER web services Client to a select number of states to do alpha testing to ensure it suffices for their functional requirements, and that the state is able to incorporate the Client into their CVIEW systems.

The proposed framework would allow us to easily provide all current XML output transactions through web services in near real-time. Any new SAFER specific transactions to be developed in the future would require no additional work to use the web services. Note that this change does not purport to duplicate the query capabilities of other FMCSA systems, Query Central (QC) in particular. For transactions not inherent to SAFER (Past inspections from the SAFER data mailbox for example - see CR22), we recommend the CVIEW sites utilize other mechanisms.

[2004-03-09 ncm] SAFER CR 21 was discussed at the 2004-02-26 ACCB meeting. Volpe explained the web services approach to implementing the query capability. Three transactions (T0028, T0030, and T0031) will be tested; this capability is targeted for the April, 2004 release of SAFER. Eventually, other transactions are expected to be implemented via web services. Volpe noted that the query capability will only provide data in SAFER; it will not provide the more detailed or up-to-date data that may be available from Query Central. There was general agreement among the states to this approach; the CR has already been approved by FMCSA.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 4/6/2004 8:25:36 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/18/2003 5:09:03 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 4/6/2004 8:25:36 AM

CR Number: 2443

External Reference: SAFER CR 11 and CR 12

Category: Changes to SAFER-CVIEW interface to handle REVIEW_TYPE

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Two new values for CARRIER_REVIEW_TYPE are in the carrier data received by SAFER from MCMIS.

Summary: Since the FMCSA-sponsored CVIEW will not accept the new values, Volpe has implemented a workaround to change the values or not send records that would be rejected.

Proposal:
The CVISN states change their CVIEW to accept the new review type values so that the data in their CVIEW databases will be consistent with the data displayed on the SAFER web site. A schema change will be required; the transaction T0031 will be versioned.

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: [2005-06-17] Closed - incorporated into CR 3115

Description: MCMIS uses new Review Type data which has the following values:

G combined Compliance Review and Cargo Tank Review
F Cargo Tank only review

The current SAFER system failed to process records with the new Review_Type data from MCMIS due to a check constraint on the Review_Type column -- REVIEW_TYPE in ('C','E','H','N','S')

Changing the value of the REVIEW_TYPE will require changes to the SAFER ICD and to CVIEW applications.

SAFER CRs 11 and 12 were discussed at the ACCB meeting 2003-12-18. More information will be provided by Volpe.

See Solution-Work Around for how this will be handled by Volpe to support the SAFER/CVIEW interface.

[2004-05-07] Closed, pending request for data from states.

[2004-07-12] Volpe has requested that this CR be reopened. Volpe recommends that the CVISN states change their CVIEW to accept the new review type values so that the data in their CVIEW databases will be consistent with those displayed on the SAFER web site. Volpe will develop revised schema files.

If states accept this CR, the implementation timeframe needs to be discussed. Volpe proposes that they would continue to support the work around until the end of September. Volpe would provide technical assistance to the states in making this change.

[2004-07-19] Presented and discussed at the 2004-07-15 ACCB meeting.
This CR was reopened at Volpe's request and will be posted to the CVISN Systems Architects list serv for review. Volpe will provide information on the changes that were made to SAFER so states can better judge the monetary/time impact. It is targeted for inclusion in SAFER 4.6 due to be released in September. States attending the meeting had no concerns over implementing this CR. A test case will be sent to APLINT to determine whether there is an impact on the EDI interface.

[2004-08-23] Presented and discussed at the 2004-08-19 ACCB meeting.
States agreed to the proposal that "the CVISN states change their CVIEW to accept the new review type values so that the data in their CVIEW databases will be consistent with those displayed on the SAFER web site." Wisconsin and Utah volunteered to beta-test T0031V2. This CR is recommended for FMCSA approval and implementation in the next release of SAFER, 2004-09-30. However, because the impact of this change on the State CVIEWs is not clear, the date for turning off T0031V1 has been extended to 2005-01-01. See related CR 2933.

[2004-09-27] Discussed at the 2004-09-23 ACCB meeting.
Because additional values are going to be supplied by MCMIS, beta-testing has been postponed until October, and the CR will not be implemented until the January SAFER release.

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

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Impact on States:
XML states would have to use the versioned schema. If they have a database constraint on the REVIEW_TYPE field, or if they do any processing based on the value of that field, that processing may need to change.

Utah noted that changes could probably be done in one day.
There seems to be no impact on EDI states, as any unknown value of REVIEW_TYPE is mapped to "Other".

[2005-06-17] Closed - incorporated into CR 3115

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 6/17/2005 7:37:17 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/18/2003 4:49:16 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 6/17/2005 7:37:17 AM

CR Number: 2417

External Reference: Volpe CR #2

Category: Addition of fields to XML inspection summary transaction

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Change to SAFER to process and send Level 6 Radiological data in inspection reports.

The current version of SAFER, v 4.2.3.10, does not accept input files from ASPEN which have radiological records.

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: [2004-05-12] Closed, incorporated into CR 2132.

Description: The following code change to SAFER has been made in v 4.2.3.10 in order for SAFER to accept the inspection reports in question:
- Changed the 284 record processing code to read and ignore the new radiological data fields.

However, SAFER will eventually be changed to send the radiological data in output transactions. This will impact states' CVIEW systems.

Analysis is pending on what the new fields are and when the change will be made. Note that the affected XML transactions will be versioned, so that states may still use the XML transactions that are in place now and will not have to change their code immediately.

[2003-11-21:sbs] Update from Volpe 2003-11-20
No change will be made to SAFER to accept or to send radiological data to states until

CR 2132, Need for XML input transaction, is implemented.

Presented at ACCB meeting 2003-11-20.

[20040507] Closed, incorporated into CR 2132.

Fix: Close this CR and update CR 2132 to incorporate this potential change.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 5/12/2004 10:19:45 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 11/13/2003 10:52:26 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 5/12/2004 10:19:45 AM

CR Number: 2416

External Reference: Volpe CR #1

Category: Change to field sizes in XML inspection summary transaction

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Change to SAFER to support extended field sizes used by SAFETYNET 2000 and ASPEN.

The new ASPEN and SAFETYNET releases are sending inspection reports with extended field sizes for a number of fields.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: [2004-05-07] Closed. Implemented in SAFER 4.3.

Description: The SAFER ELQ Service version 4.2.3.10 has been deployed with changes to support the new releases of SAFETYNET and ASPEN. The changes are completely transparent as far as end users are concerned. However, SAFER will eventually be changed to send the extended fields in output transactions without truncating them. This will impact states' CVIEW systems.

Analysis is pending on what fields are affected and when the change will be made. Note that the affected XML transactions will be versioned, so that states may still use the XML transactions that are in place now and will not have to change their code immediately.

[2003-11-21 sbs] Volpe update 2003-11-20
This CR affects XML transactions T0022, T0028.

The following fields have changed sizes:

Inspection Report Fields
Carrier Name changes from 55 characters to 120
Carrier Street from 30 to 50
Shipper Name from 55 to 120

Vehicle Fields
Owner Name from 55 to 120
Operator Name from 55 to 120

Discussed at ACCB meeting 2003-11-20. Volpe would use version identification for the new transactions. States would be able to use the older version until ready to process the longer length records. States will need to implement a means to identify the transaction versions. Bill Guiffre asked for a schema and example transactions and Volpe accepted an action item to send that information out in the next week.

[2003-11-25] Volpe provided a schema and example transactions demonstrating the changes in XML transactions T0022 and T0028 and the use of versioning.

[2004-05-07] T0028 v2 was implemented in SAFER 4.3 released January, 2004.

[2004-05-07 clarification Jingfei Wu] The changes in SAFER CR#1 (CR 2416) are in T0028v2. Primarily field size changes.

Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Salazar Sandra B
Modified Time:	5/18/2004 9:08:13 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	11/13/2003 10:46:08 AM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	5/7/2004 4:17:02 PM

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:	Closed Approved

Disposition: [2006-09-18] Closed; incorporated into 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.

[2006-09-18] Closed; incorporated into SAFER Release 5.1.
****

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: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 1/23/2007 12:44:41 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 10/14/2003 11:53:58 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On: 9/18/2006 6:57:50 AM

CR Number: 2410

External Reference:

Category: SAFER now stores Inspection Reports for 90 days

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: SAFER has been changed to store inspection reports (IRs) for 90 days rather than 60 days. It will eventually be changed to store IRs for 120 days. Documents under configuration control need to be changed to indicate this.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: SAFER has been changed to store inspection reports (IRs) for 90 days rather than 60 days. It will eventually be changed to store IRs for 120 days. Documents under configuration control need to be changed to indicate this.

ACCB Documents Affected:
COACH Part 1 - no longer maintained
COACH Part 3
COACH Part 5 - no longer maintained
Other Documents Affected:
CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange - no longer maintained
SCOPE Workshop - Session 5 - no longer maintained

[20031017sbs] Presented at ACCB meeting 2003-10-16.

Fix: COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.
COACH Part 1 will not be updated at this time.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 5/7/2004 2:32:48 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 10/10/2003 11:31:58 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 5/7/2004 2:32:48 PM

CR Number: 2390

External Reference:

Category: CVISN - National ITS Architecture

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Update CVISN Architecture to keep pace with changes to the National ITS Architecture (Version 5)

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed following publication of document

Description: The National Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture is about to release version 5.0. The most significant Version 5.0 enhancement is the improvement of the coverage of transportation security in the National ITS Architecture <http://itsarch.iteris.com/itsarch/version5.0beta/html/security/securityhome.htm>. These improvements include updates to the physical architecture, market packages, logical architecture, and supporting documentation. Using ITS to Enhance Transportation Security is addressed in the following areas: Transit, Rail, Freight and Commercial Vehicle, HAZMAT, Wide Area Alerts, Transportation Infrastructure, and Disaster Response and Evacuation. In addition, guidance is now offered on ways in which ITS can be made more secure. A new security document was created to define and present aspects to ITS-related surface transportation security and their applicability to the National ITS Architecture. It provides context and guidance for using the security-related parts of the National ITS Architecture when developing regional and project ITS architectures.

The CVISN Architecture is represented by a diagram that depicts subsystems, equipment packages, architecture flows, and terminators represents the CVISN Architecture [see CVISN Web site: http://www.jhuapl.edu/cvisn/ > Documents > CVISN Architecture and Standards]. Tables provide additional information about each item shown on the diagram. The diagram and tables in the CVISN architecture should be updated to include National ITS Architecture changes as summarized in the attachment.

[2003-10-10 ncm per VBB email Fri 6/13/2003 9:25 AM]
In the upcoming Version 5.0 of the National ITS Architecture, the definition for architecture flow "Information on Violators" will be revised as follows: "Information on violators provided by a law enforcement agency. May include information about commercial vehicle violations or other kinds of violations associated with the particular entity. The information may be provided as a response to a real-time query or proactively by the source. The query flow is not explicitly shown."

[2003-10-17 ncm] Presented at 10/16/03 ACCB meeting.

[2003-10-27 ncm] Addtions to attachment - in the course of updating the document, there were some additional architecture flows, subsystems and terminators that need to be added, are new or have updated definitions. The document was updated to reflect this.. Alerting and Advisory Systems, EVS, ADMS, EM, RS, TCS, alerts and advisories, CVO driver initialization, CVO pass/pull-in message, emergency notification, information on violators, road network conditions, trip log information, vehicle location.

[2003-10-28 ncm] The document should be updated to reflect the NITSA V5.0 definition for the Fixed Point Communications architecture interconnect.

IMPACT SUMMARY:
ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture Flow diagram

2. CVISN Architecture document

Note: other CVISN documents containing the flow diagram are not being maintained.

Fix: ACCB Items:
1. CVISN Architecture Flow diagram
2. CVISN Architecture document

CVISN Architecture: published and delivered via PL-04-0133 (POR-02-7364), 1 April 2004.

Comment:

Attachment names: Natl ITS Arch V5 Impacts on CVISN Arch R1.doc

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 4/5/2004 3:43:47 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/17/2003 2:02:59 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 4/5/2004 3:43:47 PM

CR Number: 2178

External Reference:

Category: COACH Part 4

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: COACH 4 - cleanup

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: Various changes were made to update the COACH Part 4 for publication including:
**Expand acronyms
**References updated
**Section 2 - split the interface function diagram into 4; dispensed with separate Interface Standards diagram(s)
**Remove version number from SAFETYNET
**Added CR section at back explaining impacts

[2003-10-17 ncm] Presented at 10/16/03 ACCB meeting.

ACCB Impact:
1. COACH, Part 4

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	3/11/2004 3:36:34 PM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	7/9/2003 2:29:29 PM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	11/5/2003 1:13:43 PM

CR Number:	2156
External Reference:	
Category:	COACH Part 4
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	COACH 4 - add Query Central interface info
Status:	Closed Fixed
Disposition:	Closed
Description:	Added CIA interfaces to the COACH 4 Table 2-1 (Standard Interface Identification Table) in accordance with the attached Query Central document. [2003-10-16 ncm] Presented at 10/16/03 ACCB meeting. ACCB Impact: COACH Part 4
Fix:	COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.
Comment:	
Attachment names:	Brenda Lantz Query Central Jan03.ppt
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	3/11/2004 3:36:21 PM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	6/27/2003 3:26:44 PM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:13:13 PM

CR Number: 2155

External Reference:

Category: COACH Part 4

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: COACH 4 - correct safety system interfaces

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: In Table 2-1(Standard Interface Identification Table), many interfaces between safety systems (ASPEN, CVIEW, SAFER, SAFETYNET, MCMIS) indicate the use of the SAFER/CVIEW Data Mailbox. We brought these into accordance with the SAFER ICDs and comments received during review of the SAFE current systems document.

The interface diagrams will also be updated to reflect the revised table.

[2003-10-17 ncm] Presented at 10/16/03 ACCB meeting.

ACCB Impact:
COACH Part 4

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 3/11/2004 3:36:10 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 6/27/2003 3:25:54 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:12:50 PM

CR Number: 2147

External Reference:

Category: COACH Part 4

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: COACH 4 - replace EDI-A, etc, with AA, etc.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: To simplify both the Level 1 drawings and the Standard Interface Identification Table (table 2-1), replace the identification labels EDI-A, etc, with AA, etc. Add to the "Std" column "XML", "HTML", and "CIA" as appropriate.

General rules:
** Wherever EDI is available for a carrier to state interface, add XML and HTML
** Wherever EDI is available for an interface within the state, add XML and CIA
** Wherever EDI is available for a state to core infrastructure interface, add XML and possibly HTML

Remove/renumber INT rows of the table since most are now covered by the AA, etc, rows.
** Int A in AA
** Int B in HH
** Int C in UU
** Int D becomes Int A
** Int E deleted
** Int F in LL
** Int G in RR

AFF-A removed - no evidence it was true
AFF-F removed - no evidence it was true
AFF-H removed because it is covered in AFF-E without any SDM involvement

CIA-C removed - no evidence that this is so
Old CIA-R removed - covered by CIA-E

If an XML standard exists, reference it in the table.

[2003-10-17 ncm] Presented at 10/16/03 ACCB meeting.

ACCB Impact:
COACH Part 4

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 3/11/2004 3:36:04 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 6/25/2003 9:26:52 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:12:13 PM

CR Number:	2137
External Reference:	
Category:	COACH 3
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	COACH 3 - cleanup
Status:	Closed Fixed
Disposition:	Closed
Description:	Various changes were made to update the COACH Part 3 for publication including: ** Update References format ** Expand acronyms ** XML as a current (as opposed to future) capability ** Adopt the COACH Part 1 L1/E/C requirement level in the appendices' tables ** Use "X" as the requirement level for design components not considered essential to achieve CVISN Core (Level 1) functionality in the appendices' tables [2003-09-19 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 9/18/2003. ACCB Impact: COACH 3
Fix:	COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	3/11/2004 3:35:18 PM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	6/23/2003 9:10:14 AM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	10/23/2003 7:16:42 AM

CR Number:	2132
External Reference:	Tania Rossouw, Wisconsin - Volpe CR 9
Category:	Need for XML inspection report transaction

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The XML inspection summary transaction in SAFER 4.2 is an output transaction from SAFER to the states. There is no XML inspection report transaction from the state to SAFER. Wisconsin, a non-ASPEN state, would like an input XML inspection report transaction.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2004-07-19] Closed - implemented in SAFER 4.5.

Description: The application file format (AFF) used by ASPEN to send inspection reports to SAFER has not been documented for use by systems other than SCAPI. Non-ASPEN states that will be using the XML capabilities of SAFER 4.2 would like to be able to send inspection reports to SAFER via XML as well.

This CR was created in response to action item assigned at ACCB meeting June 19, 2003.

[2003-10-17 ncm] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2003-10-16. Tania Roussouw said that ASPEN has defined/implemented an XML interface for inspection reports. What is needed now is for SAFER to be able to read it. This is one example of the larger problem of capability gaps in the XML version of SAFER.

[2003-11-21 sbs] CR 2417, Addition of fields to XML inspection summary transaction, has been closed and incorporated into this CR. When this CR is addressed, it will be decided what radiological data will be included in input and output transactions between SAFER and CVIEW.

[2002-01-19] Volpe Analysis:
A new input transaction T0018 will be created to support states uploading inspection reports in XML. The Volpe Center will jointly work with FMCSA FST at Colorado to define the XML schema file for the transaction T0018. The proposed XML schema file will be used by SAFER, CVIEW, SAFETYNET2000, ASPEN or equivalent systems and possibly MCMIS.

The data items in T0018, both required and optional, shall at least be consistent with those in the Inspection Report uploaded in AFF format. The framework of the current XML input transactions will be used when implementing T0018.

Once implemented, the CVISN states will be able to use T0018 to upload the inspection reports from CVIEW to SAFER in XML format. These inspection reports will subsequently be processed by the SAFER XML_in service.

For roadside inspectors, the inspection reports will be uploaded in XML from ASPEN or an equivalent system through HTTP protocol and processed subsequently by SAFER web service.

The SAFER web service will be an enhancement to the SAFER system to support real time query and uploads. The details of this enhancement are documented in SAFER CR#21, which has been approved by FMCSA.

[2004-03-11] presented at the 2/26/04 ACCB meeting.
Recommended for FMCSA approval. If approved, this change will be targeted for the July, 2004 release of SAFER. It will be implemented via the existing FTP method.

Regarding the statement "For roadside inspectors, the inspection reports will be uploaded in XML from ASPEN or an equivalent system through HTTP protocol and processed subsequently by SAFER web service", this would be a future capability; there is no

current plan.

[2004-04-16] presented at the 4/15/04 ACCB meeting.
The solution to the XML inspection report transaction will be implemented as a web service. Iowa will test the transaction. This feature will be available in a special release in May. This change will also be implemented via the FTP method; that capability will be available in the July quarterly release of SAFER.

[2004-05-07] clarification by Jingfei Wu] Changes in SAFER CR#2 (CR 2132) are not related to T0028 v2 at all. These are inspection data. We only made changes in SAFER to accept the radiological data from ASPEN and SAFETYNET. SAFER is not sending the data to CVIEW. So no impact right now. If the CVISN users are interested in getting radiological data, then we will include the data in T0030.

[2004-07-12] From SAFER CR 9: The implementation of this CR has been divided into two phases. (1) Inspection uploads using SAFER web service will be implemented in version 4.5 scheduled on July 19th.
(2) The IR uploads using SAFER XML service through FTP protocol will be available in version 4.6 in September.

[2004-07-19] Presented as the 7/15/04 ACCB meeting.
This CR has been implemented in the new version of SAFER (version 4.5) - CR is closed.

Impact on architecture:
ASPEN - SAFER XML

Fix: Workaround: A state could implement SCAPI to create the AFF format that is used by ASPEN to send the inspection report to SAFER.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 7/19/2004 12:04:09 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 6/19/2003 4:50:18 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 7/19/2004 12:04:09 PM

CR Number: 2110

External Reference:

Category: National ITS Architecture V5

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Natl Arch V5 - updated definition for "Information on Violators"

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: Closed - incorporated into CR 2390

Description: In the upcoming Version 5.0 of the National ITS Architecture, the definition for architecture flow "Information on Violators" will be revised as follows:

""Information on violators provided by a law enforcement agency. May include information about commercial vehicle violations or other kinds of violations associated with the particular entity. The information may be provided as a response to a real-time query or proactively by the source. The query flow is not explicitly shown."

per VBB email Fri 6/13/2003 9:25 AM

[2003-10-10 ncm - moved this CR into CR 2390]

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:53:17 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 6/13/2003 9:35:17 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Low

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/10/2003 8:38:47 AM

CR Number: 2045

External Reference:

Category: E-Screening Enrollment

Component: CVISN Architecture

Synopsis: what escreening jurisdictions can a carrier enroll in ??

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed.

Description: in SAFER v4.2, a carrier may request to participate in escreening in one or more jurisdictions via a T0023 XML transaction or EDI snapshot.

What choice of jurisdictions should be available to the carrier?

For instance, if a state does NOT have an escreening program, should the carrier be allowed to enroll in that jurisdiction anyway ? Shouldn't he be informed that this request has been denied ?

SAFER maintains a list of escreening jurisdictions that a carrier may enroll in. if that list contains ONLY jurisdictions that have escreening programs or have otherwise agreed to participate in escreening, if a carrier attempts to enroll in a jurisdiction that is NOT in the list, SAFER will return an error message to the carrier in the transaction log file. If the list contains all possible jurisdictions, regardless of whether the state has a program or wishes to participate, the carrier won't know and transponder information could be generated for that state anyway.

Which states should be include in SAFER's list of escreening jurisdictions ? ALL ? only those that policy states should be included (whatever that policy might be ?)

This question needs to be resolved in order to ensure that the deployed SAFER v4.2 works as expected by the CVISN states and FMCSA.

[sbs for rkc] 20030610 SAFER should include all jurisdictions. Since there is no easy way to add jurisdictions to the list now, any other solution would cause maintenance problems.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/21/2003 2:55:09 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 5/23/2003 10:52:18 AM

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: High

Priority: Yes

Type: Defect

Closed On: 6/10/2003 5:31:30 PM

CR Number: 1992

External Reference:

Category: COACH Part 1

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: CVISN "Level 1" changed to CVISN "Core"

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: As part of the CVISN program, FMCSA defined an initial set of capabilities that could be deployed incrementally by a state and its motor carriers. The capabilities focus on

electronically exchanging safety and credentialing information, electronically processing interstate registration and fuel tax credentials, and implementing roadside electronic screening at one fixed or mobile site. These capabilities were originally referred to as "CVISN Level 1" capabilities, but are now called "Core" CVISN capabilities.

ACCB Checklist:
1. COACH Part 1 - add paragraph above to 2nd page, and update words in Appendix B
2. COACH Part 3 - add paragraph above to 2nd page
3. COACH Part 4 - add paragraph above to 2nd page

Fix: 1. ncm 2003-05-14
2. ncm 2003-05-14
3. ncm 2003-05-14

COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.
COACH Part 4 V1.0: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:53:35 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 5/15/2003 6:41:20 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:11:41 PM

CR Number: 899

External Reference:

Category: E-Screening Enrollment

Component: CVISN Architecture

Synopsis: what should SAFER do if vehicle is not registered?

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed per Robert Goldfarb [2003-09-24]

Description: When SAFER receives a vehicle escreen enrollment request (via EDI or XML) it normally associates the TRANSPONDER ID in the request to a vehicle (VIN) in SAFER 's db.

What should SAFER do if :

a) there is no vehicle (VIN) record for the vehicle in the db (i.e., the vehicle was never registered - SAFER has never received a vehicle IRP registration edi snapshot update or XML transaction) ?

or

b) there is a vehicle (VIN) record in the data base but it is associated with ONLY an expired registration ?

or

c) there is a vehicle (VIN) record in the data base but it is NOT associated with ANY registration. (This can happen if a the plate on a vehicle (VIN record) were switched to another vehicle (VIN record) - leaving the original vehicle (VIN record) without a legitimate registration. SAFER does not delete the VIN record in this case - perhaps it should - but it doesnt.)

We require requirements guidance on this issue in order to proceed with SAFER v4.2 XML & EDI development.

[2003-03-20 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 3/20/2003.

Fix: [sbs 2003-0314]
There has to be a VIN record in the database and it has to be associated with a registration.

In the cases described, the escreening enrollment request would be accepted in case (b), but in cases (a) and (c), the escreening enrollment request would be rejected.

[2003-09-24] Implemented in SAFER v4.2 (per rhg)

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Goldfarb Robert H

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:54:12 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 2/20/2003 1:50:56 PM

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: High

Priority: Yes

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/24/2003 7:30:57 AM

CR Number: 895

External Reference:

Category: CVISN Core Infrastructure

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Query Central needs to be added to the list of CVISN Core Infrastructure systems.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: Query Central (QC) is an information retrieval system designed to dramatically increase access to motor carrier safety information for State and Federal law enforcement personnel using the power of web-based technology. QC is hosted at Volpe and connects directly to MCMIS, SAFER, and L&I. The current user base is made up of FMCSA and State Motor Carrier enforcement personnel.

Query Central was added to diagrams as a CVISN Core Infrastructure system.

Interfaces were added to diagrams between Query Central and the following systems:
SAFER
L&I
CDLIS
MCMIS
Firewalls
Roadside Inspections

Impact Summary:
ACCB Items:
CVISN System Design Document
COACH Part 3
COACH Part 4

Frequently Used Slides: (see attachments - proposed may show effects of other CRs)
Generic State Design Template.ppt
CVISN System Design Description (ACCB)
COACH Part 3 (ACCB)
CVISN Guides: (no longer maintained)
Top Level Design
Safety Information Exchange
Electronic Screening
Credentials Administration
Scope (no longer maintained)
Generic Network Template.ppt
CVISN System Design Description (ACCB)
CVISN Guide to Top Level Design - no longer maintained
Scope - no longer maintained
CVISN Design-Stakeholder View.ppt
CVISN System Design Description (ACCB)
CVISN Web Page
Introductory Guide to CVISN - no longer maintained
Safety Information Exchange.ppt
CVISN System Design Description (ACCB)
CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange - no longer maintained
Scope 5 - no longer maintained
Generic CVISN Configuration.ppt
CVISN System Design Description (ACCB)
Scope - no longer maintained
CVISN System Design Legacy - Planned View.ppt
CVISN System Design Description (ACCB)

Other:
CVISN Web Page

[2003-03-20 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 3/20/2003.

Fix: CVISN Web Page - tgn working on it

Frequently Used Slides:
Generic State Design Template.ppt - ncm updated 3/3/03
Generic Network Template.ppt - ncm updated 3/30/03
CVISN Design-Stakeholder View.ppt - ncm updated 3/30/03
Safety Information Exchange.ppt - ncm updated 3/30/03
Generic CVISN Configuration.ppt - ncm updated 3/30/03
CVISN System Design Legacy - Planned View.ppt - ncm updated 3/30/03

Documents:
CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.
COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names: CR 895 proposed.ppt
CR 895 current.ppt

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 3/9/2006 11:13:21 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 2/10/2003 3:31:01 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 3/9/2006 11:13:21 AM

CR Number: 877

External Reference:

Category: New MCMIS replaces MCMIS

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: MCMIS replaced by New MCMIS

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed.

Description: New MCMIS became operational about 3 September 2002. "Old MCMIS" functionality needs to be replaced by "New MCMIS" functionality in the following documents as they

are updated. Note that the system will be referred to as "MCMIS", not "New MCMIS".

Impact Summary:
ACCB Items:
CVISN System Design Description

Frequently Used Slides (see attachment): (the documents each affects are listed in the individual FUS files)
CVISN Design-Stakeholder View.ppt
CVISN System Design Legacy-Planned View.ppt
Generic Network Template.ppt
Safety Information Exchange.ppt
(Note that the "new" slides in the attachment may include changes from other CRs)

Other documents not scheduled for update - listed for completeness only.
Introductory Guide to CVISN
CVISN Guide to Top Level Design
CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange
CVISN Planning Workshop
Scope

[2003-03-20 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 3/20/2003.

Fix: ACCB Items:
CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Frequently Used Slides (see attachment): (the documents each affects are listed in the individual FUS files)
CVISN Design-Stakeholder View.ppt
CVISN System Design Legacy-Planned View.ppt
Generic Network Template.ppt
Safety Information Exchange.ppt
(Note that the "new" slides in the attachment may include changes from other CRs)

Comment:

Attachment names: CR0877_MCMIS CR FUS.ppt

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/23/2003 7:05:25 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 1/20/2003 7:01:04 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/23/2003 7:05:25 AM

CR Number:	861
External Reference:	
Category:	System Design Description
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	System Design Description document "clean-up"
Status:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	Closed
Description:	Various types of "cleaning up" need to be done to the System Design Description during the current update process. Some of these revisions are as follows: * Expanding acronyms at first use * Reorganizing to increase clarity * Adding section 6 (Change Requests) to allow change management tracking * Modifying slide titles for consistency * Updating references * Section headings added to page footer * XML was added as an option for many transactions that used to be solely EDI * Double arrows between SAFER and MCMIS were replaced by a single arrow from New MCMIS to SAFER * Information was updated to bring it in line with the most recent CVISN guides and the SAFER ICD * CAPRI updated to L1 * Add paragraph on 2nd page explaining that in the future "CVISN Level 1" will be referred to as "CVISN Core" etc. [2003-03-20 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 3/20/2003. Impacted Summary: ACCB Items: System Design Description
Fix:	CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	11/24/2003 6:54:38 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	1/7/2003 10:18:44 AM
Entered By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Severity:	High
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	5/23/2003 3:06:43 PM

CR Number: 833

External Reference:

Category: E-Screening Enrollment - New Business Rules

Component: CVISN Architecture

Synopsis: Beginning with SAFER v4.2, SAFER's processing of Electronic Screening enrollment requests will change for both Carrier E-Screening and Vehicle E-Screening requests. The impacts to the CVISN states desiring to participate in E-Screen enrollment via EDI or XML are described below.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed per Robert Goldfarb [2003-09-24]

Description: 1) Carrier E-Screen Enrollment - Carrier E-Screening enrollment requests, which identify jurisdictions that a carrier (identified by a DOT Number in the request) grants permission to receive Transponder Numbers for his vehicles participating in E-Screening enrollment, will no longer need to be approved by each jurisdiction specified by the carrier; only by the carrier's base jurisdiction, which has implicitly approved it by virtue of its forwarding the request to SAFER.

2) Transponder Number Exchange - The Vehicle E-Screening request EDI or XML transaction will be the only mechanism by which a vehicle's Transponder Number can be entered in SAFER's database. Starting with SAFER v4.1, a vehicle's Transponder Number will no longer be accepted by SAFER if it is included in an IRP Registration (Cab Card) EDI transaction.

The Vehicle E-Screening EDI or XML transaction will be the mechanism by which a vehicle's Transponder Number will be forwarded by SAFER to other CVISN states (if authorized by the vehicle's E-Screen carrier), and only if SAFER has previously received an IRP Registration (Cab Card) EDI or XML transaction for that vehicle.

3) Identifying an E-Screen Carrier's E-Screen Vehicles - Vehicle E-Screening requests will no longer be used to specify which of a carrier's vehicles are participating in E-Screening. Instead, all vehicles assigned to a carrier for Safety plus all vehicles for which the carrier is the Registrant will be considered to be the E-Screen vehicles for that carrier. The association of an E-Screen carrier to his E-Screen vehicles is made via the specification of the E-Screen carrier (DOT number) as either the Safety carrier (CVIS_DEFAULT_CARRIER) or Registrant in the vehicle's EDI or XML IRP Registration (Cab Card) transaction sent to SAFER.

Therefore, unless the vehicle's E-Screen carrier is identified in the Cab Card transaction, it will not be possible to determine if that vehicle participates in E-Screening and its Transponder Number will not be forwarded by SAFER to any jurisdiction - even those granted permission to receive it by the vehicle's E-Screen carrier.

[20021219 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 12/19/2002.

Fix: None needed - purpose was to document SAFER 4.2 escreening logic (per rhg)

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified 11/24/2003 6:54:54 AM

Time:
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 12/4/2002 11:01:01 AM
Entered By: Salazar Sandra B
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On: 9/24/2003 7:29:44 AM

CR Number: 807
External Reference:
Category: IRP Processing
Component: SAFER
Synopsis: SAFER's data model for vehicle registration information supports a combination of IRP and PRISM requirements.

The bottom line is that multiple registrations for the same vehicle must be supported in the SAFER database at the same time. Example 2 portrays a situation that may occur. The SAFER project requires guidance as to what the vehicle data should look like to ensure that the vehicle registration information best reflects the "real world".
Status: Closed Fixed
Disposition: Closed upon SAFER 4.2 releas.
Description: SAFER Vehicle Data Model Background Information

SAFER's vehicle data model is comprised of a Vehicle_Vin database table that contains information about the vehicle (VIN, Model, Model Year, Numer of Axles, Color, Title Number, Title jurisdiction, etc.) from the incoming registration. A Vehicle_Registration table contains the information associated with the registration (License Plate Number, state of registration, Safety carrier, registration dates, IRP_Check_Flag, etc.). It also includes a pointer to the Vehicle_Vin record for that vehicle. In this way, a single Vehicle_Vin record (vehicle) can be associated with many Vehicle_Registration (registration) records.

Example 1:

MD sends in the following IRP registration information:

VIN - 123
Make - Ford
Year - 1999
Color - Blue
Title No - 1234
Title Jurisdiction - MD
Number of Axles - 4
Plate - 1234
License_Plate_State - MD
Registration Start Date - 20020112

Registration End Date - 20021231

If not already existing, a Vehicle_Vin record containing the first 7 items is created and a Vehicle_Registration record containing the last 4 is created.

In early March, VA sends in the following IRP registration information:

VIN - 123
Make - Ford
Year - 1999
Color - Blue
Title No - 1234
Title Jurisdiction - MD
Number of Axles - 4
Plate - 5678
License_Plate_State - VA
Registration Start Date - 20020301
Registration End Date - 20020630

A Vehicle_Registration record containing the last 4 items is created. It points to the already existing Vehicle_Vin record for VIN 123.

There is no problem with this scenario. However, assume that instead of the above IRP registration information from VA, the following information is received:

Example 2:

VIN - 123
Make - Dodge
Year - 2002
Color - Red
Title No - 5678
Title Jurisdiction - PA
Number of Axles - 2
Plate - 5678
License_Plate_State - VA
Registration Start Date - 20020301
Registration End Date - 20020630

How should SAFER handle this?

Currently, the information associated with the VIN (Make, color, year, title, etc.) REPLACES the previous information from MD. What used to be a 4axle Blue Ford titled in MD is now a 2 axle Red Dodge Titled in PA. This is done, even though the registration information from VA will expire before that from MD.

When subscriptions are generated following processing the MD registration information, the recipients will receive information for a 4 axle Blue Ford. When subscriptions are generated following processing of the VA registration information, the recipients will receive information for a 2 axle Red Dodge. Both registrations designating the same VIN.

It is certainly possible that the vehicle was painted between the time it was registered in MD and VA. It is also possible that the vehicle was retitled as well. What is not likely is that the 4 axle FORD is now a 2 axle DODGE.

When registration information is sent out in response to queries or when included in the

PRISM Local Target file (if the vehicle were targeted), there will be 2 registration records - one from MD and one from VA for a 2 axle Red Dodge (with the same VIN).

There are several alternatives to handling this situation:

1 - Continue doing what SAFER does now (as described above).

2 - Process the VA registration but don't update the vehicle information (Make, Year, axles, etc.) in the Vehicle_Vin table if it is not consistent. Report the inconsistency for manual resolution. Note that since the registration information comes in with many alternative spellings for the same data element (e.g., "FOR" and "FORD"), there would be many "errors" detected due to spelling inconsistencies.

3 - Use one of the Registration (or other?) dates to determine whether to update the Vehicle_Vin information. For instance, if the Registration End Date is later than any already received, then update the Vehicle_Vin information - even if it conflicts. This will ensure that the vehicle information is consistent for all registrations associated with the designated VIN.

4 - Move all vehicle attribute information from the Vehicle_Vin table into the Vehicle_Registration table. This would ensure that all of the vehicle information provided in each registration would remain consistent with itself. If this were done, registration information was sent out in response to queries or when included in the PRISM Local Target file (if the vehicle were targeted), there would be 2 registration records - one from MD for a 4 axle Blue Ford titled in MD and one from VA for a 2 axle Red Dodge titled in PA - both having the same VIN. This would rightfully be confusing to consumers.

5 - Ignore Make and Model Year of the vehicle included in the registration where there could be spelling or other inconsistencies and use a VIN decoding algorithm to determine these values. (This won't resolve conflicts in axles, fuel, weight, etc.). Store along with the vehicle color, title, axles, fuel, and weight and other information from the incoming registration (with or without comparing information in the database with that in the incoming registration).

Please advise whether the current SAFER processing approach, as described above, is adequate or provide alternative processing requirements.

[20021122 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 11/21/2002.

States agreed that there should be VIN decoding. Option 5 was agreed upon; options 2-4 should be discarded. Option 1 will continue to be in effect for now. The implementation of a VIN algorithm will be explored and its impact on the SAFER 4.2 schedule determined. Sources for two such algorithms were provided by participating states and were added as an attachment to the CR.

In addition, Robert Goldfarb will look into the effects of replacing existing data with incoming blank data fields. Currently all data are replaced; whether or not existing data for title number and title jurisdiction should be blanked out is at issue.

[20021216 rhg] While the response from the ACCB members was positive and the VIN parsing tools look promising, changes of this magnitude will definitely be beyond that which can be accomplished in SAFER v4.2. After SAFER is transitioned to Volpe would be a more appropriate time to consider this enhancement.

SAFER v4.2 will only support "REPLACE" operations. Therefore, incomplete XML input records will result in any existing data in a record being replaced by NULL data.

[20021219 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 12/19/2002.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: CR 807 Comments.doc
CR 807 VIN algorithm sources.doc

Responsibility: Goldfarb Robert H

Modified Time: 5/7/2004 1:54:03 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 11/4/2002 3:48:42 PM

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 5/7/2004 1:54:03 PM

CR Number: 785

External Reference:

Category: Changes to SAFER to State trans. for Veh.Inspection in SAFER 4.2

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The XML/FTP interface for SAFER shall send vehicle inspection report summary data to States.

The Inspection Report Summary transaction shall contain information derived only from inspection reports that were sent to SAFER. SAFER may not receive all inspection reports pertaining to a particular vehicle, so the summary only applies to a subset of the inspection reports that may exist.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include support of XML/FTP interface for SAFER to send vehicle inspection summary data to States. Refer to the SAFER 4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD) to be released in September 2002 for details.

[2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/02

[2003-02-06 ncm] The text in the synopsis was updated per RHG.

[2003-02-25 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:55:11 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 10/10/2002 12:50:51 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:09:59 PM

CR Number: 782

External Reference:

Category: sendlist subscription process

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: A convention needs to be established for the values of "sender" and "receiver" in the EDI transactions from SAFER.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed per Robert Goldfarb [2003-09-24]

Description: The Sendlist process for filling subscriptions involves creating the subscription output for one user and copying it for all other subscribers, rather than repeating the process of creating the bundled snapshot for each subscriber to that subscription. This results in inaccurate destination Trading partner IDs in the EDI transaction. If the receiver of the snapshot is expecting the "receiver" field to be their own Trading Partner ID, and if they have designed a system that uses this field for some purpose such as data routing or security, they would have a problem with the receiver values supplied by the Sendlist replication process. It is important that the users of the SAFER snapshots understand that the "receiver" field does not identify their Trading Partner ID. (see SAFER CR 699)

One solution that removes the presence of inaccurate "receiver" values, is to hard code a generic destination TPID such that every snapshot from SAFER would have "SAFER" as the sender and "subscriber" as the recipient. These values would be present in the ISA, GS and NM1 segments of the EDI message. If there is consensus on this approach, the convention should be documented in the SAFER requirements, design description and interface documents.

[2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/2002. States agreed

that the proposed solution will work.

Impact summary:
1. SAFER requirements documents
2. CVIEW 3.3 CD documentation "CVIEW Utility Instructions" and "CVIEW Release Notes"
3. SAFER design documents

[2003-09-24 ncm per rhg] Changes implemented in SAFER & CVIEW v3.3.

Fix: RHG 10/18/02:

changed sendlist 3.3 to use generic "SUBSCRIBER" recipient trading partner and use application's MY_TP_ID registry key as the sender TP.

still need to change carrier & vehicle sendlist version 4.x

Impacted documents:
1.
2.
3.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Stuart Mary W

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:55:27 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 10/8/2002 3:14:54 PM

Entered By: Stuart Mary W

Severity: Medium

Priority: Yes

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 9/24/2003 7:28:36 AM

CR Number: 771

External Reference:

Category: Views and View Versions

Component: SAFER and CVIEW

Synopsis: See SAFER CRs 660 and 661 and the attached spreadsheet for background.

Changes to SAFER/CVIEW views and versions were suggested in CRs 660 and 661. I contacted the users. The following changes are recommended:

DELETE Full Carrier Q105 View version 2;
KEEP Full Carrier view version 3 and 4.

DELETE Carrier MCMIS Q102 view version 2.

DELETE ROC Vehicle Q301 and all view versions;
KEEP Full Vehicle Q303, View version 3 only.

DELETE Q304 IRP with tag, all view versions;
KEEP Q306 IRP no tag view version 3 only.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed per Robert Goldfarb [2003-09-24]

Description: [2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/02.

Impacted Documents:
1. Snapshot reports (Ron Glaser generates) after views deleted
2. Opcon Documentation (user manual? release notes?_
3. ROC documentation?

[2003-09-24 ncm per rhg] Changes were implemented in SAFER 4.1 and 4.2

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: SUbscriptionRegistrations.xls

Responsibility: Stuart Mary W

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:55:41 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 10/2/2002 3:51:40 PM

Entered By: Stuart Mary W

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/24/2003 7:27:29 AM

CR Number: 768

External Reference:

Category: View for updating Transponder ID

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: SAFER v3.3 will support Transponder_ID updates from Escreen View (Q305) only.

The purpose of this CR is to document the following behavior of SAFER v3.3 (and later versions).

When SAFER v3.3 goes into production during October 2002, vehicle Transponder IDs in SAFER will only be updated via the Vehicle Escreen Enrollment update transaction (view Q305).

The Vehicle IRP Registration view (Q304) will no longer include Transponder ID. If a

Transponder ID is included in a vehicle IRP registration update sent from CVIEW to SAFER v3.3 (or later), SAFER will not update the value of Transponder ID currently in its DB for that vehicle.

Transponder IDs will only be included in subscriptions in the vehicle Escreen view (Q305) and only for states authorized to receive the Transponder ID for that vehicle.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed per Robert Goldfarb. [2003-09-24]

Description: [2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/02. Because CR 1771 was approved, the last line of the 4th paragraph and the 1st line of the 5th needed to be removed in the synopsis. Robert Goldfarb took an action item to send out a list of deleted views and the effective dates via the general distribution list.

Impacted Documents:
1. Snapshot reports (Ron Glaser generates) after views deleted
2. Opcon Documentation (user manual? release notes?_
3. ROC documentation?

Fix: no change required - purpose was to document use of Q305 view - per rhg

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Goldfarb Robert H

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:56:00 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 10/2/2002 1:51:24 PM

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 9/24/2003 7:25:57 AM

CR Number: 744

External Reference:

Category: Delete SAFER snapshot field

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Delete HM_PASSENGER_SCORE from SAFER snapshot.
The HM_PASSENGER_SCORE value is no longer calculated in (New) MCMIS (per Mark Swope). It should be deleted from SAFER snapshots since the current values in SAFERhave not been updated since Sept 01 and are obsolete.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed per Robert Goldfarb. [2003-09-24]

Description: [2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/02.

Impact Summary:

1.SAFER View Summary Report (view_sum_report.doc)
2.SAFER Snapshot Definition Report for Carrier Data (carrier_snapshot_def_report.doc)
3.SAFER Snapshot Definition Report for Vehicle Data (vehicle_snapshot_def_report.doc)
4.SAFER View Definition Report for Carrier Data (view_matrix_DOT30_car.doc)
5.SAFER View Definition Report for Vehicle Data (view_matrix_DOT30_veh.doc)

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Goldfarb Robert H

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:56:14 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/23/2002 3:31:16 PM

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 9/24/2003 7:24:35 AM

CR Number: 732

External Reference: VOLPE CR 15

Category: Requirement for OOS information for escreening

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Is there a requirement for carrier Out of Service information at the roadside when screening vehicles ? If so, which roadside applications require it, what frequency should be provided, and in what form.

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: [2005-09-22 obr] Closed out and incorporated into ARCH CR 3115

Description: [2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/02. States agreed that carrier-level OOS data would be useful at the roadside for screening and should be included in SAFER snapshots. This feature will not be included in SAFER 4.2, but will be added to the list for future SAFER updates.

[2005-09-22 obr] Closed out and incorporated into ARCH CR 3115

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Goldfarb Robert H

Modified Time: 9/23/2005 2:32:56 PM

Modified By: Roberts Onna Beth

Entered On: 9/18/2002 8:29:29 AM

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 9/23/2005 2:32:56 PM

CR Number: 731

External Reference:

Category: Delete L&I snapshot view

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: It appears that Licensing and Insurance serves no role in support of roadside screening. Consequently, the storage of L&I data in the CVIEWs seems to be unnecessary. The SAFER project requests termination of L&I CVIEW subscriptions unless there is a business reason for this information to be sent to the CVIEWs (could it possibly be used by PRISM for carrier registration of vehicles ?) If retention of L&I subscriptions is required, please provide details of the business case for it.

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2002-10-18 ncm] Disapproved and closed.

Description: [2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/02. States agreed that L&I data is useful at the roadside for screening, and the capability should be retained in SAFER snapshots.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Goldfarb Robert H

Modified Time: 10/21/2002 11:37:49 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 9/18/2002 8:26:32 AM

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 10/21/2002 11:37:49 AM

CR Number: 708

External Reference:

Category: MCMIS quarterly updates

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: We need a better mechanism for transfering the data from a MCMIS quarterly update to the states. The SAFER data mailbox system was not designed to handle this kind of volume of data and the CVIEWs have a hard time keeping up with the processing as well. One option would be to provide the data as an Oracle dump via an ftp site at Volpe. Other options include providing an AFF, or (later) an XML file on the ftp site.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: [2003-02-06] Closed - no longer applicable.

Description: [NCM 2002-09-24] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. One of the changes in new MCMIS is the move to more frequent SAFESTAT updates. After October 2002, updates may occur monthly. As noted in the CR synopsis, even the quarterly updates present processing problems for SAFER and for States' CVIEWs. Field Systems is investigating a solution in which only "significant" changes will cause update records to be generated. An example of a "significant" change is a carrier moving into category A or B.

[NCM 2003-02-06] Closed - no longer applicable.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Stuart Mary W

Modified Time: 8/23/2004 12:00:29 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 9/6/2002 5:21:59 PM

Entered By: Stuart Mary W

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 2/6/2003 2:06:51 PM

CR Number: 704

External Reference: http://www.jhuapl.edu/cvisn/ Documents, White papers

Category: Update to Primary Identifiers White Paper

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The Recommendations for Primary Identifiers White Paper should be updated to incorporate the following changes:

1) Clarify that the Transponder Serial Number and the Manufacturer Identifier are hexadecimal values.

2) Update the Primary Carrier ID to delete the ID Type. The ID Type applies to the EDI interface and does not apply to the XML interface and so is not really part of the identifier itself.

3) Update the Primary Carrier ID to delete the terminal ID, because States do not use it; it will not be in the XML interface (CR 87)

4) Update the Primary Carrier ID to delete the State Code.

5) Update the section on International Carriers to state that each Mexican carrier that operates in the US is required to have a USDOT #.

6) Update the Recommended Implementation Approach section to state that SAFER/CVIEW do not support the State Specific Carrier ID.

7) Update the section on International Vehicles to reflect that Ontario is a member of IRP.

8) Add note to section on Impact on Information Systems for vehicle identifiers regarding future modification to SAFER to link IFTA accounts to vehicles through the VIN.

9) Add note to section on Transponder Identifiers regarding potential future use of transponders for container security.

10) Update section on Impact on Information Systems for Shipment Identifiers to state that "motor carriers that transport hazardous material must incorporate the Shipment Unique ID and data structures for HazMat shipments into their legacy systems.

11) Various editing changes to improve readability in tables.

12) Update frequently used slide Figure A Primary Identifiers - CVISN Level 1

13) Incorporate recommendations of SAFE Data Architecture. Specifically, add CVO Company Type to the Primary Carrier ID.

14) Update Driver Identifier to include the potential for biometric identification.

15) Update the information in the Vehicle Identifier section regarding Mexico and the IRP.

16) Update the information in the Trip Identifier section regarding ITDS and ACE.

17) Change "MCMIS" to "New MCMIS".

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: This CR incorporates CR 87.

CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include the impact of changing the identifers white paper

[NCM 2002-09-24]: Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. Item number 4 will be corrected to indicate that the State code is not part of the Primary Carrier ID. There was clarification on item number 6. The State Specific Carrier ID is not a key field by which the carrier can be searched/selected. It is not populated by SAFER, but it could be by a State's CVIEW.

[SBS 2002-1022]: Additional changes made (items 12- 17).

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description
Primary Identifiers White Paper
SCOPE Part 3
Primary Identifiers FUS

Fix: Published (or finalized):
Primary Identifiers White Paper - published and delivered via PL-02-0471, 2002-11-14
FUS - Primary Identifiers - updated in FUS directory 2002-11-15
CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Changes pending in following documents:
SCOPE Part 3 - not being maintained

Corrections made in following documents:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:56:53 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/5/2002 1:11:54 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:09:36 PM

CR Number: 688

External Reference:

Category: Changes to EDI State-SAFER interface in SAFER 4.2

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The following changes will occur to the EDI interface for exchanging data between States and SAFER, as a result of deploying SAFER 4.2.

1. IFTA
- The CVIEW 3.3 IFTA view requires an IFTA account to be associated with a carrier by providing a USDOT Number. Only one such association can be maintained. SAFER 4.2 does not require such an association, and, more than one IFTA account may be associated with a particular carrier. SAFER v4.2 will send, in the CVIEW 3.3 format, one and only one IFTA license record (where one exists) in each carrier snapshot.

2. IRP
- The CVIEW 3.3 IRP account view requires an IRP account to be associated with a carrier by providing a USDOT Number. Only one such association can be maintained. SAFER 4.2 does not require such an association, and, more than one IRP account may be associated with a particular carrier. SAFER v4.2 will send, in the CVIEW 3.3 format, one and only one IRP account record (where one exists) in each carrier snapshot.

- The IRP account "check flag" is obsolete and shall be replaced by a more comprehensive IRP status. The IRP vehicle "check flag" is obsolete and shall be replaced by a more comprehensive IRP vehicle status.

3. Electronic Screening

- While CVIEW 3.3 transactions recording each individual jurisdiction's acceptance of a carrier or vehicle will still be accepted by SAFER 4.2, only the base state's acceptance at the carrier level shall be recorded.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include the impact of SAFER 4.2 changes on EDI transactions.

[NCM 2002-09-24] Presented at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. No discussion.

[NCM 2003-02-10] Description text modified per RHG.

[2003-02-25 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:57:03 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 8/23/2002 10:41:35 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:09:05 PM

CR Number: 687

External Reference:

Category: Changes to SAFER to State trans. for E-Screening in SAFER 4.2

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The following requirements apply to the XML/FTP interface for SAFER to send escreening data to States in SAFER 4.2:

4. Electronic Screening Transactions

- The Transponder Id Transaction is supported. Refer to CR 683.
- The transponder id is sensitive information. It shall only be sent to jurisdictions authorized by the carrier to receive it.
- A carrier authorizes a jurisdiction to receive his vehicle's transponder ids through the Carrier Authorization transaction. - The transponder id may be sent to a jurisdiction if it has been authorized by any of a vehicle's registrant or safety carriers.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include support of XML/FTP interface for SAFER to send carrier and vehicle data to States. Refer to the SAFER 4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD) to be released in September 2002 for details.

[NCM 2002-09-24] Presented at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. No discussion.

[2003-02-20 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:57:12 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 8/23/2002 10:35:57 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:08:37 PM

CR Number: 686

External Reference:

Category: Changes to SAFER to State trans. for IRP in SAFER 4.2

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The following requirements apply to the XML/FTP interface for SAFER to send IRP data to States in SAFER 4.2:

3. IRP Transactions

These are the same as the input IRP Transactions, with the additional notes below. See CR 682.

The IRP Registration transaction shall consist of VIN, registration, and proration information structured within a file as follows:

Interface Header + IRP-Reg Transaction Header + { IRP-VIN + IRP-Reg + {IRP-Proration} }

- Since a vehicle can be registered simultaneously in more than one jurisdiction, several records with the same VIN and different license plates may exist in any particular file. However, only one license plate from any one jurisdiction may exist at a single time.
- It is recommended that the client's data store allow multiple IRP-Reg records to be stored per vehicle. If the license plate from a particular state already exists for a particular vehicle, the IRP-Reg and IRP-Proration information should be considered to be an update to that information and should not affect registrations from other states. If a license plate does not exist for the state, the IRP-Reg and IRP-Proration information should be inserted into the data store without affecting any other registrations for the same vehicle.

IRP REG
- This transaction can hold either interstate or intrastate information. The information in this transaction is designed for use with IRP, that is interstate, registrations. If used for intrastate registrations, the intrastate information used should be equivalent to the IRP information, but no checks or validations will be performed to ensure that this is the case. It is recommended that client systems do not retain intrastate vehicles from other jurisdictions in their data store.
- The base jurisdiction licensed gross vehicle weight and expiration date is redundant with the proration information. If this information exists in the record, then one of the associated proration records will have the same values for the base jurisdiction.

IRP PRORATION

- In the associated proration records, at least one proration, for the base state, shall be provided. In the case of an intrastate vehicle, one and only one proration, for the base state, shall be provided.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include support of XML/FTP interface for States to send IRP data to SAFER. Refer to the SAFER 4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD) to be released in September 2002 for details.

[NCM 2002-09-24] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting on 9/19/2002. It was clarified that the USDOT number will be optional for IRP and IFTA transactions using the XML interface.

[SBS 2002-10-09] The capability for handling multiple names and multiple addresses has been included in the SAFER 4.2 ICD.

[NCM 2003-01-20] CR 79 closed out because it is incorporated within this CR.

[2003-02-25 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:57:22 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 8/23/2002 10:33:15 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:08:19 PM

CR Number: 685

External Reference:

Category: Changes to SAFER to State trans. for IFTA in SAFER 4.2

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The following requirements apply to the XML/FTP interface for SAFER to send IFTA vehicle data to States in SAFER 4.2:

2. IFTA Transaction

This is the same as the input IFTA Transaction. See CR 681.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include support of XML/FTP interface for SAFER to send carrier and vehicle data to States. Refer to the SAFER 4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD) to be released in September 2002 for details.

[NCM 2002-09-24] Presented at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. No discussion.

[SBS 2002-10-09] The capability for handling multiple names and multiple addresses has been included in the SAFER 4.2 ICD.

[2003-02-25 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:57:32 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 8/23/2002 10:29:11 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:07:55 PM

CR Number: 684

External Reference:

Category: Changes to SAFER to State trans. for MCMIS and L&I in SAFER 4.2

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The following requirements apply to the XML/FTP interface for SAFER to send carrier and vehicle data to States in SAFER 4.2:

There will not be a concept of "full carrier" or "full vehicle" snapshot for XML transactions. Instead, there will be multiple transactions. These are:

Carrier Safety and Credential Transactions
IFTA Transaction
IRP Transactions
Electronic Screening Transactions

1. Carrier Safety and Credential Transactions
This category consists of two transaction types.
- The MCMIS Census and Safety transaction shall consist of the information defined in interface I-011, SAFER-MCMIS Update, of POR-99-7129, V1.0, Safety and Fitness Electronic Records (SAFER) System Interface Control Document, dated May 2001. Several minor changes, including the MCS 150 date, requested by FMCSA since the interface was defined will be incorporated.

- The Licensing and Insurance (L&I) transaction shall consist of the information defined in interface I-012, SAFER-L&I Update, of the SAFER System Interface Control Document, POR-99-7129, Baseline V1.0, June 2001. Several minor changes requested by FMCSA since the interface was defined (principally to support NAFTA) will be incorporated.

CRs 685-687 will address IFTA, IRP, and escreening SAFER to State transactions.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include support of XML/FTP interface for SAFER to send carrier and vehicle data to States. Refer to the SAFER 4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD) to be released in September 2002 for details.

[NCM 2002-09-24] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. It was clarified that inspection reports transactions will not be implemented in the XML interface for SAFER 4.2. If States would like this as a future capability, please submit a CR. A CR will be submitted by Wisconsin for a future version of SAFER to handle permit transactions in the XML interface. Prototype fields exist in the EDI interface, but it has never been used.

[SBS 2002-10-10] Vehicle inspection report summaries will be available as Output XML transactions in SAFER 4.2. Refer to CR 785

[2003-02-25 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment

names:	
Responsibility:	Salazar Sandra B
Modified Time:	11/24/2003 6:57:44 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	8/23/2002 10:27:51 AM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	11/5/2003 1:07:28 PM

CR Number:	683
External Reference:	
Category:	Changes to E-Screening transactions in SAFER 4.2
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	The following requirements apply to the XML/FTP interface for States to exchange E-Screening data with SAFER 4.2: The system shall support two transactions related to electronic screening (e-screening) enrollment, one that establishes the jurisdictions which are authorized by the carrier to receive transponder ids, and one to establish the transponder id for a particular vehicle. 1. Carrier Authorization - The carrier designated by the USDOT Number is the "e-screening" carrier. The e-screening carrier authorizes SAFER to send his vehicle's transponder ids to the given jurisdiction. A vehicle's transponder id may be sent to the given jurisdiction if its registrant or safety carrier is the e-screening carrier. - The authorizations in the transaction shall completely replace any existing authorizations previously established for that carrier. - The jurisdiction sending the transaction shall be considered the "base jurisdiction" for e-screening authorization. The base jurisdiction's authorization shall include the jurisdiction action and jurisdiction action date. In all other records the actions and dates shall be left NULL. At least one authorization, that for the "base jurisdiction," shall be provided. - The base jurisdiction should only send authorizations to SAFER when and if it approves of the carrier's participation in its e-screening program. If it does not approve it should not enroll the carrier. 2. Transponder ID - SAFER shall store no more than one transponder id for a particular vehicle. - The transponder id will replace any previously established transponder id for a given VIN. - The VIN is mandatory - The Transponder Id may be NULL to indicate that a transponder is no longer associated with a particular vehicle. - The transponder id is sensitive information. It shall only be sent to jurisdictions authorized by the carrier to receive it.

- A carrier authorizes a jurisdiction to receive his vehicle's transponder ids through the Carrier Authorization transaction. - The transponder id may be sent to a jurisdiction if it has been authorized by any of a vehicle's registrant or safety carriers.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: This CR incorporates CR 213.

CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include support of XML/FTP interface for States to send electronic screening enrollment data to SAFER. Refer to the SAFER 4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD) to be released in September 2002 for details.

[NCM 2002-09-24] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. In discussion about supporting only one transponder ID, it was noted that because PrePass doesn't provide account numbers to SAFER at this time there is no need for more than one transponder ID in SAFER 4.2. States may submit CRs for future SAFER 4.3.

[2003-02-25 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:57:53 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 8/23/2002 10:03:15 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:07:11 PM

CR Number: 682

External Reference:

Category: Changes to IRP transactions in SAFER 4.2

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The following requirements apply to the XML/FTP interface for States to exchange IRP data with SAFER 4.2:

SAFER shall support three types of transactions (snapshot views) related to IRP: IRP Account, IRP Fleet and IRP Registration.

1. IRP Account
- A particular Jurisdiction (State / Province) may associate no more than one carrier (USDOT Number) to an IRP account. Since it is possible that two or more separate jurisdictions may be maintaining separate IRP accounts for the same carrier, the same USDOT Number may exist for more than one IRP account.
- SAFER shall store no more than two names for a particular IRP account. The name in the transaction shall completely replace any existing name previously established for a given account.
- SAFER shall store no more than two addresses for each name. The address in the transaction shall completely replace any existing address previously established for the name.
- The IRP Account transaction may be combined with the IRP Fleet transaction

2. IRP Fleet
- Many fleets may exist for a particular IRP account number. Only one account may exist for a particular fleet.
- SAFER shall store no more than two names for a particular IRP Fleet. The name in the transaction shall completely replace any exiting name previously established for a given fleet.
- SAFER shall store no more than two addresses for each name. The address in the transaction shall completely replace any existing address previously established for the name.

3. IRP Registration
- In the transaction, there must be one and only one registration per VIN (i.e. per vehicle), but in SAFER there may be more than one registration per VIN since a vehicle can be registered simultaneously in more than one jurisdiction.
- The vehicle's transponder id shall not appear in this transaction. The transponder id shall only be available through the electronic screening enrollment transaction.
- This transaction can hold either interstate or intrastate information; there will be a field that indicates interstate or intrastate. The information in this transaction is primarily designed for use with IRP, that is, interstate registrations. If used for intrastate registrations, the intrastate information used must be analogous to the IRP information. In the case of intrastate vehicles, one and only one proration record, for the base jurisdiction, will exist.
- The base jurisdiction licensed gross vehicle weight and expiration date is redundant with the proration information. If this information exists, then one of the associated proration records will have the same values for the base jurisdiction.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include support of XML/FTP interface for States to send IRP data to SAFER. Refer to the SAFER 4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD) to be released in September 2002 for details.

[NCM 2002-09-24] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. It is still being considered whether multiple names and addresses for IFTA accounts will be implemented in SAFER 4.2. This capability will only be implemented if it does not impact the schedule.

[SBS 2002-10-09] The capability for handling multiple names and multiple addresses has

been included in the SAFER 4.2 ICD.

[NCM 2003-02-06] The text in the synopsis was updated per RHG.

[2003-02-25 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:58:02 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 8/23/2002 9:42:10 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:06:49 PM

CR Number: 681

External Reference:

Category: Changes to IFTA transactions in SAFER 4.2

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The following requirements apply to the XML/FTP interface for States to exchange IFTA data with SAFER 4.2:
- A particular Jurisdiction (State / Province) may establish no more than one carrier (USDOT Number) for an IFTA account. Since it is possible that two or more separate jurisdictions may be maintaining separate IFTA accounts for the same carrier, the same USDOT Number may exist for more than one IFTA account.
- SAFER shall store no more than two names for a particular IFTA account. The name in the transaction shall completely replace any existing name previously established for a given account.
- SAFER shall store no more than two addresses for each name. The address in the transaction shall completely replace any existing address previously established for a given name.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: CVISN Architecture documentation should be updated to include support of XML/FTP interface for States to send IFTA data to SAFER. Refer to the SAFER 4.2 Interface Control Document (ICD) to be released in September 2002 for details.

[NCM 2002-09-24] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 9/19/2002. No changes to CR, but it was noted that some States track IFTA accounts by FEIN and may have to change their business process to link to the USDOT number. It is still being considered whether multiple names and addresses for IFTA accounts will be implemented in SAFER 4.2. This capability will only be implemented if it does not impact the schedule.

[SBS 2002-10-09] The capability for handling multiple names and multiple addresses has been included in the SAFER 4.2 ICD.

[NCM 2003-02-06] The text in the synopsis was updated per RHG.

[2003-02-25 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 2/20/2003.

Documents affected:

COACH Part 4
CVISN System Design Description

Fix: COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:58:11 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 8/23/2002 9:38:49 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:06:24 PM

CR Number: 654

External Reference: Mike Miller

Category:

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: National ITS Architecture 4.0 shows no standard for "tax filing"

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed following publication of document

Description: In the National ITS Architecture Version 4.0, the architecture flow named "tax filing" is not mapped to any standard. EDI TS 813, Electronic Filing of Tax Return Data is available to carry fuel tax return information and should be shown.

We are using this mechanism to track this discrepancy. We will discuss the issue with our technical contact on the National ITS Architecture team (Mike Miller (703-367-5015 or michael.e.miller@lmco.com).

This CR should remain open until a resolution has been implemented either in the CVISN Architecture or in the National ITS Architecture.

[2002-10-18 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 10/17/02.

[2002-10-22 ncm] Below is from a 10/22/02 e-mail from Mike Miller (see Attachments]
Val and Nancy,
Here's the latest. We requested that JPL put this standard on their list so we could map it to the architecture. As of now, JPL doesn't plan on adding it because it's not one of the ITS standards being funded by the JPO (I guess that is the criteria for inclusion). I explained the situation to the Architecture team's standards people and they recognize it would be beneficial to include this standard. They fear that if they map one standard not tracked by JPL, do they open up pandora's box regarding other stakeholder areas wanting their standards mapped to the architecture.

The architecture team may develop criteria for including standards not tracked by JPL. This would give us some latitude to include additional standards, like EDI TS-813. I'll let you know when this issue has been resolved.
Michael E. Miller

[2003-10-17 ncm] Presented at 10/16/03 ACCB meeting.

[2003-03-04] Updated explanation included in document:
National ITS Architecture 4.0 showed no standard for "tax filing"
In the National ITS Architecture Version 4.0, the architecture flow named "tax filing" was not mapped to any standard. EDI TS 813, Electronic Filing of Tax Return Data, is available to carry fuel tax return information and should be shown. In Version 5.0 of the National ITS Architecture, "tax filing" is mapped to EDI TS 813, so Table 1 in the CVISN Architecture has been updated.

IMPACT SUMMARY --
ACCB Items
1. CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram
2. CVISN Architecture document

Fix: CVISN Architecture: published and delivered via PL-04-0133 (POR-02-7364), 1 April 2004.

Comment:

Attachment names: Mike Miller 2002-10-22.txt

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 4/5/2004 3:42:55 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 7/25/2002 2:35:34 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Low

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 4/5/2004 3:42:55 PM

CR Number: 607

External Reference:

Category: Remove WWW, EDI, DSRC interfaces diagram; improve CVIEW descript

Component: CVISN System Design Description

Synopsis: Remove the diagram showing the WWW, EDI, and DSRC standards interfaces between CVISN Architecture subsystems from the CVISN System Design Description. Add a more complete description of the functions of a state CVIEW.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: Description:
The following changes are proposed for the CVISN System Design Description:

1) Remove the diagram showing the WWW, EDI, and DSRC standards interfaces in the CVISN Architecture (slide 1 in the attachment). These three standards types are only a subset of those in use, and standards continue to change more quickly than the document is updated.

2) Add a description of CVIEW to complement the diagram shown in slide 2 of the attachment ("The State CVIEW handles the exchange of safety and credentials information within the state, and with other jurisdictions via SAFER). The proposed text is shown in slide 3 of the attachment.

[2003-01-17 ncm] Presented at ACCB meeting 1/16/2003.

Fix: CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names: CR 607 example slides.ppt

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:58:22 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 6/20/2002 2:18:28 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 5/23/2003 3:01:57 PM

CR Number: 604

External Reference: CR 0312

Category: Add Clearinghouse Connections to SAFER

Component: Interfaces

Synopsis: In the generic state CVISN System Design, the IRP and IFTA Clearinghouses connect only to the state IRP and IFTA products. Snapshot segments related to IRP and IFTA data are made by the state CVIEW based on inputs from the state IRP and IFTA products (or some other product, such as the Credentialing Interface).

We expect that some states will join the Clearinghouses before they implement other aspects of CVISN Level 1. The IRP and IFTA information needed for the snapshot segment updates is already part of the dataset that the Clearinghouses receive from the member states. So that the IRP and IFTA segments of snapshots from Clearinghouse member states without a CVIEW can be made available as quickly as possible, the proposed change establishes a connection between the IRP Clearinghouse and SAFER, and between the IFTA Clearinghouse and SAFER. The current scenarios for states with a CVIEW remain in effect; that is, states with a CVIEW may choose to provide IRP and IFTA snapshot segment updates to SAFER from their IRP and IFTA products through CVIEW. (VBB 10/6/1998)

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: Closed - disapproved. 11/27/2000 No states are currently supporting or requesting this approach. APL will update documents to remove the proposed links. The CRF will remain open until the documents have been updated.

Description: The proposed change impacts the IRP Clearinghouse, IFTA Clearinghouse, and SAFER. At the request of a state, the clearinghouse will send TS 285 segments to SAFER comparable to the segments that state would normally submit. SAFER will respond with 997 and 824. The clearinghouse will acknowledge the 824 with a 997. The attached figures illustrate the flow.

Impacts:
ACCB configuration identification - CVISN System Design Description, COACH

SAFER configuration items - ??

Clearinghouse configuration items - ??

Other: Training materials for Introduction to ITS/CVO and Understanding ITS/CVO Technology Applications courses; Guides; Workshop materials; Introduction to CVISN; other places where the affected slides are used

Note: States will choose one method for updating IRP snapshot segments, and one method for updating IFTA snapshot segments. The snapshot segments can either be provided by CVIEW to SAFER, or by the appropriate Clearinghouse to SAFER.

Estimated Cost:
ACCB changes are within existing budgets.
SAFER changes are scheduled and budgeted ??
Some funding exists for making these IRP Clearinghouse changes.
IFTA Clearinghouse changes are not planned; the concept is being evaluated.

Fix: No states are currently supporting or requesting this approach. APL will update documents to remove the proposed links. The CRF will remain open until the documents have been updated.

COACH Parts 1, 3, 4, System Design Description, Guide to Credentials Administration have been updated. COACH Part 5 has been updated(MWS July 2001).

Documents updated:
Guide to Safety Information Exchange: published and delivered via PL-02-0088 (POR-99-7191), 13 Jun 2002
System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
Guide to Credentials Administration (changes made; publication pending)
COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.
COACH Part 5: published and delivered via PL-01-0444 (POR-98-7126), 21 Sep 2001

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:58:43 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 6/18/2002 2:11:19 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:04:55 PM

CR Number: 439

External Reference: http://itsarch.iteris.com/itsarch/

Category:

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Discrepancy between CVISN and V4 Nat'l ITS Architectures

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed following publication of document.

Description: The National ITS Architecture recently released Version 4. The interfaces between subsystems have been redefined (e.g., Wireline, DSRC, Wide Area Wireless). In most cases, these changes were judged to have no effect on the intent of the CVISN Architecture and were implemented into CVISN documents.

There are 3 request/response pairs that do not fall into this category. In each of these pairs, the possibility of a DSRC connection between FMS and CVS Aggregate was dropped by the National ITS Architecture. The DSRC connections will be retained in the CVISN Architecture, but it is advisable to discuss the problem with the National ITS Architecture team.

The 3 data flow pairs are:
on-board safety request/on-board safety data
trip log request/trip log
on-board vehicle request/on-board vehicle data

[2003-10-17 ncm] Presented at 10/16/03 ACCB meeting.

[2004-03-04] Updated explanation per VBB:
Discrepancy between CVISN and V4 National ITS Architecture
In the following request/response pairs, the National ITS Architecture dropped the possibility of a DSRC connection between FMS and CVSAg in ITS Architecture Version 4.0. In Baseline V1.0 of the CVISN Architecture document, the DSRC connection option was retained. This was shown as "X?" in the Std column of Table 1 for these flows:
-+ on-board safety request/on-board safety data
-+ trip log request/trip log
-+ on-board vehicle request/on-board vehicle data
In Version 5.0 of the National ITS Architecture, the discrepancy was eliminated. Allowance was made for future standardization of the "trip log request", "trip log", "on-board vehicle request", and "on-board vehicle data" flows. The flow "trip identification number" was also added to the set that may be transmitted via either DSRC or wide area wireless, with an option for future standardization. Figure 2-1 and Table 1 of the CVISN Architecture Baseline Version 2.0 document have been updated to align with Version 5.0 of the National ITS Architecture.

ACCB Impact:
1. CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram
2. CVISN Architecture document

Fix: CVISN Architecture: published and delivered via PL-04-0133 (POR-02-7364), 1 April 2004.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 4/5/2004 3:42:16 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 4/19/2002 9:54:29 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 4/5/2004 3:42:16 PM

CR Number: 358

External Reference: http://itsarch.iteris.com/itsarch/

Category: Update documentation reflecting V4 of Nat'l ITS Architecture

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The National ITS Architecture team is releasing Version 4. There have been some changes to definitions and diagrams that are not related to our alignment efforts and have no effect on the intent of our documents.

The types of changes involved include:
* Definition wording
* Redefinition of line connectors
* Applicable standards

To stay current, these changes will be implemented in CVISN documents during the regular publication process.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: IMPACT SUMMARY --
ACCB Items --
CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram
CVISN System Design Description
CVISN Architecture document

Other Items --
Scope part 3

Frequently Used Slides --
Natl ITS Arch Sausage w CVO highlights.ppt
CVISN architecture connects subsystems.ppt
CVISN architecture - equipment packages.ppt

Fix: IMPACT SUMMARY --
ACCB Items --
CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram - done 20020618 ncm
CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
CVISN Architecture document - published and delivered via PL-02-0307 (POR-02-7364), 22 Aug 2002

Other Items --
Scope, part 3 - required changes noted in README, not maintained [20020618 ncm]

Frequently Used Slides --
Natl ITS Arch Sausage w CVO highlights.ppt - updated 3/15/02 NCM - done
CVISN architecture connects subsystems.ppt
CVISN architecture - equipment packages.ppt - updated 20020618 ncm - done

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/23/2003 7:31:36 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 3/15/2002 9:39:11 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 9/23/2003 7:31:36 AM

CR Number: 291

External Reference:

Category: What is States' Preferred Data Format for SAFER interface?

Component: CVISN Architecture

Synopsis: The CVISN architecture should reflect the States' preferred data exchange format for the State - SAFER carrier and vehicle snapshot data interface, whether that be flat file or XML.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: FMCSA approved - closed

Description: While both flat file and XML State - SAFER interfaces will be specified in the SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD), which will be available in September, 2002, only one interface type can be implemented in the timeframe needed to support states deploying CVISN Level 1 by September 30, 2003. It is important that all States, particularly those committed to achieving CVISN Level 1 by September 30, 2003, weigh in on which data format they would prefer (or whether they intend to use EDI). FMCSA will then decide which format shall be implemented to support deployment by 9/30/03.

Some notes from stakeholders:

The CSI CVIEW currently supports EDI. Both CA and MN will use EDI. WI has purchased the CSI source code and is modifying it. CSI is currently in discussion with a number of other States. CSI is committed to supporting whichever interface SAFER implements. CSI has also been approached by WA to provide support for States using xCVIEW and by APL to provide support to States using the FMCSA CVIEW.

ID and SD have signed agreements with WA to for xCVIEW. UT and AZ are currently using data from WA. A number of other states, including LA, NM, OK, and OR have expressed interest in xCVIEW. WA prefers an XML interface with SAFER.

MT and other states may use PreView. The ACS proposal to MT states that "Although ASCII and XML are the preferred data interchange formats, VISTA/CA - PreView can also accept and send data in ANSI X.12 transaction set formats."

NCM 2002-04-05: Presented at ACCB 4/4/2002
NCM 2002-04-05: Recommended for FMCSA approval by ACCB 4/4/2002
NCM 2003-02-06: FMCSA approved - closed

Fix: SBS 2002-03-29: As of 3/29/2002, States have voted 17-3 XML vs. flat file, with 6 states indicating preference to use EDI for 9/2003 deployment.

This information will be passed to the SAFER development team so that the XML interface from State systems to SAFER will be given priority over the flat file interface.

Comment:

Attachment Level1Matrix_VotesonDataFormat.xls

names:	States Comments on Question.doc
Responsibility:	Salazar Sandra B
Modified Time:	2/6/2003 2:21:37 PM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	2/21/2002 6:03:24 PM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	High
Priority:	No
Type:	Suggestion
Closed On:	2/6/2003 2:21:37 PM

CR Number:	215
External Reference:	
Category:	SAFER
Component:	CVISN Architecture
Synopsis:	Allow All States to Have All Transponder ID's
Status:	Closed Disapproved
Disposition:	[20020821] Disapproved and closed.
Description:	In order to simplify SAFER processing, it is desired to create one and only one subscription file per view, which will be accessible by any authorized user via FTP. Since the CVISN architecture allows carriers to designate a specific list of jurisdictions to which transponder id's may be sent and does not allow them to be sent to any other jurisdiction, such access cannot be granted for a file that contains all the currently registered transponder id's. We would like to change this policy so that a carrier may choose to send transponder id's to the central location, but not to designate individual recipients after doing so. In this way a SINGLE file containing transponder id's can be created, rather than multiple custom-tailored files for each recipient. SAFER will provide only a single file over the FTP server for all users of a particular subscription, rather than a seperate file created for each recipient specifically. Such a file would either have to contain all of the transponder id's avaiable or none. Putting them all in would mean violating the current CVISN transponder id privacy model, so transponder ids would not be put into the file at all. While this privacy model is in effect, the states that will exercise the "SAFER Option," which will be using the file, won't be able to obtain transponder ids from SAFER. A state that wants transponder ids would have to use the current SMTP / POP3 approach, since it currently supports the privacy model. SBS 2002-02-21: As FMCSA stated in the CVISN Level 1 Checklist: "The CVISN architecture does not address issues involving business interoperability." The SAFER software should not force any particular business model "to simplify SAFER processing".

Fix: [20020821] This is not in the SAFER 4.2 requirements. Disapproved and closed.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 8/23/2004 11:45:42 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 2/4/2002 2:15:48 PM

Entered By: Mick Alan A.

Severity: High

Priority: Yes

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 8/21/2002 11:18:36 AM

CR Number: 213

External Reference: Safer Options Working Group

Category: Transponder Registration

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Allow Multiple Transponder ID's per Vehicle

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: Closed - FMCSA disapproved.

Description: As a practical matter, the SOWG would like to be able to associate more than one transponder id to a vehicle, since this is actually the way trucks are operated today. However, the SAFER database only allows one transponder id per vehicle. This is consistent with the CVISN architecture, since standards to allow one transponder to perform multiple functions are being promulgated by it.

The question of multiple transponders per vehicle in the SAFER database should be discussed by the CVISN architecture group and a recommendation made.

NCM 2002-04-05: Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 4/4/2002. This CR addresses the possibility of two CVO transponders in a truck; toll transponder data would not be passed in SAFER snapshots. PrePass is not enrolling their transponders in CVISN. The meeting participants could not think of a scenario in which a carrier would be enrolling two escreening transponders for the same truck. However, such a situation may be known to other States who did not participate in this call, so an action item was taken to send an email to the ACCB membership. States will be requested to respond by April 19, 2002 as to whether they see the need for multiple transponder ids in the SAFER database and snapshots and, if they do see the need, to describe the scenario.

[2003-02-06 ncm] FMCSA disapproved.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:	States Responses to CR 213.doc State response summary.xls
Responsibility:	Mick Alan A.
Modified Time:	2/6/2003 2:05:26 PM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	2/1/2002 11:26:55 AM
Entered By:	Mick Alan A.
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	2/6/2003 2:05:26 PM

CR Number:	182
External Reference:	
Category:	Update documentation to reflect CVISN Level 1 Checklist
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	On August 8, 2001, at a working meeting with FMCSA and APL, FMCSA proposed changes to COACH Part 1 that resulted in nine ACCB Change Requests. One CR addresses various document-formatting concerns. The other eight CRs address changes to the State System Checklists in Chapter 4 of COACH Part 1. The new CVISN Level 1 Checklist incorporates all eight of the technical CRs, as well as many of the formatting changes addressed in the ninth CR. This CR requests that COACH Part 1 and other CVISN documents be updated to reflect the CVISN Level 1 Checklist. The original set of nine CRs will be closed with references to the new CR.
Status:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	Closed
Description:	The CRs that are incorporated into this CR are (old system number in parentheses): 84 (1786), 90 (1832), 91 (1833), 92 (1834), 93 (1835), 94 (1836), 95 (1837), 96 (1838), and 97 (1839). [2003-02-06 ncm per sbs] The Level 1 Checklist will be added as an Appendix to the COACH Part 1. ACCB Documents Affected: COACH, Part1, Chapter 4 State System Checklists CVISN System Design Description COACH Part 3 COACH Part 4 Other Documents Affected: Scope Workshop - not maintained
Fix:	ACCB Documents Affected: COACH, Part1, Chapter 4 State System Checklists - published and delivered via PL-03-0143, (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.

CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.
COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 6:59:07 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 1/21/2002 2:35:05 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 1:03:55 PM

CR Number: 158

External Reference: KY Wray Williams

Category: "Baseline" SAFER snapshot

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: KY would like a capability to obtain SAFER snapshot data for a specific time interval or for the entire SAFER database.For example, KY would like the capability to obtain all of the Motor Carrier insurance data from the SAFER data base to bring the KY CVIEW up to date. A request might be a set up as a special selection of SAFER data that would result in creating the same type of transactions a subscription would create. This request might be used to bring a CVIEW up to date as well as to recreate a set of subscription transactions for a time period where there might have been a local CVIEW problem.

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2003-10-17] Disapproved

Description: Salazar: Suggest that this be added to SAFER version 4 requirements.

Two options are requested:

1. The ability to go "back in time" and catch up (assume this would be based on a time stamp).
2. The ability to deliver an update to a customer. If, for example, a state had system problems last period, the state could request a "two period" update. The state should still be able to get that via e-mail. But another media (FTP, etc.) would be an acceptable option.

The attachments to this CR contain more detailed suggestions from MI, MN, and APL on options for addressing this requirement.

[2003-10-17 ncm] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2003-10-16. The affected (EDI) states will implement work-arounds for baseline snapshots. The three EDI states and six of the seven XML states that responded to the email query indicated that time-interval snapshots were not needed.

Fix: Responses were requested by January 31, 2002. Michigan and CSI, representing several states including MN, replied that this capability is required.

Comment:

Attachment names: ACCB CR 158 - Baseline SAFER Snapshot.htm
RE ACCB CR 158 - Baseline SAFER Snapshot.htm
RE ACCB CR 158 - Baseline SAFER Snapshot_Giuffre.txt
RE ACCB CR 158 - Baseline SAFER Snapshot_Giuffre_01.txt
RE ACCB CR 158 - Baseline SAFER Snapshot_Walton.txt

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 10/17/2003 11:18:31 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 1/9/2002 3:21:15 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 10/17/2003 11:18:31 AM

CR Number: 103

External Reference: CR 2031

Category: Align with National ITS Arch Maintenance & Construction Ops

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Version 4.0 of the National ITS Architecture will support a new Maintenance and Construction Operations (MCO) User Service. As a result of the analysis associated with adding the new service, two changes to the segments of the architecture that are aligned with the CVISN architecture are recommended:

1. Add a new Architecture Flow that makes "asset restriction" information available to the Commercial Vehicle Administration Subsystem:

(new) Maintenance and Construction Management Subsystem => current asset restrictions => (existing) Commercial Vehicle Administration Subsystem

Proposed flow definition for "current asset restrictions" - Restrictions levied on transportation asset usage based on infrastructure design, surveys, tests, or analyses. This includes standard facility design height, width, and weight restrictions, special restrictions such as spring weight restrictions, and temporary facility restrictions that are imposed during maintenance and construction.

2. Replace an Architecture Flow to make a richer set of information available to the fleet and freight management subsystem including road weather information and work zone

information:
Before: Information Service Provider (ISP) => traffic advisories => Fleet and Freight Management Subsystem (FMS)
After: ISP => road network conditions => FMS

Definition for "road network conditions" - Current and forecasted traffic information, road and weather conditions, incident information, road restrictions, and pricing data. Either raw data, processed data, or some combination of both may be provided by this architecture flow.

Note: "road network conditions" is an existing architecture flow that is used on several different interfaces in the draft V4.0 architecture (e.g., Traffic Management Subsystem=>road network conditions=>ISP). This flow includes a broad set of highway-travel related information, which is very close to what we want to make available to FMS. It might be even better to choose a different flow name to reflect the fact that the ISP might do some processing/tailoring on the information that it makes available to the FMS (e.g., "traveler information for fleet management" or similar. Send your suggestions.

Submitted by Val Barnes 11/21/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: The proposed changes are recommended for approval. The new MCMS-to-CVAS current asset restrictions architecture flow will provide for improved support of permitting operations based on current roadway restrictions. The replacement architecture flow, road network conditions, from ISP-to-FMS is a richer set of data reflecting the sort of information that FMS users need. Even if the data are tailored for FMS use, the proposed road network conditions flow should be sufficient.

During the discussions about these proposed changes, we also raised the question of additional connections to the Commercial Vehicle Check Subsystem (CVCS) to account for changes in traffic management due to maintenance and construction activities. The National ITS Architecture team prefers to address that question in a subsequent update, since the discussion should involve a broader audience and the deadline for freezing changes for V4.0 is drawing near.

Impact Summary:
ACCB Items --
CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram
CVISN Architecture document
(memo dated December 2001)
CVISN System Design Description

Other Items --
SCOPE workshop

Frequently Used Slides --
CVISN Arch Flow.ppt
CVISN Architecture - equipment packages.ppt
CVISN Architecture connects subsystems.ppt
Natl ITS Arch Sausage w CVO highlights.ppt

Recommended for FMCSA approval, November 29, 2001.
Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Fix: Impact Summary:
ACCB Items --

CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram - published and delivered via PL-02-0307 (POR-02-7364), 2002-0822
CVISN Architecture document - published and delivered via PL-02-0307 (POR-02-7364), 2002-0822
CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
Other Items --
SCOPE workshop - pending
Frequently Used Slides --
CVISN Arch Flow.ppt - done [20020618 ncm]
CVISN Architecture - equipment packages.ppt - updated 20020618 ncm
CVISN Architecture connects subsystems.ppt (see CR 607 - 20030108 ncm)
Natl ITS Arch Sausage w CVO highlights.ppt - updated 3/15/02 NCM

Comment:

Attachment names: Maintenance and Construction and CVISNIBC.htm

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/23/2003 7:33:22 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:26:30 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 9/23/2003 7:33:22 AM

CR Number: 102

External Reference: CR 2014

Category: Are periodic subscriptions a required capability for SAFER/CVISN

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: SAFER and CVIEW incorporate the capability to generate subscriptions on a periodic basis (WEEKLY, MONTHLY, QUARTERLY, YEARLY, etc.) This capability is not currently used in either SAFER or in any FMCSA CVIEW.

Are periodic subscriptions a required capability for SAFER & CVIEW ?

Submitted by: Robert Goldfarb 11/9/2001

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: The CR is thereby disapproved and closed on February 1, 2002.

Description: Goldfarb 11/29/01 -

Background:

In Safer v3, subscription data is generated and sent to the subscriber by safer/cview either:

1 - at the time the system's db is updated (Update Time). This is called an "Immediate" subscription. This is the manner used for all Vehicle subscriptions.

2 - at a 24 hour interval - but only if the system's db had been updated within the last 24 hours. This is the current mechanism used for carrier data. Currently, carrier data is received and processed only once a week (ie., from mcmis). Thus, all carrier subscription data is generated at that interval (even though the software checks every 24 hours to see if subscription data is available).

The SAFER/CVIEW design allows for subscriptions to be GENERATED at longer intervals so that users would not have to connect and download their subscriptions as frequently as the system's data base was being updated. Thus, for a MONTHLY subscription, all data processed within the prior month (regardless of the interval of the updates) would be sent to the subscriber once a month in a single file. For mcmis carrier data (for example) the user would download one file each month - containing a full months worth of data - rather than 4 files - each containing a week's work of mcmis carrier data.

As seen from the example, the PERIODIC subscription is not necessary. It just simplifies the download process for user's not wishing to connect at as frequent an interval. For these users, timeliness is not critical. They might be insurers or others interested in doing periodic research, etc. Instead of having to download 4 files each month - each having a week's carrier data (for example) - a subscriber requesting a MONTHLY subscription would connect once and download a single (larger) file containing the entire months data.

Analysis:

CVIEW: Periodic subscriptions have not been tested and at this time there are no plans for this capability to be in "production" in FMCSA Cview v3.3

SAFER: this capability could be incorporated at version 4 or later

Presented at ACCB 11/29/2001
Salazar sent email to states on 12/17/2001; mentioned on state teleconferences 12/18/2001. Responses due 1/11/2002.

Fix: States were asked to reply by January 11, 2002. MD, KY, SC, SD, NV, and KS responded that they did not require this capability. No states replied that they did need it.

The CR is thereby disapproved and closed on February 1, 2002.

Comment:

Attachment names: CR 2014 email.doc
Kansas RE Periodic Subscriptions.txt
MD RE Periodic Subscriptions in SAFERCVIEW.txt
Periodic Subscriptions in SAFERCVIEW.htm
KY RE Periodic Subscriptions in SAFERCVIEW.txt

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 2/1/2002 2:21:07 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:25:09 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 2/1/2002 2:21:07 PM

CR Number: 101

External Reference: CR 2000

Category: Update documents regarding TS 284 not supported in Fed systems

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Related to CR 1849 which was disapproved on 10/25/01. Instead of removing the TS 284 from the CVISN architecture, keep it in the documentation but add a note saying it is not supported by Federal Safety systems such as SAFER and Safetynet. This CR calls for the update of all the CVISN documents that contain references to TS 284.

Submitted by Stuart 10/25/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Description: CVISN documents affected:

CVISN Guide to Top Level Design
CVISN System Design Description
Introductory Guide to CVISN
CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange
Workshop materials
Snapshot White Paper
Test Suite Part 3
COACH Part 4
CVISN, National ITS Architecture, IBC Architecture Alignment document
(Look for others)

Recommended for FMCSA approval, November 29, 2001.
Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Fix: 1-CVISN System Design Descrip: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
2-Snapshot White Paper: 12/01 - this document is not going to be maintained.
3-Architecture Alignment Document: published and delivered via PL-01-0650 (POR-02-7349), 25 March 2002 (20020108 ncm)
4-Guide to Safety Information Exchange: published and delivered via PL-02-0088 (POR-99-7191), 13 June 2002 (20020617 ncm)
5-COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Other docs no longer maintained.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time:	11/24/2003 6:59:35 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	12/17/2001 3:23:58 PM
Entered By:	Greenwald Beverly E
Severity:	High
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	11/5/2003 1:03:01 PM

CR Number:	100
External Reference:	CR 1984
Category:	IBC/CVISN/National ITS Architecture alignment
Component:	CVISN Architecture and Standards
Synopsis:	In June 2001, The CVISN Architecture, the IBC architecture and the National Architecture teams agreed to align the three architectures. The alignment involved making the terminators, subsystems and architecture flows consistent. Submitted by: Clyde 10/18/2001
Status:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001
Description:	Members of all three architecture teams have worked together on the alignment process. A synopsis of the changes proposed for the CVISN architecture follows: 1. Added the Trade Regulatory agencies terminator. 2. Added the Intermodel freight/shipper terminator. 3. Revised definitions for Fleet and freight management Subsystem and Other CVAS Terminator. 4. Deleted the following flows: a. Customs & Immigr Info Request flow. b. Deleted Lock Message Set Flow c. Deleted CV Border Clearance Message Set Flow d. Deleted International Border crossing data 5. Added the following flows: a. border agency clearance results b. border clearance status c. border clearance data d. border clearance data request

e. border clearance event
f. declaration information
g. domestic transportation information
h. electronic lock data
i. electronic lock data request
j. transportation border clearance assessment
k. trip declaration identifiers
l. trip identification number

6. Modified the definition for safety status information

The CVISN Architecture Flow diagram is a configuration item under the ACCB. The arch alignment document produced as part of CRF 1760 will be updated with the revised information.

Impact Summary:
ACCB Items --
CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram
The arch alignment document produced as part of CRF 1760 will be updated with the revised
information.
CVISN System Design Description

Other Items --
SCOPE workshop

Frequently Used Slides Affected:
CVISN Arch Flow.ppt
CVISN Architecture - equipment packages.ppt
CVISN Architecture connects subsystems.ppt

Recommended by ACCB 11/29/2001
Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001.

Fix: Comments received during the review cycle were incorporated into the document. The final document is PL-01-0650/POR-02-7349.

IMPACTED ITEMS:
CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram - published and delivered via PL-01-0650 (POR-02-7349),
25 March 2002
"CVISN, IBC and National ITS Architecture Alignment" - published via PL-01-0650 (POR-02-7349), 25 March 2002
CVISN Arch Flow.ppt - updated
CVISN Architecture - equipment packages.ppt - updated 3/14/02 ncm
CVISN Architecture connects subsystems.ppt - updated 3/14/02 ncm
CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

SCOPE workshop - no longer maintained

Comment:

Attachment names: CVISN Arch Flow R1.ppt

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified 11/24/2003 6:59:48 AM

Time:
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:22:41 PM
Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E
Severity: High
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On: 10/10/2003 12:55:54 PM

CR Number: 99
External Reference: CR 1983
Category: Remove View Versions no longer used for SAFER/CVIEW/ROC
Component: Database
Synopsis: After talking with Ron Glaser and sending out a few emails, I would like to propose that we remove/delete the following views/view versions from the database:
Q103, view version 2, Carrier SAFEVUE
Q103, view version 3, Carrier SAFEVUE
Q103, view version 4, Carrier SAFEVUE
Q105, view version 1, Full Carrier
Q108, view version 2, Carrier ROC
Q108, view version 3, Carrier ROC
Q108, view version 4, Carrier ROC
Q110, view version 4, Carrier ISS
Q301, view version 2, Vehicle ROC
Q301, view version 4, Vehicle ROC

submitted by: Jim Polaha 10/18/2001
Status: Closed Fixed
Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001
Description: From DJ Waddell, Sent on Wed 10/31/2001 3:14 PM:
After the proposed deletions, would ROC and CVIEW still be able to get the data they need in the formats they expect? Would LSIs and CVIEW still be able to update snapshots appropriately?

Jim Polaha, Nov. 5, 2001:
- All the views mentioned are OUTPUT only views, they are NOT Input or Update views.
- Eric King verified that the views in question are not being used (no one has subscriptions for them) on VOLPE SAFER.

Q103, view version 2, Carrier SAFEVUE
Q103, view version 3, Carrier SAFEVUE
Q103, view version 4, Carrier SAFEVUE
These are not used, and there are no SAFEVUEs in existence.

Q105, view version 1, Full Carrier
This view is not longer used/needed.

Q108, view version 2, Carrier ROC
Q108, view version 3, Carrier ROC
Q108, view version 4, Carrier ROC
The ROC does not use this view, it uses FULL CARRIER views.

Q110, view version 4, Carrier ISS
This view is no longer used/needed.

Q301, view version 2, Vehicle ROC
Q301, view version 4, Vehicle ROC
These are not used by ROC Version 4 in the field.

ROC Version 4 (4, 4.0, 4.1, whatever it will be called) does/will work with the views that will remain. ROC Version 4 does not need/use the views that are going to be deleted. I spoke with Eric and Wendy about this and they both agreed.

The remaining views that are "ROC" related are:
Q105, View Version 2, Full Carrier - O
Q105, View Version 3, Full Carrier - O
Q105, View Version 4, Full Carrier - O
Q301, View Version 3, Vehicle ROC - O

From an email from Eric to Sandy, Sent on Wed 11/7/2001 10:15 AM:
OpCon:
OpCon looks into the database to determine which views & versions are available for use. Deleting them from the database will automatically remove them from OpCon.
The OpCon.oce file, which contains the available "event fields", must be modified by removing the Carrier ROC selection. This can be incorporated into the OpCon v3 release.
Note that there is no SafeVUE selection - there never was.

SCAPI32:
The code must be modified to disallow Carrier ROC transactions (such as queries) and Carrier SafeVUE transactions.
The SCAPI32 documentation must be modified.

In summary, relatively minor modifications must be made as indicated above. About 1 day of effort.

From Eric King, 30 Nov 2001:
The following should also be accomplished in concert with the aforementioned database data modifications:

The SAFERViews.txt file should be similarly modified (by removing the SAFEVue references):
: Q103 MC 2 SAFEVue view
: Q103 MC 3 SAFEVue view
etc.

ACCB Documents Affected:
Snapshot White Paper (SAFER View Summary Report)

Recommended for FMCSA approval, November 29, 2001.
Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Greenwald Beverly E
Modified Time:	11/24/2003 6:59:59 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	12/17/2001 3:21:17 PM
Entered By:	Greenwald Beverly E
Severity:	High
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	8/21/2002 10:47:10 AM

CR Number:	98
External Reference:	CR 1842
Category:	Update the State diagram in the CVISN System Design Description
Component:	CVISN System Design Description
Synopsis:	Update the Interfaces Within the State diagram in the CVISN System Design Description. Submitted by: Salazar 8/14/2001
Status:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001
Description:	On the diagram in section 4 of the CVISN System Design Description, "In CVISN Level 1, Interfaces Within the State support enhanced exchange of safety and IRP & IFTA credentials information.", add dashed lines indicating custom interface agreements wherever there are EDI interfaces. This is because states are not restricted to using EDI for interfaces between systems within the state. This change also affects workshop material. Impact Summary [2003-02-03 ncm] ACCB Items: System Design Description COACH 4 Other Items: Workshop materials (no longer being maintained) Frequently Used Slides: Core Capabilities - within State.ppt
Fix:	CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003. COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Core Capabilities - within State.ppt - done

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:00:10 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:19:58 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 12:56:15 PM

CR Number: 97

External Reference: CR 1839

Category: Add use of credentials and safety data to e-screening reqts.

Component: COACH Part 1, V2

Synopsis: The L1 requirements related to e-screening do not explicitly include using credentials and safety data. It is generally understood that e-screening should be based on an evaluation of credentials and safety data, but the criteria are not explicitly stated.

Submitted by Jeff Secrist 8/8/2001.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: Update COACH Part 1, table 4.4-2, State Electronic Screening Systems Design Requirements Checklist, item 4.4.4 by adding 2 new L1 sub-items:
- Use safety data from snapshots and other sources
- Use credentials data from snapshots and other sources

ACCB Impacts:
COACH Parts 1, 3

Fix: COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:00:22 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:18:57 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/23/2003 7:12:19 AM

CR Number: 96

External Reference: CR 1838

Category: Remove item 4.4.3 re interoperability policies from table 4.4-2

Component: COACH Part 1, V2

Synopsis: COACH Part 1, table 4.4-2 State Electronic Screening System Design Requirements, item 4.4.3 says to implement interoperability policies as they are developed by a wide variety of groups. Is this a necessary item in the table?

Submitted by: Jeff Loftus 8/8/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: The referenced item was intended to remind states to keep up with e-screening interoperability policies as they evolve. Now the interoperability guiding principles (included in chapter 2 of the COACH Part 1) capture most of the agreed-to policy ideas. This item is no longer useful in chapter 4 of the COACH Part 1 and should be deleted.

ACCB Impacts:
COACH Parts 1, 3

Fix: COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:00:31 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:18:00 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/23/2003 7:11:44 AM

CR Number: 95

External Reference: CR 1837

Category: Update DSRC "sandwich" spec guidance

Component: COACH Part 1, V2

Synopsis: The rulemaking for the DSRC "sandwich" specification is taking longer than expected.

Submitted by Val Barnes 8/8/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: The technical documents should be updated to reflect that the sandwich specification is planned for future use as of an unspecified date, and that current guidance for DSRC is to use the existing technology.

Documents affected:
- COACH Part 1 - In section 4.4, the requirements related to the DSRC equipment were updated to reflect the uncertainty of action on the rulemaking for the sandwich specification. The language was simplified and clarified.
- COACH Part 3

Fix: COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:00:46 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:17:01 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/23/2003 7:10:57 AM

CR Number: 94

External Reference: CR 1836

Category: Eliminate confusing "L1;E" Req Level in COACH Part 1

Component: COACH Part 1, V2

Synopsis: Showing L1 and E for some items in the COACH Part 1, Chapter 4, State Systems Checklists, is confusing. Clarify what is really a Level 1 item and what is an Enhanced item.

Submitted by Elyse Turkeltaub 8/8/2001.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: The "L1;E" items are those related to credentialing interfaces - Web-based (person-to-computer) or computer-to-computer. The FMCSA policy states that States should implement either a Web-based OR a computer-to-computer interface as part of their Level 1 activities, and do the other implementation as an Enhanced activity. The introductory paragraphs should explain that, and the tables should show all such requirements as L1.

ACCB Impacts:
COACH Part 1
COACH Part 3

Fix: COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:00:55 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:15:59 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/23/2003 7:09:21 AM

CR Number: 93

External Reference: CR 1835

Category: Clarify COACH Part 1

Component: COACH Part 1, V2

Synopsis: Many items in the COACH Part 1 are not clear to new readers and should be clarified.

Submitted by: Elyse Turkeltaub 8/8/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: Changes to the structure and wording are recommended to simplify the text and increase readability.
- Acronyms were expanded at first use;
- Table titles are shown on each page of the table;
- References to tables were made consistent
- Appendices A and B were created for change management tracking;
- References to CRs applied to previous versions of this document were removed from the text and tables;
- Any comments in the Comments column of the tables were moved into the Compatibility Criteria column; the Comments column is now reserved for state use.

ACCB Impacts:
COACH Part 1
COACH Part 3

Fix: COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:01:02 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:14:57 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/23/2003 7:08:46 AM

CR Number: 92

External Reference: CR 1834

Category: Replace date columns in COACH Part 1 Ch 4 with Verification col.

Component: COACH Part 1, V2

Synopsis: Op Test Date, IOC Date, and FOC Date columns in the COACH Part 1, Chapter 4, State Systems Checklists are not used and take up space. Replace with one column that explains how each of the requirements in those checklists is verified - through interoperability testing, less-formal demonstration, or inspection.

Submitted by: Elyse Turkeltaub 8/8/2001

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: The three date columns in chapter 4 of the COACH Part 1 were intended to be used for planning and tracking by the owner of a particular copy of the COACH Part 1. In

practice, they are not used. Therefore, it would be more useful to replace those columns with guidance about how each design requirement should be verified.

Fix: COACH, Part1 published and delivered via SSD/PL-003-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:01:10 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:13:55 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/10/2003 1:00:05 PM

CR Number: 91

External Reference: CR 1833

Category: Intrastate data exchange within state is Level 1

Component: COACH Part 1, V2

Synopsis: The definition of CVISN Level 1 is inconsistent about whether intrastate data exchange within the state is part of Level 1 or not. Intrastate data exchange within the state should be part of CVISN Level 1.

Submitted by Jeff Loftus 8/8/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: Update the COACH Part 1, table 4.1-2, General State Systems Design Requirements Checklist, item 4.1.5, sub-items 3 and 4 from E to L1:
4.1.5 Exchange safety and credentials data electronically within the state to support credentialing, safety, and other roadside functions. Where useful, exchange snapshots.
3 Data for intrastate carriers L1
4 Data for intrastate vehicles L1

Other ACCB impacts:
Coach Part 3

Fix: COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:01:19 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:12:51 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/23/2003 7:08:01 AM

CR Number: 90

External Reference: CR 1832

Category: Clarify Level 1 summary slide

Component: COACH Part 1, V2

Synopsis: The one-page viewgraph summary definition of CVISN Level 1 should be clarified to answer many frequently-asked questions.

Submitted by: Stuart 8/8/2001

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: The CVISN Level 1 summary viewgraph as well as the summary table used in the CVISN documents should be clarified to indicate ASPEN to SAFER data flow via direct and indirect paths;use of SAFER option as alternative to CVIEW; use of Web-based credential solutions; updating SAFER and CVIEW with credential data; and use of snapshots in the e-screening process.

ACCB Documents Affected:
COACH, Part1, Chapter 4 State System Checklists
CVISN System Design Description
Other Documents Affected:
Scope Workshop
E-screening Guide [2003-01-08 ncm]
Frequently Used Slides:
DSRC in Electronic Screening [2003-01-08 ncm]

Fix: The new top level slide is found in \\ssdapps2\pvo\Reference Communications\Freq Used Slides_CONTROLLED Slides, filename "Definition of CVISN Level 1 Deployment.ppt".
The attachment to this CR contains both the original and proposed new slide. The changes are highlighted in bold, red, italic font in the proposed slide.

ACCB Documents Affected:
COACH, Part1, Chapter 4 State System Checklists - published and delivered via SSD/PL-003-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.

Other Documents Affected:
Scope Workshop - not maintained
E-screening Guide - not maintained
Frequently Used Slides:
DSRC in Electronic Screening - done 2003-01-08

Comment:

Attachment names: Definition of CVISN Level 1 Deployment.ppt

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:01:28 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:11:34 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/10/2003 12:58:52 PM

CR Number: 89

External Reference: CR 1829

Category: Make SNET 2K View "Private"

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: The definition of the carrier SNET view (Q101) is currently included in CVISN documentation. This view is used only by SAFER in communicating to SAFETYNET 2000. By including it in the CVISN architecture definitions of views, programs other than SAFETYNET 2000 might utilize it. If so, when SAFETYNET requirements change, those programs other than SNET 2K utilizing the view might experience difficulties. For this reason, the view should be removed from the generally available list or be clearly marked "for use by SNET 2K only."

Submitted by: Mick 8/8/2001

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Description: Documentation on views will clearly state which views are proprietary and who owns the view. In particular, the SAFER View Summary Report (successor to the Snapshot White Paper) will clearly indicate that Q101 is a proprietary view owned by SAFETYNET 2000.

If the view_description for Q101 is changed to "Carrier SNET (SNET Proprietary)", it will appear in both OPCON and the "SAFER View Summary Report".

Documents affected:
SAFER View Summary Report.

Recommended by ACCB: 9/20/2001
Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Fix: rcg - star date 20020123
Added" (SNet Proprietary)" to view_description field for the Q101 views.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:01:41 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:10:01 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 8/21/2002 10:45:00 AM

CR Number: 88

External Reference: CR 1828

Category: Miscellaneous View Changes to Correct Minor Problems

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Field 62 (SHIPPER_INTERSTATE) was added to the Carrier Snet view Q101 (v3 and v4) in the DOT30 database. See CRF 1815.

Field 0 (VIN) has been made not updateable in the Vehicle Insp view Q302 (v3 only). See CRF 1684.

CRF 1821 requests adding field 17 (LICENSE_PLATE_STATE) to the Vehicle Insp view Q302 (v2 and 3). These view versions were created when the search key was LICENSE_PLATE_NUMBER+IRP_BASE_STATE. The search key is now LICENSE_PLATE_NUMBER+LICENSE_PLATE_STATE so the missing field should be added.

submitted by: Mick 8/8/2001

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Description: Shipper Interstate was added to correct a problem with the field called "Shipper Interstate HazMat." MCMIS is populating Shipper Interstate, but not Shipper Interstate HazMat.

The VIN has been made "not updatable" to prevent the VIN numbers in SAFER 2.0 from becoming corrupted by errant inspection report data. Inspection report data generally does not contain a full 17 character VIN. If the field is updatable a vehicle established through an IRP update, with a full 17 character VIN, will have the VIN set to an incorrect value if the vehicle is inspected and the inspector does not use the full 17

characters.

The "License Plate State" is an artificial field created to provide functionality requested by MD. It is not really a field in the snapshot. It has to be included in the internal definition of the snapshot to make sure the functionality works correctly, but does not affect the "official" definition of the snapshot, which does not (and cannot) contain this field.

Documents affected:
SAFER View Summary Report.

Recommended by ACCB: 9/20/2001
Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Fix: These changes were accomplished under the CRF's indicated in the request. Alan Mick 12/7/2001

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:01:52 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:08:54 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 8/21/2002 10:44:38 AM

CR Number: 87

External Reference: CR 1824

Category: Primary Carrier ID recommendation needs to be reviewed

Component: Documentation

Synopsis: The CVISN recommendation for Primary Carrier ID needs to be reviewed and perhaps revised.

Submitted by Salazar 8/2/2001

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: Closed - This CR has been incorporated into CR 704. While some States are using state specific carrier identifiers, only one State has voiced a need at this time to have SAFER support. States should be kept aware that if they do have a need for SAFER to support state-specific carrier identifiers, they must express this to FMCSA and the ACCB. In future updates of architecture documentation, it should be noted that this capability is not supported by SAFER.

Description: Several States were consulted regarding some of the primary identifier issues, which include the need to carry both USDOT number and state-specific identifier, need for

terminal ID component, need for issuing authority component.

An email message was sent to all CVISN deployment States explaining the issues and requesting comments.

During discussion of this CR at the ACCB meeting of August 9, 2001, several participating states expressed the need for the capability to update and retrieve data from SAFER by jurisdiction-specific Carrier ID. CR 1851 has been submitted. During subsequent discussion at the ACCB meeting of September 20, 2001 and the CVISN Program Manager-s meeting on October 5, 2001, a few States voiced a need for state-specific carrier ID within the state and supported by the State-s CVIEW, but only one expressed a need for SAFER support.

At this time, no changes will be made to the Primary Carrier ID recommendation. States will be informed at the Workshops that if they do have a need for SAFER to support state-specific carrier identifiers, they must express this to FMCSA and the ACCB. In future updates of architecture documentation, it should be noted that this capability is not supported by SAFER.

Documents affected:
CVISN Recommendations for Primary Identifiers White Paper
Snapshot White Paper
COACH
Workshop Materials

Discussed at ACCB 9/20/2001

Fix: This CR has been incorporated into CR 704.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:02:52 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:01:20 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/15/2002 3:16:23 PM

CR Number: 86

External Reference: CR 1809

Category: NAFTA Additions to SAFER Snapshot

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: FMCSA is identifying fields that need to be added to MCMIS, SAFETYNET, SAFER website to support NAFTA. Need to determine whether these changes impact CVISN

architecture, specifically the SAFER snapshots.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed by ACCB 4/4/2002.

Description: FYI - In our NAFTA discussions so far, we've determined that there are several pieces of information that will need to be added to our Census:

1. OP-1(MX) - Mexican carriers operating anywhere in U.S.
versus
OP-2 - Mexican carriers operating only in the U.S. commercial zone

2. MC or MX (for type of ICC number issued)

3. Revocation Indicator and Date

4. Tracking Number (for coordination between L&I and MCMIS databases)

(Phyllis/Vera - If you've come up with a specs for these new fields, would you respond to everyone on this message with those? Also, let me know if I've omitted anything.)

We will need to coordinate on getting these new fields into all the appropriate systems, which will likely include SAFETYNET, SAFER snapshot, etc. I'll try to set up a meeting next week.

Further Information from Pat, Sent 8/10/2001:

Just a heads- up...We've finally narrowed down the list of data items that will need to be added to the SAFER web site. In order to make this as painless as possible to you, we've decided to have the data transfer come from the L&I database. We would just add the new items to the existing records that L&I passes to you.

Here's our initial list of items:

Mexican carrier RFC identification number
Canadian carrier identification number
Revocation/ Suspension Indicator
Revocation/Suspension Date

We don't have the specifics on the lengths of these fields, the values, etc. I'll get those to you as soon as they're defined.

Submitted by Pat Savage 7/12/2001.

This request has been placed in the NAFTA requirements document and scheduled for implementation. Alan Mick: The change has resulted in several SAFER CRF's, a requirements document and has been scheduled. 12/10/01

Analysis needs to be completed with final list of new fields.

Documents affected:
SAFER View Summary Report

Presented to ACCB

NCM 2002-04-05: The changes have no impact on any of the snapshot views.

Modifications, however, were made to the SAFER database. As a result, new fields will show up in the SAFER/CVIEW 3.3 database and data dictionary.

Closed by ACCB 4/4/2002.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 6/4/2002 2:35:40 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 12/17/2001 3:00:05 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 4/8/2002 6:28:46 PM

CR Number: 85

External Reference: CR 1794

Category: Add fields to vehicle inspection view.

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Several states would like to have CVSA Expiration date and state carrier ID in the vehicle inspection view. We recommend that those two fields be added to the views in a future version of SAFER. This corresponds to ACCB CR 1554.

Submitted by Salazar to CVOSS CCB 6/21/2001

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: This is actually the SAFER CR that is the equivalent of ACCB CR 1554. Disapproved and closed by ACCB 4/4/2002.

Description: Due to requests from additional CVISN states for the CVSA expiration date, we would like the priority to be changed to "H" and would like this change to be considered for SAFER 4.

Information from Ron:

The CVSA_EXPIRE_DATE and STATE_CARRIER_ID fields are NOT in the vehicle_inspection table. Both of these fields are in the vehicle_registration table. I think we talked about moving the CVSA_EXPIRE_DATE(calculated field) to the vehicle_inspection table but we never discussed moving the STATE_CARRIER_ID. The DB3.0 design would not support a view based on fields from two possibly unrelated tables (vehicle_inspection and vehicle_registration). We would have to add or move STATE_CARRIER_ID to vehicle_inspection. How would we populate this field ?

Information from Alan:

We do not have a direct source for "CVSA Expiration date."
In the inspection report, keyed by VIN / LICENSE PLATE / STATE we have:

CVSA_DECAL CHAR(1) (True/False)
DECAL_NUMBER VARCHAR2(8)

If the decal field is only filled in when the decal is ISSUED, the expiration date can be ASSUMED to be the date of the inspection report + 60 days. If this field is filled in at any other time, this assumption does not hold.

The inspection view is a summary of all inspections for vehicles with a particular license plate. Over time, more than one vehicle can have the same license plate, and the same vehicle can have different license plates. But the decal is stuck to the truck. For this reason, the cert flag and expiration date may not relate to the truck with the license plate.

According to Paul, SAFER can not further consider these changes until further requirements analysis is done by the CVISN Architecture CCB to clarify the source and means of calculating the CVSA expiration date.

State Carrier ID:

The SAFER inspection view / table contains information about the last OOS inspection received, the last inspection received, OOS or not, and statistics about inspections received. The fields for these two inspection reports are:

DATETIME
LOCATION
RPTNUM
VIN

The inspection report contains a single field for carrier id and state carrier id, and multiple vehicles. An INSPECTION_STATE_CARRIER_ID and an OOS_STATE_CARRIER_ID could be added to the vehicle inspection table and set using the STATE CARRIER ID for each vehicle contained in the report. These two fields could then be put into the inspection view.

Since access to the vehicle inspection view is through the registration information provided to SAFER, the USDOT numbers and state id numbers recorded in the vehicle inspection table may be different from the carrier ids recorded in the registration for the license plate of the vehicle.

Before further consideration can be given to this request, the ACCB should verify that these considerations are acceptable to the states, or provide details to whatever alternative they would like to consider.

Analysis: 12/10/2001

NCM 2002-04-08: It was agreed at the 4/4/2002 ACCB meeting that vehicle.CVSA_EXPIRE_DATE and vehicle.CARRIER_STATE_ID will not be requested for the Inspection View Q302. CR disapproved and closed.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 1/8/2007 11:19:54 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:58:53 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 1/8/2007 11:19:54 AM

CR Number: 84

External Reference: CR 1786

Category: Address CVIEW in COACH Part 1

Component: COACH Part 1

Synopsis: CVIEW should be mentioned in the appropriate operational concepts and system requirements tables of COACH Part 1.

Requested by Jeff Loftus 6/15/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: Recommend adding a new item 4.2.9 to table 4.2-2 State Safety Information Exchange and Safety Assurance Systems Design Requirements Checklist in COACH Part 1 to address the CVIEW requirement:
Implement the CVIEW (or equivalent) system for exchange of intrastate and interstate data within state and connection to SAFER for exchange of interstate data through snapshots - OR - utilize the SAFER option for exchange of inter- and intrastate data through snapshots.

ACCB Documents Affected:
- COACH, Part 1
- COACH, Part 3

Fix: COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:03:12 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:57:38 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 10/23/2003 7:06:27 AM

CR Number: 83

External Reference: CR 1784

Category: Updates to snapshot whitepaper for SAFER/CVIEW version 2

Component: Snapshots

Synopsis: This CR documents updates to be included in the snapshot whitepaper for SAFER/CVIEW version 2.

Submitted by Clyde 6/14/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: Combine all of the spreadsheets in appendices A & B into whitepaper as word table
Remove shading and multiple fonts
Repeated key fields for some supporting tables
For Appendix A:
Rename column B from -SAFER Database Element- to -Database Field Name-
Rename column D from "Added/Changed under CRF Number" to "Applicable CR No."
Delete column E ("SAFER Support Revision")
Delete column F ("Supported in EDI IG") and
Added column to show field type and length for SAFER database
For Appendix B:
Rename column B from -SAFER Database Element- to -Database Field Name-
Rename "Data Sources" to "Authoritative Sources"
Rename column K from "Common Source" to "Source"
Rename column L from "Common Source Availability" to "Source Availability" - use a "C" for current or a "F" for future
Rename column N from "Common Source" to "Source"
Rename column O from "Common Source Availability" to "Source Availability" - use a "C" for current or a "F" for future
Rename column S from "Common Source" to "Source"
Rename column U from "Common Source Availability" to "Source Availability" - use a "C" for current or a "F" for future
Delete column M ("Data Source Issues")
Delete column P ("Data Source Issues")
Delete column U ("Data Source Issues")
Rename "Maryland State" to "Maryland State (example)"
General changes
Add words in white paper about SSN change in CRF 1059 (Appendix A Comment)
Add L & I Fields from CRF 626 to white paper (appendix A & B)
Add fields from CRF 693 to white paper (Appendix A & B)
Add words on not change and replace in safer(Text In Whitepaper)
Add words about keys for views (Text in Whitepaper)
Updated appendix D to be consistent with paper itself

Clear definition for IRP Check Flag (appendix A Comment)
Define snapshot update views for credentials at carrier level (Text in whitepaper and Appendix B)
Add MCS 150 Mileage and Year to snapshot.(appendix A & B)
Add L&I summary fields to carrier snapshot (Appendix A & B)
Rename IRP Check Flag (Appendix A)
Added paragraphs on interface alternatives to EDI (Text in Whitepaper)
Added paragraphs about SOWG (text in whitepaper)
Appendix A added comments on CVIS default carrier and ties to PRISM (appendix A)
Added updates to Comments on ISS2 values. (Appendix A)
Added Inspection report retention being 60 days. (text in whitepaper)

Analysis: Clyde 6/14/2001
Recommended by ACCB 6/21/2001

Fix: Snapshot White Paper published and delivered via PL-01-0258, 6 Aug 2001

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:03:23 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:56:04 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 12/19/2001 12:27:54 PM

CR Number: 82

External Reference: CR 1760

Category: Align CVISN and National ITS Architecture flows

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: In June 2000, the CVISN Architecture and National ITS Architecture teams were directed to align the two architectures. Equipment Packages and Subsystems were already aligned, but the flows were not.

Submited by Barnes 5/30/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: Members of the National ITS and CVISN Architecture teams have worked together on the alignment process. A synopsis of the changes proposed for the CVISN architecture follows:

1.The National ITS Architecture naming conventions were adopted by CVISN for

aligned flows (flow name initial caps were changed to lower case). Flows that have not yet been aligned, e.g., IBC flows, are shown as all caps to differentiate them.

2.The Cargo terminator was eliminated as part of the CVISN architecture.

3.The proposed CVISN Architecture Flow diagram (2001 Version) shows the Vehicle Subsystem aggregated with the Commercial Vehicle Subsystem; this aggregation was not explicitly shown in the original. Architecture flows that were not unique to CVO were not represented in the original CVISN architecture. For the alignment process, basic vehicle functions were incorporated into the CV realm.

4.Many of the two-way flows (Message Sets and DSRC request/response pairs) were eliminated and explicitly split into their component unidirectional functions.

5.The snapshot data flow "CV Safety & Cred Info Exch" was split into separate safety and credential flows.

6.Direct flows from a center to a human interface without an intervening system at the driver-s location were eliminated.

7.The terminator label "Law Enforcement Agency" was replaced by "Enforcement Agency."

8.When necessary for clarification and/or alignment, flow names and definitions were modified.

9.A few flows were added for alignment or because they were missing from the original CVISN architecture.

10.Some flows between humans and subsystems remain in the National ITS Architecture but are not shown in the CVISN Architecture because the human operator is considered to be part of the subsystem in CVISN. This is an area where we agreed to disagree.

The attachment -- CR_1760 _Arch_Flow_Diagrams.ppt -- includes the proposed and original CVISN architecture flow diagrams. An additional file -- ssdapps2\pvo\Config Mgmt\CRF Database\CRFs\Attachments\CR_1760 \CR_1760_Arch Alignment.doc -- contains tables that correlate new and old flow names. All flow names are defined; explanations for flow deletions and additions are also included. The CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram is a configuration item under ACCB.

ACCB Documents Affected:
CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram
CVISN System Design Description

Other Documents Affected:
SCOPE Workshop

Frequently Used Slides Affected:
CVISN Arch Flow.ppt
CVISN Architecture - equipment packages.ppt
CVISN Architecture connects subsystems.ppt

Analysis: Barnes 5/30/2001
Recommended by ACCB 6/21/2001
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Fix: Scope Workshop - published
CVISN Architecture Flow Diagram - published and delivered via PL-01-0358, 3 Aug

	2001 CVISN Arch Flow.ppt - updated CVISN Architecture - equipment packages.ppt - updated CVISN Architecture connects subsystems.ppt - updated CVISN System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
Comment:	
Attachment names:	CR_1760_Arch_Alignment.doc CR_1760_Arch_Flow_Diagrams.ppt
Responsibility:	Greenwald Beverly E
Modified Time:	11/24/2003 7:03:37 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	12/17/2001 2:54:46 PM
Entered By:	Greenwald Beverly E
Severity:	High
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	5/23/2003 2:55:26 PM

CR Number:	81
External Reference:	CR 1743
Category:	Remove Last Update Date from inspection view
Component:	Snapshots
Synopsis:	Remove Last Update Date from inspection view Submitted by Clyde 5/17/2001
Status:	Closed Fixed
Disposition:	Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001
Description:	This CRF replaces 1403. 1403 introduced the problem of continuing to use last update date in certain circumstances starting with SAFER/CVIEW version 3.0. To support storage of data for PRISM, underlying changes to the database structure have been made. These changes result in the situation where last update date can't be utilized by some authoritative sources. Since this is the case, we recommend just removing it from the view so that last_update_date can't be misinterpreted. It is not essential for performing screening or an inspection. Documents affected: "SAFER View Summary Report" Analysis: Recommended by ACCB 5/17/2001 Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001
Fix:	rcg - 20020123 Removed LAST_UPDATE_DATE from Q302 v4 (Vehicle Inspection).

Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Greenwald Beverly E
Modified Time:	11/24/2003 7:03:50 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	12/17/2001 2:52:51 PM
Entered By:	Greenwald Beverly E
Severity:	High
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	8/21/2002 10:45:16 AM

CR Number:	80
External Reference:	CR 1738
Category:	Non-populated data elements in the SAFER database
Component:	SAFER
Synopsis:	Alan Mick: 5/14/2001 Non-populated data elements in the SAFER database should be removed from the "White Paper," the "CVO Vocabulary," and the SAFER database.
Status:	Closed Fixed
Disposition:	Closed
Description:	Discussed at ACCB meeting 5/17/2001
Fix:	Carrier non populated data fields have been eliminated from the SAFER DB. No additional database cleanup is planned.
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Greenwald Beverly E
Modified Time:	11/24/2003 7:04:03 AM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	12/17/2001 2:51:38 PM
Entered By:	Greenwald Beverly E
Severity:	High
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	10/10/2003 12:48:58 PM

CR Number: 79

External Reference: CR 1731

Category: Need fields to support intrastate registration

Component: CVIEW

Synopsis: There is a need for CVIEW to support intrastate registration. Fields needed include:
License Plate Number
License Plate State
License Plate Country

Submitted by Salazar 5/9/2001

A field called -LICENSE_PLATE_STATE- already exists in the SAFER/CVIEW database, but it has other business rules associated with it.

There may also be a need to have a status flag associated with intrastate registration. There may also be a need to have an -interstate or intrastate- flag.

Status: Closed Is Duplicate

Disposition: [2003-01-20 ncm] Closed - covered by CR 686

Description: Related to SOWG requirements. See SAFER 4.2 requirements.

[2003-01-20 ncm] Intrastate registration is covered by CR 686.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 1/20/2003 8:57:02 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:50:40 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 1/20/2003 8:57:02 AM

CR Number: 78

External Reference: CR 1717

Category: Add OOS and Inspection VIN to Vehicle Inspection View

Component: Snapshots

Synopsis: Add OOS VIN and Inspection VIN to Inspection view for release 3. Add to Q302 and Q303 for view version 4.

Submitted by Mick 5/2/2001

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Description: From the minutes of the Deployment state teleconferences on May 22, 2001: During the calls, Gary Steinmetz (MO) said he felt a partial VIN field would not be useful, and could be confusing. CT, MD, NV and NY felt the VIN captured during inspection would be useful information. This CR is associated with the CVOSS CR 1793.

Documentation affected:

SAFER View Summary Report

Analysis:
Recommended by ACCB: 6/21/2001
Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Fix: rcg - 20011130
Added the INSPECTION_VIN and OOS_VIN fields to Q302,v4 (Vehicle INSP) and Q303,v4 (Full Vehicle) views.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:04:15 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:49:35 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 8/21/2002 10:45:31 AM

CR Number: 77

External Reference: CR 1662

Category: SAFER now stores IRs for 60 days

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: SAFER has been changed to store inspection reports for 60 days rather than 45 days. Documents under configuration control need to be changed to indicate this.

Submitted by Salazar 4/6/2001.

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: ACCB Documents Affected:
Snapshot White Paper
COACH Part 1
COACH Part 3
COACH Part 5
Other Documents Affected:
CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange
SCOPE Workshop - Session 5

8/15/01 - removed System Design Description from affected documents - the note that referenced this change was removed. Ncm

Recommended by ACCB 4/19/2001
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Fix: COACH Part 5 updated July 2001 (MWS). Published and delivered via PL-01-0444 (POR-98-7126), 21 Sep 2001
Snapshot White Paper - published and delivered via PL-01-0258, 6 Aug 2001
Scope Workshop - published Oct 2001
CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange - published and delivered via PL-02-0088 (POR-99-7191), 13 Jun 2002
COACH Part 1 V3.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0143 (POR-97-7067), 8 August 2003.
COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:04:25 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:48:14 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/23/2003 7:03:50 AM

CR Number: 76

External Reference: CR 1590

Category: Increase field lengths for Unit Number and Address

Component: CVIEW

Synopsis: Increase the data length allowed for vehicle Unit Number and street address fields so that snapshots are not rejected by CVIEW/SAFER. KY IRP sends 6 digit vehicle Unit Numbers and street address fields of 40 characters. These snapshots are rejected by

CVIEW which only allows 5 digits for Unit Number and 30 for street address. Data fields should not be so restrictive.

Submitted: Stuart 3/13/2001

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed

Description: Unit number: This is a motor carrier assigned ID number. KY allows 8 characters to provide room for fleet designations. MD allows 9 characters because VISTA allows 9 in the IRP registration process. I have seen example cab cards from MD with 6 characters. WA also allows 9 characters. WA says the transponder administrators use the unit number to ID the vehicle and that's why it should still be included in the snapshot. Since motor carriers are allowed up to 9 characters in the VISTA system and so many states use VISTA, SAFER/CVIEW should increase the field length to 9. At the present time SAFER/CVIEW allows only 5 characters and this is not enough. Even non-VISTA states are allowing fleet designators in the IDs which can make them fairly long. See SAFER CRFs 1748 and 1749.

Analysis: Stuart 6/14/2001
Discussed at ACCB 6/21/2001
Disposition: Open until corresponding SAFER CRs 1748 and 1749 closed; analysis will need to include updates to documents affected. Paul North has contacted FMCSA regarding the impact the change of the unit number length would have on release of SAFER/CVIEW 3 (about 1 week). The address length problem will most likely be addressed in the context of the SAFER Option Working Group requirements.

sbs 2002-04-01: SAFER CR 128 (formerly 1748) has been fixed. SAFER CR 129 (formerly 1749) will be included in SAFER version 4.

Fix: Field lengths have been corrected in XML transactions in SAFER 4.2.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:19:54 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:46:49 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/10/2003 1:02:01 PM

CR Number: 75

External Reference: CR 1555

Category: Impact of EDI standard version on data elements carried in snaps

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: The SAFER software is remaining at EDI standard 4010. (CRF 1196) This has the following impact:
- Fuel Type not available.
- SAFER User ID, which would be helpful for update security, will not be available. Must continue to use -mutual agreement- code in 4010.
- The Implementation Guides are Version 4030. Earlier versions are not maintained.
- 4010 does not include the increased VIN length (from 25 to 30) requested by PRISM.
- 4010 does not include country code in license plate.
- 4010 does not include the additional N2 segment to accommodate the longer name lengths requested for license and insurance data.
- FMCSA code directory in the 4010 version of the standard does not include 3 codes added since then. These codes, T23, T24, and T27, refer to the code tables for Cargo, Hazmat Cargo, and Compliance Reviews. Therefore none of the codes in these 3 tables are referenced by Version 4010. If states use 4020 or later versions, SAFER will ignore the transaction. If they use 4010, they will have to edit their version of the standard to include the 3 codes that SAFER uses that are not part of the 4010 standard.
QUESTION: If SAFER is never going to migrate to the new standard should these effected data fields still be part of the snapshot view definitions? We are saying one thing (in the IG) and doing another.

Submitted by Stuart 2/22/2001

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: Discussed with FMCSA 12/20/2001

Description: We talked to Chris Conway of MN, Jim Ramsey & Wray Williams of KY, DJ Waddell of MD, Gary Nishite of CA. They all indicated that there was no need within their respective states to have the fields in 4040 that are not in 4010. CA does not need the increased VIN length; they will handle it. There is an issue of what it means for four states to not be in conformance with the standard identifiers, by not using the country code for license plate. Otherwise, we propose that FMCSA does not implement changes in SAFER to support 4040.

Disaspproved by ACCB 6/15/2001, but needs to be discussed with FMCSA.
Submitted to FMCSA 12/2001.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: CRF 1555 Attachment.doc

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 12/21/2001 5:12:13 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:45:30 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 12/21/2001 5:12:13 PM

CR Number: 74

External Reference: CR 1554

Category: No new vehicle views after CVIEW 3.x

Component: CVIEW

Synopsis: The latest SAFER SOW says: Update views will have specific business rules tied to them. For instance, IRP updates will behave differently from E-Screening and Inspection Report updates. Since these rules constitute view-specific code, vehicle update views can no longer be created simply by adding new views to the database. New vehicle update views must be accompanied by new code and a new release of SAFER/CVIEW to accommodate them. This means that after CVIEW 3.x there will be no support for new vehicle update views from the state's point of view, and no way to add additional credential data to the snapshots, such as OS/OW, intrastate regstration, titling etc. How does this work with CVISN statements that the electronic credentialing (and data flow to CVIEWs) is expected to expand beyond IRP and IFTA ?

Submitted: Stuart 2/22/2001

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: Disapproved and closed by the ACCB 4/4/2002.

Description: The S/C V2 and S/C V3 vehicle data elements are essentially the same, with the exception of special tables created for vehicle history for PRISM. The relationships between these elements have been revised.

An examination of the snapshot white paper has shown that ALL vehicle data elements are covered in the three update views (E-Screen, IRP, Inspection) with the following exceptions:

License Plate State is not in any view. IRP Base State is the data element that establishes this value. The update rules for License Plate State are as follows:

* If there is a license plate number in the update information, Licence Plate State is set to the value of IRP Base State.
* If there is no license plate number in the update information, both License Plate State and License Plate Number are set to NULL.

This allows MD to send in IRP registrations prior to a license plate being issued.

No NMVTIS Check Flag or Update Date view.

-
No view for CVSA Expiration date, although the CVSA decal issued does exist in the inspection view. No inspection state assigned carrier census number in inspection view.

-
No view for Permit fields in S/C V2, however this view has been added to S/C V3.

Recommendations:

* Add NMVTIS view.

* Add CVSA Expiration date and "inspection state assigned carrier census number" to inspection view.

* Clarify License Plate State in white paper.

Salazar:
Email sent to states on May 11 and discussed with states in monthly teleconferences on May 22, 2001.
Only one state expressed interest in the NMVTIS view.
Several states would like to have CVSA Expiration date and state carrier ID in the vehicle inspection view. We recommend that those two fields be added to the views in a future version of SAFER. We do not recommend that an NMVTIS view be defined. Architecture documentation would be impacted. This corresponds to CVOSS CR 1794.

Recommended by ACCB 8/9/2001.

Reopened after CVOSS CCB meeting 12/10/2001.

Information from Ron Glaser and Alan Mick (refer to CR 1794 for more details):

The vehicle.CVSA_EXPIRE_DATE is not available from the inspection report. It would have to be derived.

The inspection report contains a single field for carrier id and state carrier id. It is stored as the database field vehicle.CARRIER_ID_NUMBER.

We propose that since vehicle.CVSA_EXPIRE_DATE and vehicle.CARRIER_STATE_ID are not available from the inspection report, they should not be included in the Inspection View Q302.

NCM 2002-04-05: Presented to the ACCB on 4/4/2002. It was agreed that vehicle.CVSA_EXPIRE_DATE and vehicle.CARRIER_STATE_ID will not be requested for the Inspection View Q302.

NCM 2002-04-05: Disapproved and closed by the ACCB 4/4/2002.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 1/8/2007 11:20:03 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:43:55 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 1/8/2007 11:20:03 AM

CR Number: 73

External Reference: CR 1552

Category: Maintain vehicle query capability

Component: CVIEW

Synopsis: The CVISN architecture shows CVIEW sending carrier and vehicle queries to SAFER. According to the latest SAFER statement of work, CVIEW version 3.x will not provide vehicle queries from CVIEW to SAFER. There will be carrier queries only, and these will be via remote procedure call, not EDI. SAFER/CVIEW should maintain vehicle queries from CVIEW to SAFER.

submitted by Mary Stuart 2/22/2001

Status: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2003-02-06 ncm] Closed out CR

Description: Not scheduled for SAFER/CVIEW version 3. Estimate to implement in SAFER is 4-6 weeks. Candidate for inclusion in future version of SAFER, not in version 3.

Analysis: North reported to ACCB 5/17/2001.

[2003-02-06 ncm per rhg] SAFER will continue to support EDI vehicle queries sent to it directly via e-mail as long as EDI is supported. There are no plans to enable vehicle queries sent to a CVIEW to be forwarded to SAFER. CR is closed out.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 2/6/2003 1:45:21 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:42:40 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 2/6/2003 1:45:21 PM

CR Number: 72

External Reference: CR 1551

Category: No EDI queries from APL developed CVIEW to SAFER

Component: CVIEW

Synopsis: No EDI queries from APL developed CVIEW to SAFER; SAFER accepts EDI and RPC

The CVISN architecture shows CVIEW sending EDI queries for vehicle and carrier snapshots to SAFER. CVIEW as developed does not support EDI queries to SAFER.

Queries are accomplished via remote procedure call only. CVISN documentation should reflect CVIEW-SAFER as EDI or RPC, and point out that SAFER can acept and respond to either.

Submitted by: Stuart 2/22/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: Some documents need to be clarified by explaining the RPC vs. EDI situation that exists today between CVIEW and SAFER for snapshot queries, while discouraging new developers from planning to use the RPC mechanism long-term. In some cases this can be addressed by adding a paragraph. The proposed paragraph follows:

"SAFER was initially built to provide snapshot data to CVIEW using EDI. That is the mechanism by which the APL CVIEW currently receives subscription data from SAFER. SAFER also responds to EDI queries for snapshots. In the APL version of CVIEW, however, snapshot queries (carrier only) are sent to SAFER via remote procedure call (RPC), not EDI. The RPC capability was implemented in both SAFER and CVIEW to improve performance for the near-term, but its long-term support is uncertain and continued availability is not guaranteed. EDI is the current official interface. States can enhance the APL CVIEW by implementing EDI snapshot queries;however, in the future, the snapshot interface is expected to be Web-based, using XML and HTTP; new developers should concentrate on that approach."

Other modifications may also be required to explain the availability of RPC vs. EDI vs. Web-based solutions, e.g., diagrams and tables.

ACCB Documents Affected:
CVISN System Design Description
COACH Part 4
Other Documents Affected:
CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange
SCOPE Workshop Session 5
Training - Technology Application Course (possibly)

Analysis: Magnusson 6/8/2001
Recommended by ACCB: 5/15/2001
Approved by FMCSA: 7/3/2001

Fix: Corrections made to following documents:
**SCOPE Workshop Session 5 - published Oct 2001
**CVISN Guide to Safety Information Exchange - published and delivered via PL-02-0088 (POR-99-7191), 13 June 2002
**System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
**COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:20:15 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:41:38 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 12:55:07 PM

CR Number: 71

External Reference: CR 1508

Category: CVIEW Version 3 will not store inspection reports locally

Component: CVIEW

Synopsis: Requirements Clarification:

CVIEW 3.0 will have the capability to support ASPEN 2.X (32-bit). The following constraints on this functionality are being implemented:

1) CVIEW 3.0 will not store inspection reports locally. They will automatically be sent on to SAFER. Queries sent to CVIEW (PIQ) will be passed to SAFER via RPC, since no inspection reports will be resident on CVIEW.

submitted by: Mick 2/5/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: COACH Part 3 and the SCOPE Workshop (section 5) require slight modifications for clarification purposes. The Snapshot White Paper (soon to be published) was already clarified. The published version of COACH Part 5 is incorrect, but the latest update (which is now being reviewed) is correct.

ACCB items affected: COACH Part 3 and Part 5, Snapshot White Paper
Other documents affected: SCOPE Workshop

Analysis: Magnusson 3/30/2001
Recommended by ACCB: 5/15/2001
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Fix: COACH Part 5 updated July 2001 (MWS)

Interoperability Test Suite Package Part 2 updated July 2001 (MWS)

Snapshot White Paper published Aug 2001

Scope workshop published Oct 2001

COACH Part 3 V2.0: published and delivered via PL-03-0472 (POR-97-7067), 22 October 2003.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:20:30 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:40:19 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 12/18/2001 4:26:05 PM

CR Number: 70

External Reference: CR 1501

Category: PIQ results from SAFER and CVIEW via RPC Mechanism

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: This CR is not being submitted to request a change, just a requirements clarification:

PIQ from CVIEW to SAFER via RPC

When a CVIEW gets a past inspection query (PIQ) it will check its local database for matches and return the results, if any, to the client. If, and only if, there are no local results, it will issue an RPC query to the SAFER RPC service and return the results, if any, to the client. If no matches are found in either database the standard "data not on server" message is returned.

Note that if any matching inspection reports exist in CVIEW, the SAFER service will not be queried, and any matching inspection reports on SAFER would not be returned.

submitted by Mick 2/1/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: Allows storage of IR's in CVIEW without negative affect on PIQ.

This CR describes the ASPEN-CVIEW interface; no action required other than updating the Guide to Safety Information Exchange.

ACCB documents affected: Guide to Safety Information Exchange

Analysis: Mick
discussed at ACCB:

Fix: 2002-06-17 ncm: Guide to Safety Information Exchange published 6/13/02

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:20:40 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:38:49 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On: 6/18/2002 12:42:53 PM

CR Number: 69

External Reference: CR 1463

Category: IFTA Tax Scenario Changes

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The IFTA Tax scenarios, thread diagrams and interface specifications need to be corrected and updated. The changes need to be reviewed by stakeholders and incorporated into all applicable CVISN documentation.

Background: Some of the interface specifications for IFTA tax-related exchanges were found to be incorrectly described in the CVISN Guide to Credentials. Also, an additional tax-related business need was brought to our attention that requires the addition of an EDI interface between the State and carrier for sending notice of tax adjustments to the carrier. Revised scenarios and interface specifications were reviewed by the ANSI X-12 Government Subcommittee, Tax Information Interchange Task Group(X12/TG2) at their December 2000 meeting, and their comments and recommendations were incorporated in to the scenarios included in the attachment.

The proposed corrections are as follows:
1. There is no electronic notification of tax filing due. TG2 pointed out that this would have legal implications concerning whether or not the carrier received notification. Most jurisdictions would not rely on an electronic notice either via email or EDI, and there is no EDI equivalent transaction to accomplish this. Thus, the use of TS 813 is inappropriate for notification of tax filing due, and should be removed from the scenarios.
2. Tax credits are sent to the carrier via the TS 826. The TS 813 is uni-directional and always goes from the tax filer to the tax authority, and is not appropriate for this exchange.
3. The TS 150 is appropriate to request and receive tax rates from the state, however the TG2 group pointed out that it is more likely that states will post their rates on a web site. This is now noted on the scenarios.
4. The final change is the addition of an EDI transaction set to satisfy a business need that was not included in the original CVISN interface specifications. The transaction set is used when a state needs to send the carrier a correction to the tax filing that includes a recalculation of taxes due. According to the TG2 group, the appropriate EDI transaction set for this exchange is the TS 149, Notice of Tax Adjustment or Assessment.

Submitted by: Stuart 1/16/2001

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed

Description: Impact of changes: The proposed changes will require corresponding changes to ACCB items such as the CVISN Guides and the COACH documents (a complete list can be added to this CR upon further analysis), as well as updates and corrections to the CVISN workshop and training materials to reflect the correct interface specifications. Any existing or planned carrier system designs that serve these business needs should be examined to verify correct use of the transaction sets. On the State side, the systems responsible for creating EDI responses to the carrier, whether a legacy system interface for the IFTA tax system or a credentialing interface (CI), should be examined to verify appropriate use of the EDI transaction sets. There should be no impact for the IFTA clearinghouse.

Note that CVISN Level 1 capability does not require inclusion of the TS 150 (tax rate exchange) in State CVISN designs at this stage, and by extension, the use of the TS 826 for tax credits which are sent along with the tax rates to the carrier, would not be considered part of Level 1. The additional specification for the TS 149 for notice of tax adjustment is also outside the scope of the CVISN Level 1 capability. Therefore, the implications of these changes for a State implementing only the Level 1 capability should be minimal.

To summarize, these changes may have an impact on EDI development plans in the IFTA tax area for those states that are already designing/implementing capabilities beyond CVISN Level 1. Note that this is only applicable to your design if you are implementing an EDI interface from the carrier to your state, such as with a CAT-CI interface. MWS update 4/01: I have been in touch with KY, MN, WA, MD and none of these states have a problem with this change. MWS update 6/14/01: Email to states was sent out in February and again in May. There were no responses that indicated any problems with the proposed corrections. The few responses we did get indicated a Web solution for IFTA so it didn't impact them. The ACCB documents impacted are the CVISN Guides (TLD and Credentials), and COACH Part 5(taken care of with CR 1377). Other documents impacted are the CVISN Workshop materials(Scope), Training materials and the Interoperability Test Suite Package Parts 1,2 and 4. Also impacts System Design Description.

Analysis: Stuart 1/17/2001
Recommended by ACCB 5/17/2001
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Fix: COACH Part 5 updated July 2001 (MWS)
Interoperability Test Suite Package Part 2 updated July 2001 (MWS).
System Design Description: published and delivered via PL-03-0123 (POR-97-6998), 20 May 2003.
COACH Part 4: published and delivered via PL-03-00568 (POR-97-7067), 5 Nov 2003.

No longer maintained:
Scope 6
Guide to Credentials Administration

Comment:

Attachment names: CR_1463_IFTAtax.ppt

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:20:49 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:37:28 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 11/5/2003 12:53:36 PM

CR Number: 68

External Reference: CR 1308

Category: Add a Carrier Snapshot IRP Update View to SAFER and CVIEW

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: We need to have a Carrier Snapshot IRP Update View.

E-Mail from Alan Mick on Tuesday 10/10/2000 9:38 AM:
Jim,
The only CARRIER snapshot information we send to CVIEW is the MCMIS view, and it would be inappropriate for IDT to send that information in.
My suspicion is that they would send the IRP view, which for a carrier is pretty simple:

DOT Number
IRP Account Number
IRP Check Flag
IRP Check Flag Date

Please verify with Robert/Karen the contents of the CARRIER IRP view, and then suggest that to Wray as the view/fields to be updated.
This might involve more work than Carolyn should be handling for KY. We might have to get help from some of the EDI folks.

Submitted by Polaha 10/13/2000

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: Two IRP update views exist in CVIEW 2.4. These views are being documented in the current version of the whitepaper. Additional fields required in the IRP carrier update will need to be requested via the SAFER option working group and a new CRF.

Analysis Clyde 11/2000
Recommended by ACCB 11/27/2000
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Fix: Snapshot White Paper published Aug 2001

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:21:00 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:34:04 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 12/18/2001 4:09:39 PM

CR Number: 67

External Reference: CR 1227

Category: Make Vehicle Registration Data Repeating Fields

Component: Snapshots

Synopsis: Multiple registrations per vehicle must be supported. It is unusual but unavoidable that one vehicle can have registrations and license plates from more than one state, including IRP and/or intrastate registrations/plates. Several previous CRs addressed aspects of this problem: 607 on IRP/Intrastate check flags; 1117, 1118 and 1119 on EDI, snapshots and code directory updates for registration flags/dates. Those CRs are absorbed into this new CR (1227). Analysis is required to determine which data fields are linked to vehicle registration data for each jurisdiction (eg. different owners allowed? Different registered weights?) Update logic must be designed (e.g., two intrastate plates from one state allowed?) Proposed answers will have to be reviewed by a group of state vehicle registration experts.

Submitted: Waddell 9/6/2000

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: See "Multiple Vehicle Registrations.doc" in \\SSDAPPS2\PVO\Config Mgmt\CRF Database\CRFs\Attachments\CRF_1227

Analysis: Waddell 11/3/2000
Recommended by ACCB: 11/27/2000
Approved by FMCSA: 7/3/2001

Fix: Implemented in SAFER/CVIEW 3.3

Comment:

Attachment names: Multiple Vehicle Registrations.doc

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:21:11 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:32:38 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/10/2003 12:47:02 PM

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: Closed Disapproved

Disposition: [2006-11-21]Closed - disapproved

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.

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 11/16/06 ACCB meeting.
No states have expressed an interest recently in pursuing the addition of diesel emissions data in inspection reports and/or snapshots. It has been suggested that this CR be closed.

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:	Greenwald Beverly E
Modified Time:	1/23/2007 12:42:32 PM
Modified By:	Salazar Sandra B
Entered On:	12/17/2001 2:30:27 PM
Entered By:	Greenwald Beverly E
Severity:	High
Priority:	No
Type:	Suggestion
Closed On:	12/11/2006 7:32:56 AM

CR Number:	65
External Reference:	CR 1059
Category:	Stopped Sending the complete SSN and only send the four digit SS
Component:	Snapshots
Synopsis:	FMCSA has stopped sending SAFER the full social security number of motor carriers. Only the last four digits are being provided. In the carrier snapshots a tax id type of "S" will have a tax id number of at most four digits. Duplicates will be possible. Employeer id numbers, with a type of "E" are unaffected. Submitted by Mick 5/24/2000
Status:	Closed Approved
Disposition:	[2003-01-20 ncm] Closed - IFTA portion covered by CR 681
Description:	Include information in the Snapshot White Paper to explain what data will appear in the SSN field. When the impact has been described, the CRF should be promulgated to the snapshot stakeholders so that they are aware of what has happened. The whitepaper has been updated to reflect this change in census data. However, this is a question of being able to supply tax id's with IFTA updates. The only place tax ID occurs is in census data and MCMIS is the authoritative source for this. There probably needs to be a tax ID number added to the IFTA credential data. This was left open and was to be discussed further. We also need to look at whether there is an issue with IFTA being able to supply US DOT numbers for update. The original plan was for them to use tax id number to link to existing snapshots but this is not an option in SAFER. (Salazar 6/14/01) Spoke with Tom Melville and Jim Poe of Indiana, Rick Taylor of Kentucky, and Sandy Axley of California. It seems that this is still an open issue; there is a move toward using USDOT but it hasn-t happened yet. IFTA, Inc. needs to address this; it is an agenda item for the IFTA, Inc. Managers- Workshop in October. [ncm 2003-01-20] The IFTA part is covered by CR 681.

Fix: Snapshot White Paper published Aug 2001
Check SAFER 4.2 reqs. for association of US DOT number with IFTA account. [ncm 2003-01-20 - the IFTA portion is covered by CR 681]

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 1/20/2003 10:38:31 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:28:58 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 1/20/2003 10:38:31 AM

CR Number: 64

External Reference: CR 1046

Category: Definition of IRP Check Flag in Snapshot White Paper is unclear

Component: Snapshots

Synopsis: Definition of the IRP Check Flag in the snapshot white paper is unclear and does not meet users' needs.

Submitted by Salazar 5/13/2000

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: Appendix A. Detailed Snapshot Contents.

Carrier Snapshot Row 174 Column A Data Description
Change "IRP Check Flag" to "IRP Status Flag".

Carrier Snapshot Row 174 Column C EDI IG Data Item
Change "IRP Check Flag" to "IRP Status Flag".

Carrier Snapshot Row 174 Column G Comments Carrier's IRP Status (Active or Inactive). A value of "Check" means the carrier's status is inactive. Consult authoritative source for additional information.

Change to: Set by the authoritative source to indicate whether the carrier's IRP Status is Active or Inactive. The three states and their interpretations are: Null (not set) - No information provided by authoritative source. Check - Set by the authoritative source to indicate that the carrier's IRP status is inactive. The snapshot user should query the authoritative source for up-to-date status information and the necessary specifics. Okay - Set by the authoritative source to indicate that the carrier's IRP status is active. Note that

the IRP Status Flag is associated with the IRP Account Number; a single carrier (USDOT number) may have more than one IRP account.

Vehicle Snapshot Row 42 Column G Comments
Indicates the registration has been suspended or has a stop placed on it (invalid). A value of "Check" means no valid registration. Consult authoritative for additional information.

Change to: Set by the authoritative source to indicate whether the vehicle credentials are legal. The three states and their interpretations are: Null (not set) - No information provided by authoritative source. Check - Set by the authoritative source to indicate that the vehicle credential is suspended or revoked. The snapshot user should query the authoritative source for up-to-date status information and the necessary specifics. Okay - Set by the authoritative source to indicate that the vehicle credentials are legal. Note that the IRP Check Flag is associated with the IRP Account Number; a single carrier (USDOT number) may have more than one IRP account.

Analysis Salazar 6/1/2000
Recommended by ACCB 8/11/2000
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Fix: Snapshot White Paper published Aug 2001

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:21:27 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:26:46 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 12/18/2001 3:49:24 PM

CR Number: 63

External Reference: CR 0940

Category: Potential Changes to Vehicle Snapshot resulting from SAFER-PRISM

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Potential changes to vehicle snapshot resulting from design of combined SAFER-PRISM central site database will dramtically change structure of vehicle database and relationships of data in the vehicle snapshot. Specifically, there will be N to N relationships between VIN and state plate and between state plate and registration information. Previous vehicle snapshot queries will not work in the same manner. Previous IRP updates will not work. The 285 EDI representation of the vehicle snapshot may also be affected.

There needs to be a review of the impacts of these changes on other CVISN programs

and stakeholders.

Submitted by Goldfarb 2/25/2000

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: This CRF identifies the need to modify the SAFER database to support the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) program. The proposed changes create a many-to-many relationship between license plates and Vehicle Identification Numbers (VINs), where, before, there was a one-to-one relationship. The proposed changes should correct errors in the original design. Vehicle data will be divided into several tables as illustrated in database table design information provided in \Config Mgmt\CRF Database\CRFs\Attachments\Crf_940\for CRF 940 PRISM_Vehicle_V3.ppt Under the new design, an inspection report will not establish the state/plate relationship to a VIN. Instead, there are now separate fields for the VIN and state/plate recorded during an inspection.

Under the new design, a query on either VIN or state/plate may result in a return of zero or many matches. As part of the PRISM effort, the SAFER database team worked with Ruth Skluzacek of the Iowa Department of Transportation to create and review a truth table that describes valid, suspicious, and erroneous data combinations. This is provided in \Config Mgmt\CRF Database\CRFs\Attachments\Crf_940\IRP_matrix.xls. Another table was developed to demonstrate in more detail what the choices are when a new record is received and one or more of the key fields is the same as those fields in a record already existing in the database. The second table gives an example of what could happen when a carrier wants to switch plates on two vehicles. The example is based on these two "business rules":

RULE 1: - A VIN can only have one PLATE/STATE within a state at any given time.
This rule would prevent the following condition:
VIN STATE PLATE
10 MD 777
10 MD 888

RULE 2: - A PLATE/STATE can only be associated with one VIN within a state at any given time.
This rule would prevent the following condition:
VIN STATE PLATE
10 MD 777
20 MD 777

In March 2000, the table board agreed that other vehicle registration experts should review the truth table. After review of the proposal via email by IRP experts from MD, KY, MN, VA, and IRP, Inc., a teleconference was held on July 7, 2000, to obtain closure. The proposal was unanimously declared acceptable.

Impact Summary:
ACCB Items - Snapshot White Paper
Vehicle queries by VIN will return multiple snapshots - rather than one - if there are multiple license plates registered for the VIN.
285 EDI vehicle representation changes will be minimal - or non-existent.
285 EDI carrier snapshot will potentially need to change (for IRP account data). This change will be implemented in SAFER 3.0.

Analysis Salazar 8/11/2000
Recommended by ACCB 8/11/2000

Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Fix: 20020821 Robert Goldfarb This change has been implemented in SAFER/CVIEW v3.3.

The 2 IRP business rules described in the CR are valid for SAFER/CVIEW IRP processing but are not limitations in the SAFER/CVIEW v3.3 db. In fact, the SAFER v3.3 db at VOLPE could have vehicles that violate the 2 business rules due to PRISM processing.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:21:36 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:25:14 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 8/21/2002 11:59:07 AM

CR Number: 62

External Reference: CR 0827

Category: Snapshot Update Views and Control

Component: Snapshots

Synopsis: Questions on Snapshot update views need to be resolved. Snapshot update views need to be defined for IFTA (and perhaps other credentials) at the carrier level. Currently there is a vehicle snapshot update view for IRP only. Who decides what data items are needed for updates of the database? Who decides who should be able to update the database? If Kentucky wants a view for their CI to send full Carrier snapshot updates to their CVIEW that include IRP and IFTA information, can they do that? And if they do, does that mean every state can define any view for any combination of credentials? If SAFER will only take one type of credential update at a time (like IRP or IFTA) do we have to have a separate view defined for each credential? Which ones are to be at the carrier level and which ones at the vehicle level? Does the state decide? How is this information provided to the state CI EDI developers? If the sender thinks they are sending a snapshot update (like a Q105, full carrier) that is not actually allowed by SAFER or CVIEW as an update, some information is ignored, and the fields are not changed. How is the sender notified of this? The IG says the sender can specify a change, replace, add or delete for the TS 285 update, (see CR 269) but CVIEW treats them all as replace which requires every data field filled in or it will be replaced with a null value.

Submitted by Stuart 12/14/99

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: See Attached file for advice on handling inputs from multiple sources. Should add a carrier IRP view.

Brenda Clyde (11/21/00) A file containing the definition of proposed views for IFTA and IRP can be found on the server at PVO\Arch Concepts\snapshots\Proposed Level 1 Views 112100.xls. This file still has a few questions which are being worked. Additions will need to be made for HazMat, OS/OW and Diesel emissions.

Configuration items affected include SAFER, state developed CVIEW, EDI IG 285 and snaphot whitepaper.

Several Carrier and Vehicle views were added to CVIEW version 2.4. All new views added are being documented in the MAY 2001 version of the whitepaper Additional views are being added to CVIEW 3.0. These views allow for the updating of the fields in the snapshot. Any new views required by a state/user to perform updates of snapshots will need to be requested via the SAFER Option Working Group or via a new CRF.

Analysis Barnes 6/15/2000
Recommended by ACCB 6/15/2000
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Fix: Incorporated in System Design Document - 2000.
Incorporated in COACH Parts 1 and 3 - 2000.
Snapshot White Paper updated and published Aug 2001.

Comment:

Attachment names: Data Mult Sys 2000-06-19JJP.ppt

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:21:47 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:22:20 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 12/18/2001 3:41:02 PM

CR Number: 61

External Reference: CR 0714

Category: Multiple IRP Account Numbers per Carrier

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: The IRP allows several accounts to be established per carrier. The SAFER database has only one account / check flag per carrier. SAFER has a change request to allow multiple accounts / check flags per carrier. I think that VA stated that they did not want multiple IRP check flags but one over-all IRP check flag. I am unsure whether or not this issue was considered by the Architecture CCB board and I did not want to approve the SAFER request untill it has been.

Related CRF: 484, 832, 1227

Submitted by Alan Mick 9/7/1999

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: CRs 484 and 832 are hereby closed and absorbed into this CR. The decision of the ACCB is to support multiple IRP accounts per motor carrier. Each account is to have its own IRP Check Flag and associated date. A state that wishes to may logically "or" all such IRP Check Flags within ROC or similar systems to create their own "Master IRP Check Flag." Related CR 1227 calls for analysis of multiple IRP and/or Intrastate registration in vehicle snapshots.

Analysis: Waddell 9/6/2000.
Recommended by ACCB 9/6/2000.
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001.

Fix: Multiple IRP accounts per motor carrier are handled in XML transactions in SAFER 4.2.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:21:57 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:18:30 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/10/2003 12:47:57 PM

CR Number: 60

External Reference: CR 0693

Category: Add MCS 150 Mileage and Year to SAFER Snapshot

Component: Snapshots

Synopsis: FHWA (Pat Savage) has requested that the MCMIS database values MCS_150_MILEAGE and MCS_150_MILEAGE_YEAR added to the SAFER web page. In order to do this, these values have been added to the SAFER database. While there are no SAFER clients that require this information, it may be useful and maybe should be added to the snapshot.

submitted by Alan Mick 8/2/1999

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: Implemented in SAFER 2.x
Change will be incorporated in next revision of the Snapshot White Paper.

Recommended by ACCB 8/11/2000.
Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001.

Fix: Snapshot White Paper updated and published Aug 2001.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Greenwald Beverly E

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:22:06 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 2:16:02 PM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 12/18/2001 2:10:00 PM

CR Number: 59

External Reference: CR 0550

Category: Vehicle Cargo Type Length

Component: DSRC Standards

Synopsis: In draft 0.1.3b of IEEE P1455, Vehicle-CargoType is specified as 6 characters for HazMat Code. There are several systems and interfaces that use coded values for HazMat, and in none of them are 6 characters required.

Ron/Ray: you should review the options and make a recommendation on which to use for this field.

Requested by Barnes 3/18/1999

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - approved

Description: In draft 0.1.4 of IEEE P1455, Vehicle-CargoType is specified as 6 characters for HazMat Code. This is based upon CFR 49 part 172 which defines a 2 alpha + 4 numeric designator for a large number of hazmat types (and is normally used on manifests). It was assumed that other cargo types would use fewer than 6 characters and therefore, would be able to fit within this field.

There are a couple of approaches to reducing the number of characters allocated to hazmat. One would be to adopt some of the other codes used by FHWA to identify hazmat. These codes are based on CFR 49 part 172, but do not provide the level of detail. For example, we could adopt the codes used on form MCS-150 (which is filled in to obtain a DOT number) section 25. The instructions say "The HM types correspond to the

classes and divisions found in 49 CFR 173.2." These classes and divisions broadly define the hazmat but are not specific. Since the purpose of including a hazmat field on the transponder was to permit emergency response agencies with the ability to determine what hazmat is on a vehicle, this information MAY not be sufficient to meet their requirements.

Another approach is to code the alpha part of the CFR 49 part 172 hazmat code differently while keeping the numeric portion coded as (one byte) characters. Since the alpha portion only takes on values of "UN" for international and domestic shipments or "NA" used only for shipments within North America (between the US and Canada), it would be possible to employ only one alpha. Specifically, the "UN" would be converted to a "U" and the "NA" would be converted to an "N". Other bit oriented coding schemes would be even more efficient.

Recommend eliminating the second alpha character.

Impact Summary:

DSRC Items: IEEE P1455 standard should be modified to reflect 5 character designator and to reference CFR 49 part 172 and the specific CVISN modification.

ACCB Items - none

EDI Items: none. (The EDI X12 TS 286, 285, and 284 IGs use HazMat codes that should be considered for adoption in IEEE P1455).

Interoperability Test Items: Existing tests should be evaluated. This change may affect test data sets.

Other CCBs- Items: none (The SAFER database also stores HazMat codes that should be considered for adoption in IEEE P1455.)

Yuan 3/31/1999

Fix: Yuan 5/14/1999

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:22:22 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 11:18:35 AM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 12/18/2001 2:01:44 PM

CR Number: 58

External Reference: CR 0549

Category: Add Transponder ID to List of Standard Identifiers

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: The list of standard identifiers does not contain Transponder ID. Since the Transponder is a key entity, it should be added to the list. Unfortunately, the issue is not simple, since today-s transponders have one de facto format, and the transponder IDs proposed in IEEE P1455 will have a different format.

The proposed definition for Transponder ID consists of:
- Identifier Name = Transponder ID
- Identifier Segments
1. Transponder ID Definition Flag (1 bit; 0=current; 1=P1455)

If Transponder ID Definition Flag = current, then the other segment is:
2. Transponder Serial Number (32-bit hexadecimal value)

If Transponder ID Definition Flag = P1455, then the other segments are:
3. Manufacturer Identifier (16 bits; hexadecimal value)
4. Transponder Serial Number (20 bits; hexadecimal value)

The Transponder ID must be one of the ways used in exchanging information about transponders among agencies and jurisdictions.

Submitted by Val Barnes 3/23/1999

Status: Closed Approved

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 7/3/2001

Description: The Transponder ID is built in to the transponder. All the major electronic screening programs use the Transponder ID. States in some electronic screening programs are implementing a "screening enrollment" process to share Transponder IDs and enrollment wishes/decisions through snapshots. To make the connection between the transponder-equipped transponder and the snapshots, standardizing the format of the Transponder ID in interface definitions is prudent. The recommended format is the native Transponder ID stored on the transponder itself and used in the vehicle-roadside communications. Systems implementing the standard Transponder ID should make accommodations for both the current and future ID formats.

Impact Summary:
ACCB Items - COACH Part 4, CVISN System Design Description, Table05

EDI Items: The EDI X12 TS 286, 285, and 284 IGs should be reviewed and updated as needed.

DSRC Items: none?

Interoperability Test Items: Existing tests should be evaluated. This change may affect test data sets.

Other CCBs- Items: All products should be evaluated by each CCB. This change may affect databases, user interfaces, and code. The SAFER/CVIEW database should be evaluated.

Analysis by Val Barnes 3/23/1999
Approved by ACCB 5/1/1999

Fix: Most of the problems discussed is this CRF have been previously resolved. One unresolved problem with the transponder ID is the fact that Norpass stores transponder ID numbers as hexadecimal numbers while Prepass and others use decimal transponder ID numbers in their database. The transponder ID is normally identified in hexadecimal on the transponder case. The ID may also be displayed in decimal as well as hexadecimal, however, this is not always the case. The 8-digit hexadecimal character based format would appear to lead to less problems when stored in the SAFER/CVIEW databases due to the one-to-one relationship between the character and the position of the corresponding bits in the integer. Additionally, a hexadecimal ID would not require additional field length while the 10-digit decimal format would require additional field length. Based on a review of the appropriate implementation guides and discussions with individuals familiar with these guides, there does not appear to be a specification as to whether these numbers should be specified in hex or decimal format. Transponder ID format should be specified to be in hexadecimal, vice decimal. This format change should be implemented as soon as possible. The longer this goes on the greater the number of transponder IDs that will have to be changed.

CVISN System Design Description updated and published.
COACH 4 updated and published.
Snapshot White Paper updated and published Aug 2001.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:22:31 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 11:13:38 AM

Entered By: Greenwald Beverly E

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 12/18/2001 1:40:15 PM

CR Number: 57

External Reference: CR 0393

Category: Add Last Update Date for Views vice Snapshots

Component: Snapshots

Synopsis: Date of last update applies to the full snapshot, not to any one view in it. When one view is updated and the date is changed, it may give the false impression that other data is also up to that date. There should be an update date specific for each view.

Status: Closed Fixed

Disposition: Closed - Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Description: It is suggested that in the SAFER/CVIEW database a table be created that contains two fields: the name of the input view and the date last posted for that input view. It is suggested that whenever a snapshot is generated for output it contain one or more dates

last posted corresponding to the data being sent.

Since a view sent out (output view) may contain data items from several input views (updates from authoritative sources), the output view could be defined to include the date last posted for each input view in it.

The snapshot definition (table 5) could be organized by input views (authoritative sources) with each of these sections showing a date of last update for it. The SAFER/CVIEW database would not necessarily be organized this way, however.

Brenda Clyde (11/21/00) Configuration items affected include: SAFER, State developed CVIEW, EDI IG 285, and snapshot white paper.

Alan Mick (2001-09-17): The requested change is not included in the requirements for CVIEW version 3, which will be the last update to the CVIEW software. Given the fact that this has a LOW priority and cannot be included in CVIEW, I suggest that it not be implemented in SAFER.

Alan Mick (2001-11-29): Examination of the SAFER Option Working Group requirements and the desire to advance to the use of FTP has increased the value of this feature from the point of view of data integrity. Since each input view may be updated by different sources at different times, the last update date would be used to reject updates that would "regress" the snapshot because they arrived later than an update from another authoritative source. I recommend this change be added to the SAFER version 4 requirements, and I have reopened the SAFER CCB CRF. However, I do not believe it will be possible, or necessary, to alter CVIEW version 3.3 plans or provide this information in EDI. Instead, I recommend that it appear in the flat file and XML interface to SAFER.

Recommended for FMCSA approval and implementation in SAFER version 4, November 29, 2001.
Approved by FMCSA 12/20/2001

Fix: Discuss with SAFER team.

SAFER Team has been notified, previously deferred CRF has been changed to Reconsider. Mick 12/7/2001

In EDI, IRP view will contain the last update date, if provided in the snapshot (SAFER/CVIEW v3.3). The last update date is included in XML transactions in SAFER 4.2.

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 11/24/2003 7:22:40 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 12/17/2001 11:00:28 AM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: High

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On: 10/10/2003 12:46:50 PM

Total: 154